

Strategic Plan 2014-2017 Education 1-4 scoring indicator criteria

Output a: Enhanced support to communities with disadvantaged and excluded children to start schooling at the right age and attend regularly

1. P5.a.1 Countries with functional school management committees (SMC) [both Primary & Secondary]
2. P5.a.2 Countries in which the education management information system feeds findings back to communities/school management committees

Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to early learning opportunities and quality primary and secondary education

1. P5.b.1 Countries with innovative approaches at scale to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children
2. P5.b.2 Countries with quality standards consistent with child-friendly school / education or similar models developed or revised

Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling-up quality and inclusive education

1. P5.c.1 Countries with well-functioning learning assessment system, especially for early grades
2. P5.c.2 Countries with effective early learning policies and quality early learning programmes
3. P5.c.3 Countries with an education sector plan/policy that includes risk assessment and risk management

Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of school readiness and performance

1. P5.e.2 Countries with well-functioning education management information systems providing disaggregated data that allow identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit realization of the rights of disadvantaged children
2. P5.e.3 Countries with policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities
3. P5.e.4 Countries with an education policy/sector plan that specify prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools (SRGBV)
4. P5.e.5 Countries where girls' secondary education, in terms of enrolment, retention, and completion is a recognised, targeted and budgeted education priority
5. P5.e.6 Countries with an education policy/sector plan that includes multilingual education to allow children to learn in their mother tongue during the early grade

P5.a.1 Countries with functional school management committees (SMCs) [both Primary & Secondary]

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Community Participation. SMCs exist and they include representatives of the community who have decision power (such as being chair or permanent secretary or in charge of school finance). Students (at least for secondary schools) are members of SMCs. SMCs are authorized to make important decisions at the school level and allocate and approve the school budget. SMCs always give clearance on the data of the annual school census questionnaire before submission.</p>	<p>Community Participation. SMCs exist and they include representatives of the community but community members do not have decision power. Students (at least for secondary schools) are members of SMCs. SMCs are partially authorized to make important decisions at the school level and allocate and approve the school budget. SMCs sometimes (i.e. not in all schools) give clearance on the data of the annual school census questionnaire before submission.</p>	<p>Community Participation. SMCs exist but they only include administrative and teaching staff of the schools. SMCs are very limited with regards to decisions on school budget use and do not give clearance on the data of the annual school census questionnaire submission.</p>	<p>Community Participation. There are no SMCs in place.</p>
<p>b- Accountability. There is a financial book and records are updated and accurate. SMCs have access to detailed financial reports of their schools. SMCs' roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. There is a very active involvement of SMCs in school governance. Schools regularly publicize academic and financial performance, and the information is publicly available.</p>	<p>Accountability. Financial and human resources accountability is handled at the central or regional level. Operational budgets are managed by municipality level: Financial records are often updated. SMCs often have access to detailed financial reports of their schools. SMCs' roles and responsibilities are at least partly defined. There is an active involvement of SMCs in school governance. Information on academic and financial performance of the schools is available to parents upon request.</p>	<p>Accountability. Schools are only accountable to central or regional authorities for personal misconduct. Operational budgets are managed by regional level. Financial books and records are unusable. SMCs seldom have access to financial reports of their schools. SMCs roles and responsibilities are vaguely defined. The involvement of SMCs in school governance is passive. Information on academic and financial performance is not available to parents in most schools.</p>	<p>Accountability Personnel accountability is absent from education policy. Operational budgets are managed by central level. No financial book and records. There are no SMCs in place. There is no involvement of school community in school governance. There is no way for parents to see academic and financial performance of the schools</p>
<p>c- Monitoring. SMCs hold meetings at least eight times a year. Minutes are always recorded and submitted to School Board and/or District Education office. School Improvement plans are prepared with active involvement of SMCs. SMCs always approve and monitor school activities, grant utilization, teachers' and students' attendance and absenteeism.</p>	<p>Monitoring. SMCs hold meetings at least four times a year. Minutes are usually recorded and submitted to School Board and/or District Education office. School Improvement Plans are prepared in partnership with SMCs. SMCs often approve and monitor school activities, grant utilization, teachers' and students' attendance and absenteeism.</p>	<p>Monitoring. SMCs hold meetings at least once a year. Minutes are usually not recorded and not submitted to School Board and/or District Education office. School Development Plans are prepared with very limited involvement of SMCs. SMCs seldom approve and monitor school activities, grant utilization, teachers' and students' attendance and absenteeism.</p>	<p>Monitoring. There are no SMCs in place. There is no School Improvement Plans or they are prepared without community participation. Schools never monitor teachers' and students' attendance and absenteeism.</p>

