



USAID
DEL PUEBLO DE LOS ESTADOS
UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

**REFORMA
EDUCATIVA
EN EL AULA**

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

UPDATED



MARCH 2010

This publication was produced under the Contract No. EDH-I-00-05-00033-00 and Task Order EDH-I-05-05-00033-00, between the United States Agency for International Development/Guatemala Mission (USAID Guatemala) and Juárez & Associates, Inc. It was prepared by Otto Rego, Fernando Rubio (Juárez & Associates, Inc) and Ray Chesterfield (Mariposa Consulting).

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN THE CLASSROOM PROJECT IN GUATEMALA
(Reforma Educativa en el Aula)

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

Prepared for:

United States Agency for International Development, Guatemala

Project Contractor:

Juárez and Associates, Inc.
Otto Rego
Fernando Rubio

Subcontractor:

Mariposa Consulting, LLC

March, 2010

Contract No. EDH-I-00-05-00033-00
March 2010

I. Introduction

The purpose of this four-year Task Order is to complement and build on USAID/Guatemala's successful implementation of the Education Standards and Research Program (*Programa de Estándares e Investigación Educativa*, 2005-2009), as well as programs of the USAID/Guatemala "Better Educated Rural Society" strategy to enhance equitable access to quality intercultural bilingual education. It also builds upon gains made in the past decade in the areas of curriculum policy, teacher training, applied research, monitoring and evaluation, information technology and improved classroom management to promote transparency and accountability throughout the public education system.

Under the Reform project, Guatemala will reach its development goals by gaining substantial improvement in the quality of its human resource base. In order to develop a better educated population, USAID will, through the efforts of J&A, provide technical assistance needed to improve access to, and quality, equity and efficiency of basic education, by focusing on increasing teacher effectiveness; improving classroom-learning environments; fostering effective first and second language acquisition and reading; extending access to under-served populations, women and indigenous groups; and, expanding parents', communities' and stakeholders' participation in student learning. The overall objective is to ensure educational reform in the classroom and the application of effective, innovative approaches to increase and improve basic education opportunities for Guatemalan children.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implemented activities, including activities under subcontracts and grants, will contribute to the United States Government's foreign assistance objective "Investing in People." Under this objective, in a developing country context, USAID works to establish effective, efficient and accountable health and education systems by:

- Increasing access to and improving the quality and equity of health and education services.
- Targeting management, finance, governance and service delivery at all levels of the health and education systems.
- Encouraging social policies that bolster the ability of institutions to establish appropriate roles for the public and private sectors in service delivery.

To achieve these goals, USAID/Guatemala has designed this Investing in People project to address the Education Program Area and its Basic Education Program Elements:

- Program Area 3.2: Education. Promote effective, accountable and sustainable formal and non-formal educational systems.
- Program Area 3.2.2: Basic Education. Improve early childhood education, primary education and secondary education, delivered in formal or non-formal settings. This includes literacy, numeracy and other basic skills programs for youth and adults.

To that end, USAID/Guatemala is contributing to the achievement of its Strategic Objective 3 (SO3): Investing in People: Healthier, Better Educated People, Intermediate Result 2: Increased and Improved Social Sector Investments and specifically meeting the requirements of:

- Sub Intermediate Result 2.1 Improved policy environment and systems to support effective educational reform.

- Sub Intermediate Result 2.2 Accountability-based basic education reforms implemented and institutionalized to support quality education.
- Sub Intermediate Result 2.3 Increased, improved and more equitable educational opportunities for learning.

On behalf of USAID/Guatemala, J&A is focusing support on technical assistance and technically solid interventions to achieve national impact, including sound policies and cost-effective and evidence-based technical and systemic reforms that are focused on strengthening the capacity of the Guatemala Ministry of Education (MOE). The goal of this activity is to contribute substantially to the goals delineated in the Guatemalan Plan of the Central America and Mexico (CAM) Regional Strategy for Investing in People, specifically “Better Educated People,” by ensuring that more boys and girls progress efficiently through their years in the educational system and receive the quality education they need in order to learn life skills and become productive and conscientious citizens.

