

**SUGGESTED
INDICATORS**

for

**USAID Goal 3:
Human capacity built through
education and training**

Part I:

**Indicators for Strategic Objective 1—
Access to quality basic education, especially
for girls and women, expanded**

February, 1998

Acknowledgements

Many people have participated in creating and revising this document, which is the result of the latest in a series of Agency efforts to select and refine indicators for basic education programs. Special thanks go to Mary Lou Johnson-Pizarro, Consultant, Tracy Brunette, AFR/SD, Sarah Wright, LAC/RSD, Diane Prouty, AIR-AFR/SD, Gretchen Bloom, ANE/SEA/SPA and Chad Horning, CDIE/ESDS–ANE/SEA. Also contributing valuable feedback or guidance were Karen Tietjen, AFR/SD, Cecilia Otero, CDIE/RRS, Jon Peha G/HCD, Jim Hoxeng, G/HCD, Don Foster-Gross, G/HCD, John Haecker PPC/CDIE/PME, Harriett Destler, PPC/CDIE/PME, Dan Blumhagen, PPC/CDIE/PME, Susie Clay, G/WID, Sarah Porter, G/WID, John Hatch, G/WID, Larry Beyna, MSI/PMT, Keith Brown, MSI/PMT, Judith Light, MSI/PMT, Rene Bernier, ISTI/PMA, John Anderson, USAID/Namibia, Ash Hartwell, AIR, Yvette Malcioln, USAID/Benin, Jean Meadowcroft (ret.), David Mutchler, LAC/SPM, Anna Quandt, PPC/PHD, Marion Warren, AA/G and Emily Vargas-Baron, G/HCD. Finally, helpful virtual contributions were received from Joan Larcom, USAID/Haiti, Lisa Franchett, USAID/South Africa, Fatou Rigoulot, USAID/REDSO/Abidjan, Cynthia Chassy, USAID/Guinea, Douglas Lehman, USAID/Guinea, Nancy Langworthy, USAID/Nepal, Patrick Fine, USAID/South Africa, as well as staff in USAID/Ethiopia, USAID/Ghana, USAID/El Salvador, and USAID/Peru.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Introduction.....	iv
Background.....	iv
Purpose.....	iv
History	v
About the Suggested List of Indicators.....	v
Future: Household Surveys.....	viii
Indicators for USAID Goal 3:	
Human capacity built through education and training.....	1
USAID Objective 3.1. Access to high quality basic education, especially for girls, women and other underserved populations, expanded	1
Program Approach 3.1.1. <i>Policies to promote access to primary education improved</i>	3
Indicator Cluster A. Policies that promote primary education reviewed/formulated/adopted/implemented (3); Indicator Cluster B. Adequate resources for basic education allocated (4); Indicator Cluster C. Decision-making and/or accountability regarding public resources decentralized to intermediate and local levels (5)	
Program Approach 3.1.2. <i>Institutional capacity to promote access to primary education improved</i>	6
Indicator Cluster A. Better program and policy planning and analytic capabilities established (6); Indicator Cluster B. Better financial planning, management, and accounting procedures implemented/utilized (6); Indicator Cluster C. Educational systems improved (7)	
Program Approach 3.1.3: <i>School learning environment improved</i>	8
Indicator Cluster A. Quality of school buildings improved (8);	
Indicator Cluster B. Adequate materials and equipment for	

schools provided (8); Indicator Cluster C. High quality school teaching and supervision provided (9)

Program Approach 3.1.4 <i>Distance education established or improved</i>	10
Indicator Cluster A. Distance education for those without access to formal schooling or distance education to improve the quality of formal schooling established or improved (10); Indicator Cluster B. Communication technology to support distance education established or improved (11)	
Program Approach 3.1.5 <i>Community participation in educational policy and school management increased</i>	11
Indicator Cluster A. Local NGOs and other private sector organizations actively involved in local basic education (11); Indicator Cluster B. Parent/community groups (i.e., parent-teacher associations, school committees and school boards) involved in local basic education (12); Indicator Cluster C. Parents involved in local basic education (12)	
Program Approach 3.1.6 <i>Educational opportunities for girls improved</i>	13
Indicator Cluster A. National strategy and policies for promoting girls' education reviewed, formulated, adopted and implemented (13); Indicator Cluster B. School-based, education system and policy (supply-side) constraints for girls reduced (14); Indicator Cluster C. Family and community (demand-side) constraints for girls reduced (15)	
Program Approach 3.1.7 <i>Educational opportunities for underserved populations, rural populations, and other disadvantaged children improved</i>	16
Indicator Cluster A. National strategy and policies for promoting the education of underserved populations reviewed, formulated, adopted and implemented (16); Indicator Cluster B. School-based and education system (supply side) constraints for underserved populations reduced (16); Indicator Cluster C. Family and community (demand-side) constraints for underserved populations reduced (16)	
Program Approach 3.1.8 <i>Adult literacy and/or early childhood development programs established or improved</i>	17
Indicator Cluster A. Integrated literacy programs developed and implemented for adult learners (17); Indicator Cluster B. Early childhood development programs developed or improved (18)	