P5.a.2 Countries in which the education management information system feeds findings back to communities/school management committees

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Information Feedback and Transparency. All schools receive at least annually and before the end of the school year a school profile card (or a similar tool) showing indicators (including comparisons with other schools) in terms of school enabling environment, supply and performance (drop-out rates, repetition rate, learning outcomes). The tool is also available in an “illiterate-friendly” / user-friendly version and is displayed where it is accessible to the school community.</p>	<p>Information Feedback and Transparency. More than half of the schools receive (at least annually_ and publicly display (to the school community) a school profile card (or similar tool) showing indicators (including comparisons with other schools) in terms of school enabling environment, supply and performance (drop-out rates, repetition rate, learning outcomes)</p>	<p>Information Feedback and Transparency. Data on enrolment and student learning assessment exist but they are not sent back to most schools with comparative information and the information is publicly displayed in only a few schools.</p>	<p>Information Feedback and Transparency. School profiles (or similar tools) do not exist at all.</p>
<p>b- Training and Community Participation. All School Management Committees/School communities receive training on using the school profiles (or similar tools) in order to prepare School Improvement Plans. There is parental/community participation for deciding on the use of school resources in all schools.</p>	<p>Training and Community Participation. More than half of School Management Committees/School communities receive training on using the school profiles (or similar tools) and on preparing School Improvement Plans. There is parental/community participation for deciding on the use of school resources in more than half of the total schools.</p>	<p>Training and Community Participation. In most schools, School Management Committees/School communities are not trained on preparing School Improvement Plans and they are not involved in decision regarding use of school resources.</p>	<p>Training and Community Participation. There is no community/parental participation in school management/budgeting at all.</p>

P5.b.1 Countries with innovative approaches at scale to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children. Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Evidence. There is strong evidence collected of successful and cost-effective innovations that improve both access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children. Methodology used to assess evidence is scientifically solid and learning outcomes-oriented.</p>	<p>Evidence. There is strong evidence collected of successful and cost-effective innovations that improve either access to education or learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children. Methodology used is scientifically solid but output/process-oriented</p>	<p>Evidence. There is weak evidence collected of successful and cost-effective innovations that improve access to either access education or learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children. Methodology used is scientifically weak.</p>	<p>Evidence. There is no evidence of successful and cost-effective innovations that improve either access to education or learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged and excluded children.</p>
<p>b- Strategy/Traction. There is a strategy for identifying, testing or financing innovations in education, focused on improving learning outcomes and access for the most disadvantaged children, included in the Education Sector Plan/Policies and fully funded and implemented (incl. capacity development).</p>	<p>Strategy/Traction. There is a strategy for identifying, testing or financing innovations in education, focused on improving learning outcomes and access for the most disadvantaged children, at least partly funded and with advanced discussions with Government for inclusion in the public budget.</p>	<p>Strategy/Traction. There is a strategy for identifying, testing or financing innovations in education, but it is not focused on improving learning outcomes and access for the most disadvantaged children and is without Government buy-in.</p>	<p>Strategy/Traction. There is no strategy for identifying, testing or financing innovations in education.</p>
<p>c- Scalability. There are innovations to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged children that are implemented at large enough scale (for reaching all disadvantaged children) and are sustainable.</p>	<p>Scalability. There are innovations to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged children implemented at a pilot stage and there is a realistic plan for scaling them up (in terms of costs and logistics).</p>	<p>Scalability. There are innovations to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged children implemented at a pilot phase but with barriers preventing scalability (in terms of costs and logistics).</p>	<p>Scalability. There are no innovations to improve access to education and learning outcomes for the most disadvantaged children.</p>