This document presents the plan for monitoring the contractor’s performance in meeting these objectives. The following sections provide a detailed description of indicators to be used and the procedures to be carried out in monitoring program performance.

II. Definition of Indicators, Data Sources and Collection Procedures

A. COMPONENT 1: Institutional Strengthening for Effective Quality of Education

Result 1: Increased institutional capacity of the Ministry of Education and other stakeholders to design, plan, implement, and measure education quality in the classroom

1. Performance Indicator 1:

Education system laws, policies, regulations or guidelines or monitored with USG assistance to improve equitable access to and quality of basic education services.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of published official documents that commit new resources (staff, equipment and/or materials) to increasing equitable access or to improving quality (teaching and system support) of basic education services.

Data Requirements:

Availability of regularly published newspaper and other national and regional reports.

Data Source:

National and regional newspapers and published Ministry and local documents.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct weekly review of newspapers and published Ministry

documents.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of commitment to equitable access and classroom quality. Thus, “resources allocated” is the important component of the definition. Measurement will focus on the departments and municipalities within the target zones where the project is working, as well as the ministry of education. As data will deal with new resource allocation, the baseline is zero.

2. Performance Indicator 2:

MOE systems, units, divisions, initiatives with quality assurance mechanisms.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of systems, units, divisions, initiatives that have a package of objectives, indicators, measures, data collection procedures, and analysis plans for monitoring education performance.

Data Requirements:

Quality assurance assessment instrument developed.

Data Source:

MOE systems, units, divisions and initiative directors.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will survey MOE administrators using a quality assurance assessment checklist.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity within the ministry to measure performance in meeting objectives related to equitable access and classroom quality. As the quality assurance criteria have yet to be developed, the baseline is zero.

A system is defined as a service provider that uses multiple divisions in implementation. A division is a single service provider. A unit is a regional or local implementer (department, municipality) in targeted zones.

3. Performance Indicator 3:

Host-country institutions use project-assisted MIS system to inform administrative and management decisions.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of institutions that cite the Integrated Platform of Social Information in plans, proposals, articles.

Data Requirements:

Institutional survey instrument developed.

Data Source:

Ministries, Universities, Municipalities, and NGOs involved in basic education service delivery.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will survey technical staff in participating institutions

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity within the educational community to make information based decisions. Survey will probe for use of the MIS in decisions regarding equitable access and improved educational quality. As MIS assistance under the project has not yet taken place, the baseline is zero.

4. Performance Indicator 4:

Indicators that report on standards (children meeting learning standards and schools meeting opportunity standards) adopted, used and publicized by the MOE.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of published criteria that are used systematically by the MOE to determine system performance in improving access and quality.

Data Requirements:

Ministry documents and mass media reports available.

Data Source:

Ministries of education publications and national newspapers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct weekly review of published Ministry documents and newspaper reports.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity within the MOE to routinely monitor progress on implementation of initiatives to improve educational access and quality. Both production of measurable criteria and use in terms of planned, regular monitoring activities will be assessed. As no published criteria are currently available the baseline is zero.

5. Performance Indicator 5:

Individuals trained in strategic information management (OP indicator).

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of local managers working with education who receive at least 24 hours of training in strategic information management.

Data Requirements:

Availability of training reports from USAID-funded projects.

Data Source:

Training reports from USAID-funded projects and project activity managers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will review training documents twice during the year and conduct follow-up with Activity managers when necessary.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity within the educational system to use information in decision-making. The focus will be on the management of information related to access and educational quality. The project efforts will focus on local managers (mayors, council members, supervisors, principals). However, other USAID-funded projects involved in strategic training of education managers may use broader definitions. Separate additional training activities in related content areas that total another 24 hours will be counted separately for the same individuals.

6. Performance Indicator 6:

Individuals trained in monitoring and evaluation (OP indicator).

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of national and local technical staff responsible for performance monitoring who receive at least 24 hours of training.

Data Requirements:

Availability of training reports from USAID-funded projects.