P5.b.2 Countries with quality standards consistent with child-friendly school (CFS)/ education (CFE)¹ or similar models developed or revised.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- CFS/CFE standards² National quality standards on pedagogy, learning environment, school ethos and community involvement, and infrastructure and design are based on/reflect fully all of the 4 CFS principles³. The standards are fully incorporated into teacher training programmes, school inspection guidelines, SMC training, and are fully implemented in all target schools.</p>	<p>CFS/CFE standards National quality standards on pedagogy, learning environment, school ethos and community involvement, and infrastructure and design are based on/reflect significantly most of the 4 CFS principles. The standards are mostly incorporated into teacher training programmes, school inspection guidelines, SMC training, and are fully implemented in most target schools.</p>	<p>CFS/CFE standards National quality standards on pedagogy, learning environment, school ethos and community involvement, and infrastructure and design are based on/reflect only partially some of the 4 CFS principles. The standards are only partially incorporated into teacher training programmes, school inspection guidelines, SMC training, and are fully implemented in only some target schools.</p>	<p>CFS/CFE standards There are no national quality standards on pedagogy, learning environment, school ethos and community involvement, or infrastructure and design or they do not reflect any of the 4 CFS principles.</p>
<p>b- Measuring Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are measured in all schools in more domains than only basic numeracy and literacy skills, at least annually.</p>	<p>Measuring Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes (at least basic numeracy and literacy skills) are measured in most schools, at least once every 2 years.</p>	<p>Measuring Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are measured in less than half of the schools, and less frequently than every 2 years.</p>	<p>Measuring Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are not measured.</p>

¹ Child-Friendly Education supports schools and strengthens education system through development of national standards that promote improved learning outcomes, including life-skills education, child-friendly teaching methods, child rights education and girls' safety and security.

² Standard is a broad goal statement that defines what stakeholders should know and be able to do in order to fulfill a CFS/Quality Basic Education dimension.

For example standards related to "Pedagogy" may include, but are not limited to, standards on teacher professional preparation; on curriculum, instructional design and assessment practices; teaching methodologies; use of mother tongue in instruction, etc.

³ 4 CFS principles refer to: 1) child-centeredness; 2) inclusion; 3) participation; 4) protection.