Data Source:

Training reports from USAID-funded projects and project activity managers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will review training documents twice during the year and conduct follow-up with Activity managers when necessary.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity within the educational system to

produce valid and reliable information for decision-making at both national and local levels. Both project training and other USAID-funded projects involved in M&E training of education technicians will be monitored. Separate additional training activities in related content areas that total another 24 hours will be counted separately for the same individuals.

7. Performance Indicator 7:

Education administrators and officials trained (OP indicator).

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of national administrators who receive at least 24 hours of training in areas other than decision-making and M&E.

Data Requirements:

Availability of training reports from USAID-funded projects.

Data Source:

Training reports from USAID-funded projects and project activity managers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will review training documents twice during the year and conduct follow-up with Activity managers when necessary.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the overall enhanced capacity of national education managers. Both project training and other USAID-funded projects involved in MOE education technicians will be monitored. Individuals who are counted as trainees in either the management indicator or the M&E indicator discussed previously must have separate additional training that total another 24 hours will be counted for this indicator.

8. Performance Indicator 8:

Individuals trained in education management and education reform in the classroom.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of teacher trainers and teachers who receive at least 24 hours of training in participatory school and classroom management.

Data Requirements:

Availability of PADEP training reports.

Data Source:

PADEP training reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will review training documents twice during the year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity teacher trainers and teachers to engage in participatory school and classroom management.

9. Performance Indicator 9:

Host country institutions with improved management information system (OP indicator).

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of education institutions at the national, regional and local level that receive and use equipment, technology and/or training to monitor equitable access and classroom quality.

Data Requirements:

Availability of partner institutions records of MIS improvements and use.

Data Source:

Partner institution MIS managers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project evaluation staff will review project assistance documentation, develop a survey instrument, and survey MIS managers at the end of the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity to manipulate and use data on equitable access and classroom quality. Inputs will be monitored in terms of technical assistance provided and outputs will be monitored in terms of reports generated by the partner institutions, which will include national and local education system institutions, universities, and NGOs.

10. Performance Indicator 10:

Studies, information gathering or research activities conducted (OP indicator).

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of studies with appropriate research methodology that provide results for improving equitable access and classroom quality completed.

Data Requirements:

Availability of partner institutions records of studies conducted.

Data Source:

Partner institution research managers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project evaluation staff will develop a survey instrument and survey research managers at the end of the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity in the education community to conduct reliable and valid studies of equitable access and classroom quality. Both qualitative and quantitative research that is formative and summative will be included. However, studies must use an appropriate method to ensure validity and reliability of results to be counted.

11. Performance Indicator 11:

No. of studies published and communicated.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of studies that provide results for improving equitable access and classroom quality available in archival format (digital or print) presented in a public forum.

Data Requirements:

Availability of partner institutions records of presentations and publications of research studies.

Data Source:

Scientific journals, newspaper reports, partner institution research documents.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project evaluation staff will monitor scientific journals, digital publication, newspaper reports of presentations and studies, and partner institution documents twice during the year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity in the education community to communicate valid and reliable information on equitable access and classroom quality and to engage civil society in a dialogue about improving education.

12. Performance Indicator 12:

Outreach events focused on classroom level reform.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of awareness efforts (information campaigns, feedback on performance, etc.) dealing with equitable access and/or classroom quality carried out in a number of communities of one or more target zones.

Data Requirements:

Availability of partner institutions records of outreach events.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documentation of outreach efforts.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project evaluation staff will monitor project and partner institution documents twice during the year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity in the education community to build local awareness and participation on equitable access and classroom quality and to engage civil society in a dialogue about improving education. Only events that deal with more than one community will be counted to ensure wide dissemination.

13. Performance Indicator 13:

Gap in rural/gender/ethnic achievement.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Percentage difference in achievement by gender, by location and ethnicity.

Data Requirements:

Availability of MOE yearly data on achievement for appropriate grades and regions.

Data Source:

MOE databases.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements. The data available after the close of the fiscal year will be reported with results from the subsequent fiscal year.

Data Collection:

Project evaluation staff will collect data from MOE and conduct analysis. It is anticipated that this indicator will become part of the MOE indicator package over the life of the project and data will be reported routinely.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity of the education system to improve education services to under-served populations. Calculations will be based on

achievement scores of children in 1st, 3rd, and 6th grade. Effect scores will be calculated for differences from one year to the next to examine changes in the gap between the different populations of interest. Results will be reported in terms of change in the percentage difference between populations. A baseline was developed in February of 2010 through the analysis of MOE achievement data for the years of 2006-2008. These databases included approximately 20,000 students at each grade level. Findings suggested that a reduction of 3.3% per group per year would be a valid target. It is important to note that the calculations were based on MOE samples based on departments. For samples based on municipalities or for estimating targets for opportunity zones, targets may need to be recalculated. It is anticipated that this indicator will become part of the MOE indicator package over the life of the project and data will be reported routinely.

B. COMPONENT 2: Improved Teacher Professional Development

Result 2: Teacher professional development system designed, negotiated, validated and implemented

1. Performance Indicator 1:

Degree of implementation of the National Career Development System.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan.

Data Requirements:

Complete implementation plan. Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities

Data Source:

Project and partner institution reports and documents

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of progress in creating a national career development center for teachers. Activities in the NCDS implementation plan will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for negotiation, validation and implementation of the program. As the final implementation plan is still in process of negotiation with partner institutions, the baseline is zero.

For critical activities such as preparation of trainers-of-trainer, training of teachers, and production of texts and learning materials, the total quantities will be reported as part of regular progress reports.

2. Performance Indicator 2:

Institutional partnerships established with national and international universities and institutions to reform education courses, career, teacher training, and teacher career development.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of alliances established.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity through partnership. Alliance is defined as an official agreement between institutions that involves technical assistance, faculty and student exchange, courses, and/or training materials. It is important to note that a few long-term alliances may be more important for capacity building than a number of short-term alliances. Thus, the targets for this indicator have been set at one per year. As no official agreements exist, the baseline is zero.

3. Performance Indicator 3:

Technical support actions provided to the technical committees to support training and teacher development.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of technical support actions.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements

Data Collection:

Project institution documentation of Technical support actions.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity to support teacher professional

development at the national and regional level. It is assumed that committees will be strengthened over the life of the project. As the program has not started, the baseline is zero.

4. Performance Indicator 4:

No. of students graduated from Master Degree Program in Education.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of students receiving Master Degrees.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed degrees.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year in the last two years of the project.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced high level human resources in the education community. Students will be trained in two cohorts of 10 participants each. As the program is two years in duration, results will be in the final two years of the project. Gender and ethnicity will be monitored. As the program has not started, the baseline is zero.

5. Performance Indicator 5:

Individuals trained as Teacher Professional Development Experts.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of persons trained as teacher professional development experts.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity to deliver professional development services at the national and regional level. Experts will include university professors and technical staff from the MOE and departmental directorates. It is assumed that the same individuals will receive training over several years until certified. As the program has started, the total number of individuals to be targeted has yet to be decided and the baseline is zero.

6. Performance Indicator 6:

Percent of professional development experts and teacher trainers/pedagogical supervisors that meet quality standards.

This indicator is eliminated as it is included in the previous indicator

7. Performance Indicator 7:

Individuals trained by the cadre of Teacher Professional Development Experts.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of persons trained by teacher professional development experts.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity of teachers to deliver services to improve access and classroom quality. As the program has started, the total number of individuals to be targeted will depend on the number of technical experts trained which has yet to be decided and the baseline is zero.

8. Performance Indicator 8:

Percent of teachers who understand and apply PADEP methodology in opportunity zones.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Number of teachers identified as understanding and applying methodology correctly by supervisors divided by all sample teachers.

Data Requirements:

Availability of a supervisor survey instrument

Data Source:

Teacher supervisors

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct survey

Purpose and Issues:

This is a direct measure of the enhanced capacity to deliver professional development services. This indicator replaces the original indicator: "Percent of first and third grade children meeting reading and writing standards". The REAULA project cannot account for impact in students reading performance since the direct actions will be targeted to teachers rather than students. Also, the impact of teacher training on improved student achievement has been shown to be a long-term effect only measureable after 18-30 months of implementation in the classroom. Therefore measurement is not feasible within the time frame of the project. Finally, reading impact is a multifactorial variable that needs to be processed through hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to separate the amount of impact of each nesting level. Thus, in order to adequately account for student impact through teacher training, HLM data processing using pre-post studies must be established. The new indicator is a more accurate measure of teacher training actions at the national and regional level.