P5.c.1 Countries with well-functioning learning assessment system, especially for early grades.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a-Classroom Assessment. There is strong system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of school-based classroom assessment practices, including in early grades. The inspection and supervision system is strong. There is a formal system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment. There is a variety of system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills in classroom assessment. There are varied and systematic mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. There is effective use of classroom assessment information to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Classroom Assessment. There is sufficient system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of school-based classroom assessment practices, including in early grades. The inspection and supervision system is sufficient. There is a formal system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment. There are some system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills in classroom assessment. There are limited systematic mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. There is some use of classroom assessment information to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Classroom Assessment. There is weak system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of school-based classroom assessment practices. The inspection and supervision system is weak, although reform is ongoing. There is an informal system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment. There are no system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills in classroom assessment. There are ad hoc mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. There is very limited use of classroom assessment information to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Classroom Assessment. There is no system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of school-based classroom assessment practices. There is no inspection and supervision system in place. There is no system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment. There are no system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills in classroom assessment. There are no mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. There is no use of classroom assessment information to improve learning outcomes.</p>
<p>b-Examinations. There is a stable country-wide standardized examination in place taken by all students at the appropriate grade level(s). There is institutional capacity and strong mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of high quality and is perceived as fair and free from corruption. There is regular funding allocated for the examination. The examination office is adequately staffed to carry out the assessment effectively, with no issues. There is effective use of examination data to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Examinations. There is a stable country-wide standardized examination in place taken by all students at the appropriate grade level(s). There is institutional capacity and some limited mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of acceptable quality and is perceived as fair for most students and free from corruption. There is regular funding allocated for the examination. The examination office is adequately staffed to carry out the examination effectively, with minimal issues. There is some use of examination data to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Examinations. There is a partially stable country-wide standardized examination in place taken by all students at the appropriate grade level(s). There is a need to develop institutional capacity to run the examination. The examination typically is of poor quality and is perceived as unfair or corrupt. There is irregular funding allocated for the examination. The examination office is inadequately staffed to effectively carry out the examination, issues are pervasive. There is very limited use of examination data to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Examinations. There is no country-wide standardized examination in place for key decisions. There is no funding allocated for the examination.</p>
<p>c-National (or system-level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA). There is a stable NLSA in place, including for early grades, and strong institutional capacity and mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of high quality, is taken by a robust, representative sample of students and its information is effectively used to improve learning outcomes.</p>	<p>National (or system-level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA). There is a stable NLSA in place, including for early grades. There is institutional capacity and some mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of moderate quality, is taken by a representative sample of students and its information is disseminated, but not always used in effective ways.</p>	<p>National (or system-level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA). There is an unstable NLSA in place and a need to develop institutional capacity to run the NLSA. Assessment quality and impact are weak and it is taken by an unrepresentative sample of students.</p>	<p>National (or system-level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA). There is no NLSA in place.</p>

P5.c.2 Countries with effective early learning policies and quality early learning programmes.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a-Early Learning Curriculum & Standards. Early Learning Curriculum is on a continuum and , links with primary school curriculum.</p> <p>Early Learning Standards are translated into a Quality Early Learning Checklist administered in all early learning centres annually. Data is disaggregated by region, gender and other key culturally relevant criteria and presented to national, regional and local education contexts. Standards define student-teacher ratio, physical space and child friendly setting; and active learning pedagogy.</p>	<p>Early Learning Curriculum & Standards. Early Learning curriculum is independent of primary school curriculum. Children are not taught using active learning.</p> <p>Standards are implemented into a quality observation checklist however, the data is not disaggregated and/or it is not gathered from all ECE centres. The standards do not address all topics listed in Score 4.</p>	<p>Early Learning Curriculum & Standards. National early learning curriculum is being piloted and/or inadequate training and support to teachers and community members has resulted in uneven implementation of early learning curriculum.</p> <p>No quality checklist has been developed to track the appropriate implementation of the curriculum and the standards at the local village level.</p>	<p>Early Learning Curriculum & Standards. There are no adopted national early learning standards. There is no early learning curriculum- or the quality if is very poor.</p> <p>There is no method to track quality of early learning programmes. Early learning centres cannot assess quality of programmes. Children sit in tight rows. Teachers teaches from blackboards. Children are not encouraged to learn using active learning techniques.</p>
<p>b- ECCE Facility. 80% or more of centres are safe and protective of well-being of children: a) There is a safe area of space for activities and play exists that is safe for all children; b) Adequate play and learning facilities such as toys, books and interactive materials; c) No child must sit directly on the ground; c) Student-teacher ratio is defined; d) facility is responsive to “differently-abled” children: e) access to potable drinking water throughout school early learning programme; and f) availability of appropriate sanitary facilities; g) facility has sufficient and ventilation</p>	<p>ECCE Facility. 50-79% Centres are safe and protective of well-being of children. The centres miss up to 2 of the topics listed in Score 4.</p>	<p>ECCE Facility. Less than 50% of early learning facilities are deemed safe and protective of well-being of children as the country does not implement the monitoring tool to all sites (for example, rural sites are not assessed) OR only 2 topics listed in Score 4 are assessed as safe and protective.</p>	<p>ECCE Facility. Less than 50% of early learning facilities are considered safe OR there is no way to monitor the quality of the facility because there is no quality monitoring tool developed or systematically employed across the country.</p>
<p>c-Community Participation. Parents and local communities are actively involved in planning, decision-making and monitoring ECCE teacher attendance and programme success</p>	<p>Community Participation. Community is mobilized infrequently (less than monthly). Community plays a limited role in monitoring teacher or child attendance. No clear guidance is provided to community on how to interpret early learning outcome data or facility data.</p>	<p>Community Participation. Community is rarely engaged (only 1 or 2 times each year) and/or engaged only at the planning phase. No community management committee is in place to monitor the early learning programme.</p>	<p>Community Participation. There is no community participation in the early learning programme or community participation is discouraged.</p>