C. COMPONENT 3: Standards, life competencies, curriculum, materials, and testing for effective first and second language acquisition and student learning

Result 3: Language curriculum, textbooks, instructional and learning materials, tests, and continuous assessments and teacher training aligned with standards and proved effective for L1 and L2 acquisition

1. Performance Indicator 1:

Percent of teachers who understand and apply Intercultural Bilingual Model in the classroom

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Number of teachers demonstrating an understanding and applying the Model correctly on a survey divided by all sample teachers in opportunity zones.

Data Requirements:

Availability of a survey instrument.

Data Source:

Bilingual Teachers.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct survey.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a direct measure of the enhanced capacity to deliver bilingual education services in the classroom. This indicator replaces the original indicator: " Degree of implementation of the National Education Standards-based EBI Model" as it is a more precise measure of classroom quality. Targets will be established after interviewing local education authorities in opportunity zones during the first three months of 2010 to determine current classroom practice in multicultural bilingual education.

2. Performance Indicator 2:

Reading Assessments implemented in opportunity zones.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of reading tests and applications used to assess students in opportunity zones. A test adapted to other language is considered as a different test than the original language and pre and post intervention assessments will be accounted as different reading test assessments.

Data Requirements:

Testing, validation and adaptation of assessment instruments.

Data Source:

Pre or Post Reading assessment instruments including EGRA (first to third-Spanish and K'iche') national testing (from first to third), LEE (first grade: Spanish, K'iche').

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff and MOE evaluation unit will conduct assessments.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a direct measure of the impact of improved education services on student learning. This indicator replaces the original indicator: " Number of reading assessments implemented nationwide", as it better relates to project activities. Baseline will be established when instruments are fully developed and tested.

3. Performance Indicator 3:

Education policies, regulations or guidelines drafted, modified or monitored with USG assistance to implement education standards in the classroom, reading

methodologies, text book policy and materials distribution.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of published official documents that provide guidance for implementation of education standards in the classroom, reading methodologies, text book policy and materials distribution.

Data Requirements:

Availability of regularly published newspaper and other national and regional reports

Data Source:

National and regional newspapers and published Ministry and local documents

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct weekly review of newspapers and published Ministry documents.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of commitment to provide system support for innovations that promote equitable access and classroom quality. Measurement will focus on the departments and municipalities within the target zones where the project is working, as well as the ministry of education. As new guidance is the target, the baseline is zero.

4. Performance Indicator 4:

Activities to promote reading carried out

Indicator Definition/Measure:

This measure reflects the National Reading Plan through the total number of activities to promote reading as an important part of daily living.

Data Requirements:

Availability of a survey instrument to measure community knowledge and practice with regard to reading.

Data Source:

Local education community members.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct community surveys at least once a year to measure message penetration.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of community support for reading. It replaces the indicator “Degree of implementation of the Reading Promotion Plan” as a more precise measure of project impact. A baseline of community reading practices will be established early in 2010.

For critical activities such as preparation of reading promoters, training of specialists, and production of reading, the total quantities will be reported as part of regular progress reports.

5. Performance Indicator 5:

Number of text books and materials developed, adapted or validated.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of new educational material that the MOE accepts to use in the educational system.

Data Requirements:

Availability of a survey instrument to collect from related MOE units the new educational materials developed, adapted or validated by the MOE or other sources.

Data Source:

Local education community members and MOE units.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct surveys at least once a year to collect required data.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of availability of learning materials in local education communities. Materials include: texts, teaching guides, educational resources (audiovisuals, posters, big books, etc.), as well as reading support tools for parents and others. The adaptation includes alignment with the CNB. Validation can be conducted through experts or through examination of classroom use of the materials.

D. COMPONENT 4: Increased Opportunity to Learn

Result 4: Increased Opportunities to Learn

1. Performance Indicator 1:

Institutional partnerships established with national and international institutions to increase opportunities to learn in opportunity zones.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of partnerships established.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity through partnership. Partnership is defined as an official agreement between institutions that involves technical assistance, funding, equipment, training, and/or training materials. It is important to note that a few long-term alliances may be more important for capacity building than a number of short-term alliances. Institutional national partners will include municipalities, USAC, private universities, Riecken Foundation and the like. As no official agreements exist, the baseline is zero.

2. Performance Indicator 2:

Alliances created with donors, private sector, local governments and others.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of alliances established.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of the enhanced capacity through partnership. Alliance is defined as an official agreement between institutions that involves technical assistance, funding, equipment, training, and/or training materials. It is important to note that a few long-term alliances may be more important for capacity building than a number of short-term alliances. Candidate institutions include: Managers Association,

FUNSEPA, ALMG, Intel, GTZ, JICA, UNICEF, AECI, Banks, PRODESS As no official agreements exist, the baseline is zero.

3. Performance Indicator 3:

Municipalities implementing Municipal Models of Education Excellence.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of municipalities with Model in place.

Data Requirements:

Availability of project and partner institution documentation.

Data Source:

Project and municipal institution documents and reports.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of municipal participation in education. As the model is currently under development, it is anticipated that few municipalities will have a fully functioning model in 2010. As no complete model yet exists, the baseline is zero.

4. Performance Indicator 4:

Degree of implementation of Secondary Education Reform Model

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan.

Data Requirements:

Complete implementation plan. Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution reports and documents.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of progress in creating a national secondary education reform

model. Total number of activities in the Secondary Education Reform Model implementation plan will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for negotiation, validation and implementation of the program. As the final implementation plan is still in process of design, the baseline is zero.

For critical activities such as preparation of specialists, training of trainers, and production of texts and learning materials, the total quantities will be reported as part of regular progress reports.

5. Performance Indicator 5:

Degree of implementation of Early Childhood Education Model

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan.

Data Requirements:

Complete implementation plan. Availability of project and partner institution documentation of completed activities.

Data Source:

Project and partner institution reports and documents.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of progress in creating an early childhood education model. Total number of activities in the Early Childhood Education Model implementation plan will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for negotiation, validation and implementation of the program. As the final implementation plan is still in process of design, the baseline is zero.

For critical activities such as preparation of trainers-of-trainer, training of teachers, and production of texts and learning materials, the total quantities will be reported as part of regular progress reports.

6. Performance Indicator 6:

No. of international conferences organized under Cátedra Bloom lecture series.

Indicator Definition/Measure:

Total number of conference organized.

Data Requirements:

Availability of international specialists to give lectures.

Data Source:

Project documents.

Frequency:

Annually at the end of the fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirements.

Data Collection:

Project staff will conduct a review of documents twice during the fiscal year.

Purpose and Issues:

This is a measure of broad dialogue about education quality. It is anticipated that an average of five conferences will take place each year. As only conferences held under the project will count, the baseline is zero.

III. Performance Measurement Plan

Component 1: Institutional Strengthening for Effective Quality of Education

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
Result 1: Increased institutional capacity of the Ministry of Education and other stakeholders to design, plan, implement, and measure education quality in the classroom	Education system strengthened laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or monitored with USG assistance to improve equitable access to and quality of basic education services	Total number of published official documents that commit new resources (funding, staff, equipment and/or materials) to increasing equitable access or to improving quality (teaching and system support) of basic education services Will include the Ministry of Education and Departments/ Municipalities within the target zones	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Published Newspaper Reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 5 7 10 15 (LOP)	
	MOE systems, units, divisions, initiatives with quality assurance mechanisms	Total number of such entities that have a package of objectives, indicators, measures, data collection procedures, and analysis plans for monitoring education performance A system is defined as a service provider that uses multiple divisions in implementation. A division is a single service provider. A unit is a regional or local implementer (department, municipality) in targeted zones	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Quality Assurance Checklist	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD 5 10 15 20(LOP)	