P5.c.3 Countries with an education sector plan/policy that includes risk assessment and risk management.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a-Risk assessment. There is a comprehensive and updated risk assessment of the education sector that includes: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate and vulnerability mapping; and a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content and how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities..</p>	<p>Risk assessment. There is an incomplete risk assessment of the education sector that includes only some of the following pieces: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate and vulnerability mapping; and a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content and how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities..</p>	<p>Risk assessment. There is an incomplete and outdated risk assessment of the education sector that includes only a few of the following pieces: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate and vulnerability mapping; and a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content and how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities.</p>	<p>Risk assessment. There is no risk assessment of the education sector</p>
<p>b-Risk Reduction Strategy. The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes a relevant and comprehensive conflict/DRR/CCA strategy based upon the risk assessment and a strategic vision for relevant education in adversity contexts that is fully operationalized and implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster and climate risks identified. The strategy includes capacity development for education personnel, promotion of community and children’s engagement, guidance on teaching content and resources, school construction standards, and linkages to other sectors (WASH, CP etc.). There is a monitoring and evaluation framework for the strategy and the strategy implementation is monitored at least twice a year.</p>	<p>Risk Reduction Strategy. The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes an incomplete conflict/DRR/CCA strategy and a vision for relevant education in adverse contexts that is partially implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster and climate risks identified. The strategy includes some of the following: capacity development for education personnel, promotion of community and children’s engagement, guidance on teaching content and resources, school construction standards, and linkages to other sectors (WASH, CP etc.). There is no monitoring and evaluation framework for the implementation of the strategy or there is one but the strategy implementation is monitored less frequently than twice a year.</p>	<p>Risk Reduction Strategy. The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes an incomplete conflict/DRR/CCA strategy and a vision for relevant education in adverse contexts that is poorly articulated or poorly implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster and climate risks. The strategy includes only few of the following: capacity development for education personnel, promotion of community and children’s engagement, guidance on teaching content and resources, school construction standards, and linkages to other sectors (WASH, CP etc.). There is no monitoring and evaluation framework for the implementation of the strategy.</p>	<p>Risk Reduction Strategy. There is no conflict/DRR/CCA strategy in the Education Sector Plan/Policy.</p>

c-Human and Financial Resources. There are committed, **earmarked** and **adequate** human and financial resources to implement fully the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy.

Human and Financial Resources. There are committed, **earmarked**, adequate human and financial resources to implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy but they are **not enough to implement** fully the strategy.

Human and Financial Resources. The human and financial resources to implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy are **far from what is necessary** for a proper risk reduction.

Human and Financial Resources. There are **no human and financial resources** to implement conflict/DRR/CCA measures.

P5.e.2 Countries with well-functioning education management information systems providing disaggregated data that allow identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit the realization of the rights of disadvantaged children.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
a- Data Quality and Timeliness. Reliable and relevant education data are collected and used by decision makers. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than 6 months after the beginning of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Reliable and relevant education data are collected. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than 3 months after the end of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Education data are of questionable reliability and are not all relevant. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than one year after the end of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Education data are irregularly collected or even absent , and the quality of the data is poor . When they are collected, EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used more than one year after the end of the school year.
b- Comprehensiveness. There is 100% response rate from schools (public + private) in returning the school census questionnaires.	Comprehensiveness. There is over 90% response rate from schools (public + private) in returning the school census questionnaires. Response rates and the assumptions used for estimating data of the missing schools are clearly indicated in the statistical yearbooks.	Comprehensiveness. There is between 50% and 90% of schools (public + private) responding to the census questionnaire. Response rates are not published in the statistical yearbooks.	Comprehensiveness. Response rates are not known or there are fewer than 50% of schools responding to the census questionnaire.
c- Disaggregation. EMIS annually collects data on: children’s family income/assets , gender, urban/rural (consistently with the definition from national statistical office), children’s disabilities with at least 5 different types of disability (and using ICF based definitions of disability) and on schools’ physical environment and assistive devices for children with disabilities	Disaggregation. EMIS annually collects data on: gender, urban/rural, and children’s disabilities with at least 3 different types of disability but not on children’s family income/assets.	Disaggregation. EMIS collects data on gender, urban/rural but not on children’s family income/assets, children’s disabilities or schools’ physical environment and assistive devices for children with disabilities.	Disaggregation. No data are collected on gender, disability, children’s family income/assets or urban/rural.

P5.e.3 Countries with policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities.

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Law/policy. There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to receive an education, with an explicit mention of children with disabilities. And also a national plan on inclusive education.</p>	<p>Law/policy. There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to receive an education, with an explicit mention of children with disabilities.</p>	<p>Law/policy. There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to attend school, which implicitly but not explicitly includes children with disabilities.</p>	<p>Law/policy. There is no law /policy establishing the right to education for children with disabilities</p>
<p>b- Physical Environment. All schools have accessible classrooms and/or reasonable accommodations that remove all physical barriers (including accessible toilets and recreation areas).</p>	<p>Physical Environment. More than half of schools have accessible classrooms and toilets, at times because of an accessible design and at times because of makeshift adjustments.</p>	<p>Physical Environment. Less than half of the schools are accessible (including toilets). Some schools may have accessible classrooms, or use makeshift ramps.</p>	<p>Physical Environment. In general, schools are not accessible. Children with physical disabilities have great difficulty or are completely unable to access school facilities (including toilets).</p>
<p>c- Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in most regular schools. Books and other materials include positive references to children with disabilities</p>	<p>Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools but in less than half of regular schools. A few books and other materials include positive references to children with disabilities.</p>	<p>Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools, but not in regular schools. Little or no mention of disabled children appears in books or materials.</p>	<p>Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are generally not available in schools. Books and other materials make no mention of children with disabilities.</p>
<p>d- Human Resources. Most teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. All schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. Most children have access to speech, physical and occupational therapists, as needed.</p>	<p>Human Resources. More than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. More than half of schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. Some access to speech and physical therapists exists.</p>	<p>Human Resources. Less than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. Less than half of schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. No access to speech and physical therapists exists.</p>	<p>Human Resources. Teachers and school administrators receive no training on inclusive education. Teachers have no specialists to consult with on issues pertaining to educating children with disabilities. No access to speech and physical therapists exists.</p>