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
	Host-country institutions use project-assisted MIS system to inform admin./mgmt. decisions	Total number of institutions (Ministries, Universities, Municipalities, and NGOs involved in basic education service delivery) that cite the Integrated Platform of Social Information in plans, proposals, articles, implementation, or applied research documents.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Survey of Institutions	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 1 2 3 4	
	Indicators that report on standards (children meeting learning standards and schools meeting opportunity standards) adopted, used and publicized by the MOE	Total number of published criteria that are used systematically to determine system performance in improving access and quality.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit MOE monitoring publications and mass media reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD 1 2 4 6	
	Individuals trained in strategic information management (OP indicator)	Total number of local managers working with education (mayors, council members, supervisors, principals) who receive at least 24 of training. Training in additional related content areas that total another 24 hours will be counted separately	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit USAID-funded project training reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 10 15 20 30	
	Individuals trained in monitoring and evaluation (OP indicator)	Total number of national and local technical staff responsible for performance monitoring who receive at least 24 of training.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit USAID-funded project training	Baseline 2010 2011 2012	0 10 15 20	

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
		Training in additional related content areas that total another 24 hours will be counted separately				reports	2013	30	
	Education administrators and officials trained (OP indicator)	Total number of national administrators who receive at least 24 of training in areas other than decision-making and M&E.. Training in additional related content areas that total another 24 hours will be counted separately	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit USAID-funded project training reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 5 10 15 20	
	Individuals trained in education management and education reform in the classroom	Total number of teacher trainers and teachers who receive at least 24 of training in participatory school and classroom management.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit PADEP and other USAID-funded project training reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD 50 75 100 125(LOP)	
	Host country institutions with improved management information system (OP indicator)	Total number of education institutions at the national, regional and local level that receive and use equipment, technology and/or training to monitor equitable access and classroom quality	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Survey of cooperating institutions	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 1 2 3 4(LOP)	
	Studies, information gathering or research activities conducted (OP indicator)	Total number of studies with appropriate research methodology that provide results for improving equitable access and classroom quality completed	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Survey of cooperating institutions	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 4 6 8(LOP)	

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
	No. of studies published and communicated	Total number of studies that provide results for improving equitable access and classroom quality available in archival format (digital or print) present in a public forum	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Monitoring of news media, scientific literature and documents of cooperating institutions	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 4 6 8(LOP)	
	Outreach events focused on classroom level reform	Total number of awareness efforts (information campaigns, feedback on performance, etc.) dealing with equitable access and/or classroom quality Carried out in a number of communities of one or more target zones	Absolute frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Project and partner institution documents on outreach efforts	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 5 10 15 20(LOP)	
	Gap in rural/gender/ethnic achievement	Percentage difference in achievement by gender disaggregated by location and ethnicity Calculations will be effect size from year to year based on achievement scores of children in 1 st , 3 rd , and 6 th grade	Relative frequency/ Percentage	Gender, location, ethnicity	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Ministry achievement data.	2010 2011 2012 2013	3.3% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3%	

COMPONENT 2: Improved Teacher Professional Development

	Indicator	Definition	Units of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
Result 2: Teacher professional development system designed, negotiated, validated and implemented	Degree of implementation of the National Career Development System	Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan. Activities in the NCDS will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for negotiation, validation and implementation.	Relative Frequency/ Percentage	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 20% 40% 60% 75%(LOP)	
	Institutional partnerships established with national and international universities and institutions to reform education courses, career, teacher training, and teacher career development.	Total number of alliances established. Alliance is defined a an official agreement that involves technical assistance, faculty and student exchange, courses, and/or training materials.	Absolute frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 1 2 3 4(LOP)	
	Technical committees integrated to support teacher training and teacher career development	Total number of committees formed	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 3 5 5	
	Students graduated from Master Degree Program in Education.	Total number of students who receive Master Degrees during the project.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender, ethnicity, location	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 0 10 10(20LOP)	
	Persons trained as Teacher	Total number of persons trained	Absolute Frequency/	Gender, ethnicity,	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation		0	