<p>e- Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators support including children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make significant adjustments to ease their inclusion. Curricula and classroom management allow for the flexibility of addressing individual students' needs.</p>	<p>Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators do not object to including children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make small adjustments to ease their inclusion.</p>	<p>Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators do not see the value of including children with disabilities in regular schools but do not make explicit objections. They do not feel it is their responsibility to make any adjustments to ease their inclusion.</p>	<p>Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators object to including children with disabilities in regular schools, and do not believe they should make any adjustments to ease their inclusion.</p>
<p>f- EMIS. The routine EMIS contains data on children with disabilities, using ICF based definitions of disability. Reports are produced on enrolment of children with disabilities</p>	<p>EMIS. There are some data on children with disabilities in the school system, but it is characterized by medical diagnosis. Reports are produced on enrolment of children with disabilities.</p>	<p>EMIS. There are some data on children with disabilities in the school system, but it is characterized by medical diagnosis. No reports on enrolment of children with disabilities are produced, except for special schools.</p>	<p>EMIS. There are no data on children with disabilities in the routine EMIS.</p>

P5.e.4 Countries with an education policy/sector plan that specify prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools (SRGBV). Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Legal/policy framework. There is a well-defined legal and policy framework outlining state obligation to address gender-based violence and child protection across relevant ministries (e.g. gender, health, education, social justice, police etc.) in keeping with CEDAW & CRC recommendations. The framework includes all of the following key elements for the provision of a safe and supportive learning environment in school: i) Legislation on free and compulsory basic education or more; ii) Teachers Service legislation defining limits on teacher conduct with children; iii) Identifying “kinds” of SRGBV (spanning sexual assault to bullying by peers (including girls on girls) and psychological violence); iv) Criminalization of corporal punishment in schools; and v) Re-entry policy for pregnant school girls and adolescent mothers. There is a secure budget for implementing the framework.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. There is a nationally defined legal/policy framework to address gender-based violence and child protection across relevant ministries. The framework includes some of the key elements listed in Score 4. There is a budget for implementing the framework at least partially.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. There is a national legal/policy framework to address child protection across relevant ministries. The framework includes only a few of the key elements listed in Score 4 and there is a lack of resources for implementing it properly.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. There is no/a limited legal/policy framework to address child protection and provide safe and supportive learning environment in school for girls.</p>
<p>b- Prevention and response mechanism. Holistic mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are established and functioning in all primary and secondary schools. They include: i) Identification of “kinds” of violence; ii) Safe and standardized reporting mechanisms; iii) Defined disciplinary actions; and iv) Interventions that create a safe learning environment, including pre and in-service teacher training, related codes of conduct, curricula content.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. More than half of primary and secondary schools have established mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV. They include some of the key elements listed in Score 4.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. Mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are only at a pilot phase in a small number of primary and secondary schools.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. There are limited/ad hoc/no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to put in place mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV.</p>
<p>c- Awareness, attitude & empowerment. There is holistic institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices that includes most of the following key elements: i) On-going sensitization of teachers, head teachers and SMC/PTA members; ii) Counselling and support services for survivors of violence; iii) Mentorship programmes for girls; iv) Student participation in decision-making; and v) Enhanced involvement of local CSOs and communities.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. There is institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices that includes some of the key elements listed in Score 4.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. Pilot interventions to address SRGBV are supported by elements of institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. There are limited/ad hoc/ no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to support institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.</p>

<p>d- Data collection, availability, and use: Data tracking on incidences of SRGBV and the provision of safe and supportive learning environments for girls is available on a regular basis and is used at all levels of administration – school, sub-region, region, national – as relevant.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: Data tracking on incidences of SRGBV and the provision of safe and supportive learning environments for girls is available for most of the schools on a regular basis but not frequently used at the relevant levels of administration.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: There are some data on SRGBV available for certain regions/schools as part of independent one-off surveys/projects/initiatives.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: There are no data available on SRGBV in the country.</p>
--	---	--	---

P5.e.5 Countries where girls’ secondary education, in terms of access, retention, and learning is a recognised, targeted and budgeted priority (Supplemental indicator, not to be reported to the board).

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>a- Creating demand: Context-specific, targeted, and effective strategies based on formative research and evidence to address socio-cultural and financial barriers to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education are designed, implemented and monitored with a focus on: Strategic communication and community mobilization to address behavior change and discriminatory gendered social norms; & social protection measures, including cash transfers, and availability of scholarships and stipends to incentivize school participation and retention of girls.</p>	<p>Creating demand: Context-specific, targeted, and effective strategies based on formative research and evidence to address one of the barriers - either socio-cultural or financial barriers - to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education are designed, implemented and monitored.</p>	<p>Creating demand: Generic strategies to address socio-cultural and/or financial barriers to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education exist, however their implementation is patchy and monitoring remains weak.</p>	<p>Creating demand: No formative research and identified strategies or plans exist to address socio-cultural and financial constraints to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education;</p>
<p>b- Supportive learning environment: The national education policy/sector plan includes comprehensive support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: Availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female teachers, and quality of teaching; Updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM (Science, technology, Engineering & Maths) and life-skills learning opportunities; Sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); and, the corresponding activities are fully implemented in most secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: The national education policy/sector plan includes some support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: Availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female teachers, and quality of teaching; Updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM learning opportunities; Sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); and, the corresponding activities are –at least partially- implemented in secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: The national education policy/sector plan includes some support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: Availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female teachers, and quality of teaching; Updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM learning opportunities; Sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); But, the corresponding activities are not implemented in most secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: The national education policy/sector plan does not include any support to gender-responsive learning environments</p>

<p>c- Prioritisation and resource allocation: National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes and identifies clear targets to improve access, retention, and learning in secondary education with a well-defined focus on girls' education and gender equality; & Supported by clear as well as sufficient budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes and identifies clear targets to improve at least one aspect of secondary education – access, retention, and learning - with a well-defined focus on girls' education and gender equality; & Supported by clear but insufficient budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes secondary education with a defined focus on girls' education and gender equality, however no firm targets are identified; & Allocated some funding through generic budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: National education strategy or sector plan does not prioritize and identify targets to improve access, retention, and learning in secondary education with a defined focus on girls' education and gender equality; and nor does it have any allocated budget.</p>
--	--	---	--

P5.e.6 Countries with an education policy/sector plan that includes multilingual education to allow children to learn in their mother tongue during the early grades (Supplemental indicator, not to be reported to the board).

Universe of countries: UNICEF Country Offices where the indicator is relevant in reference to the country programme

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
a- Policy environment. There is a national law or policy establishing the right of all children to receive education in their mother tongue at least during the early grades of primary school.	Policy environment. The education policy promotes the use of minority languages in the classroom at least in early grades of primary education.	Policy environment. The education policy impedes the use of minority languages in the classroom	Policy environment. The education policy forbids completely the use of minority languages in the classroom.
b- Alignment. Mother tongue instruction is strongly reflected in teacher training, recruitment and deployment processes and in pupil assessment systems.	Alignment. Mother tongue instruction is partially reflected in teacher training, recruitment and deployment processes and in pupil assessment systems.	Alignment. Mother tongue instruction is largely ignored in teacher training, recruitment and deployment processes and in pupil assessment systems.	Alignment. Mother tongue instruction is not reflected in teacher training, recruitment and deployment processes or in pupil assessment systems.
c- Resource allocation. There are dedicated learning materials and trained teachers to allow most children to receive mother tongue instruction.	Resource allocation. There are dedicated learning materials and trained teachers to allow some children to receive mother tongue instruction.	Resource allocation. There are dedicated learning materials and trained teachers to allow few children to receive mother tongue instruction.	Resource allocation. There is no official support for teaching or learning materials to allow for mother tongue instruction.
d- Community engagement. Local communities and teachers are fully engaged in setting the curriculum and developing learning materials in support of mother tongue instruction.	Community engagement. Local communities and teachers are sometimes engaged in setting the curriculum or developing learning materials in support of mother tongue instruction.	Community engagement. Local communities and teachers are not engaged in setting the curriculum or developing learning materials in support of mother tongue instruction.	Community engagement. Local communities are discouraged from engaging in education in support of mother tongue instruction.