	Indicator	Definition	Units of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
	Professional Development Experts	Candidates will include university professors and MOE national and regional technical staff	Count	location		team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD	
	Percent of professional development experts and teacher trainers/pedagogical supervisors that meet quality standards	Eliminated – as is part of previous indicator							
	Individuals trained by the cadre of Teacher Professional Development Experts	Total number of people trained. Targets will depend on the number of Teacher Professional Development Experts	Absolute Frequency/ Count	Gender, ethnicity, location	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 TBD	
	Percent of teachers who understand and apply PADEP methodology	Number of teachers identified as understanding and applying methodology correctly by supervisors divided by all sample teachers.	Relative Frequency/ Percentage	Gender, ethnicity, location	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Survey of a representative sample of teacher supervisors	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 TBD	

COMPONENT 3: Standards, life competencies, curriculum, materials, and testing for effective first and second language acquisition and student learning

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
Result 3: Language curriculum, textbooks, instructional and learning materials, tests, and continuous assessments and teacher training aligned with standards and proved effective for I1 and I2 acquisition	Teachers in opportunity zones that understand and apply the Intercultural Bilingual Model in the classroom	Number of teachers that understand and apply the Model correctly in the classroom as determined by a survey divided by all sample teachers.	Relative Frequency/ Percentage	Gender, ethnicity	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Survey of a representative sample teachers	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 TBD	
	Number of reading assessments implemented in opportunity zones	Total number reading assessments conducted and disseminate	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Reading assessment instruments	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD TBD	
	No. of education policies, regulations or guidelines drafted, modified or monitored with USG assistance to implement education standards in the classroom, reading methodologies, text book policy and materials distribution	Total number of published official documents that provide new guidance for implementation.	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team and MOE evaluation unit Published Newspaper Reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 1 2 3 4	
	Activities carried out to promote	Total number of activities that promote	Absolute Frequency/	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team	Baseline	TBD	

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
	reading	reading in local education communities	Count			Community reading knowledge and practice survey	2010 2011 2012 2013	TBD	
	Text books, materials developed or validated	Total number of textbooks and other materials tested and put into use in opportunity zones	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team Project documents and reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 3 4 6 15(LOP)	

COMPONENT 4: Increased Opportunities to Learn

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
Result 4: Increased opportunities to learn	Institutional partnerships established with national or international institutions to increase opportunities to learn opportunity zones	Total number of partnerships established.	Absolute frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 4 6 8(LOP)	
	No.. of alliances created with donors, private sector, local governments and others	Total number of partnerships established. Alliance is defined a an official agreement that involves technical assistance, funds, equipment, training, and/or training materials.	Absolute frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 4 6 8(LOP)	
	No. of municipalities implementing Municipal Models of Education Excellence	Total number of municipalities with Model in place	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team Project documents and municipal reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 2 4 8 12(LOP)	
	Degree of implementation of Secondary Education Reform Model	Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan. Activities in the SERM will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for design, validation and implementation.	Relative Frequency/ Percentage	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2010 2011 2012 2013	0 TBD	
	Degree of implementation of Early Childhood	Percentage of activities carried out in the implementation plan.	Relative Frequency/ Percentage	NA	Annually at the end of the school year	Project evaluation team	2010	0 TBD	

	Indicators	Definition	Unit of Measure	Disaggregate by	Timeframe for Data Collection	Responsible and Source	Year	Baseline/ Targets	Actual
	Education Model	Activities in the SERM will be counted and divided by the total number of activities for design, validation and implementation.				Project and partner institutions reports and documents	2011 2012 2013		
	International conferences organized under Cátedra Bloom lecture series	Total number of conferences	Absolute Frequency/ Count	NA	Annually at the end of the Fiscal Year	Project evaluation team Project documents and reports	Baseline 2010 2011 2012 2013	0 5 10 15 20(LOP)	

USAID/Reforma Educativa en el Aula
Avenida La Reforma 6-64 zona 9
Plaza Corporativa Reforma, Torre II,
Nivel 9, Oficina 901
PBX: +(502) 2390-6700
website: www.reaula.org
Correo electrónico:
reaula@juarezassociates.com