Introduction

Background

As announced by Administrator Atwood in July, 1997, the new USAID Goal, "Human capacity built through education and training" has two strategic objectives. These are SO1, "Access to quality basic education, especially for girls and women, expanded," and SO2, "The contribution of institutions of higher education to sustainable development increased." Under SO1, there are seven Agency "Program Approaches." (See USAID Strategic Plan, September, 1997, fig. 5a.) USAID's Program Approaches organize Agency programs and activities into categories that contribute to the achievement of the Agency Objectives. As detailed in the ADS Series 200, each Operating Unit prepares and submits a strategic plan, including a Results Framework and accompanying narrative that articulates the Operating Unit's development hypothesis and how each Operating Unit's strategic plan contributes to the overall Agency Strategic Plan. (Agency SOs and Program Approaches were not intended to directly correlate with Mission SOs and Intermediate Results. In fact, many Mission SOs currently are set at the Agency Approach level.)

Purpose

This document provides a "menu" of indicators for Basic Education, from which Mission Operating Units can choose if they find it helpful for creating or refining their performance measurement systems. This document is a draft list of Agency SO-level and Program Approach-level indicators for the new Basic Education SO (SO1) under the new Agency Goal. This document is meant to provide a list of suggested indicators from which field-based Operating Units can choose to measure their relevant SOs and/or IRs. Also, this document may provide new ideas for indicators, as well as a mechanism for sharing additional new indicators that evolve. This list is not meant to be comprehensive; Operating Units working in education that choose to use this list are still likely to need to develop additional indicators.

Several of the Program Approach-level indicators on this list are stated in general terms and need to be refined and made more specific to meet the particular monitoring needs of an Operating Unit's program. However, since several indicators currently in use by different Missions are actually the same in meaning but are worded differently, it is hoped that this document will begin to consolidate the Program Approach-level indicators already in use by Missions and to standardize their wording and definitions. Of course, this standardization will be limited by the

wide variations in the status of education and education programs in different countries. Therefore, this list is *not* an attempt to set common education indicators at the Agency Approach level. However, *at the Strategic Objective level, it is hoped that this document will help promote the use of common indicators in order to facilitate Agency-wide reporting on progress in education* (see page one of the indicators). (Agency Strategic-Objective level indicators are currently used at either the Mission SO or IR levels.)

History

Basic education indicators currently in use by Mission Operating Units were the basis for this list, which was developed by the Basic Education Indicators Working Group over the last year and a half. This exercise started in late 1996 when each of the five Centers in the Global Bureau began convening USAID/W technical staff to develop what was then called "common" indicators. The Basic Education Indicators Working Group, led by G/HCD, was formed and began meeting regularly. The Working Group began by reviewing and discussing the education indicators listed in all USAID Results Reports and Resource Requests (R4s) as well as the documents produced by a basic education indicators exercise conducted in 1992-93 by the PRISM project and another interbureau Education Indicators Working Group that was led by Marcy Bernbaum and met in September, 1995. These initial efforts led to the writing of the draft list of suggested indicators that was sent out by cable to all Missions in February, 1997, with a request for comments and feedback. Mission personnel in Ghana, El Salvador, Peru, Ethiopia and REDSO/West generously took time to respond to the request. Later, in mid-1997, the indicators discussion was postponed pending an Agency decision on a new goal for education and training. In September, 1997, after the new goal was announced and the Global Bureau was settled in its new space in the Ronald Reagan Building, the working group resumed its regular meetings. Since the new goal articulates strategic objectives in both Basic Education and Higher Education, a separate working group was created to develop Higher Education indicators.

Recently, in December, 1997, a new draft of suggested indicators for Basic Education, incorporating the feedback from the field received in early 1997, was sent to key Operating Units working in basic education and to PPC/CDIE/PME (including the staff of the Management Systems International's Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement Team). Comments and feedback on the new draft has been incorporated into this draft, which is the Basic Education Indicators Working Group's final draft for this 1998 R4 season (covering FY 2000). The Basic Education Indicators Working Group will continue to meet on a monthly basis throughout 1998. An expanded version of this document, including more definitions and explanations, is planned for release at the beginning of the 1999 R4 season.

The Working Group would greatly appreciate any suggestions or comments on this year's draft. Feedback about any aspect of this draft that could improve next year's draft can be sent by e-mail to Linda Padgett, G/HCD (Internet: lpadgett@usaid.gov).

About the Suggested List of Indicators

- **All items presented after the Agency Objective and Agency Program Approaches, marked with bullets, are *suggested indicators*.** Operating Units can choose and tailor indicators or create additional indicators to match the specific needs of their Basic Education programs.
- **The Program Approach-level indicators are grouped under eight Agency Program Approaches.** (The Agency currently has only seven Program Approaches under SO 3.1. The Working Group is suggesting that the Agency's Program Approach 3.1.1 be divided into two approaches.) Each set of Program Approach-level indicators is further divided into two or three clusters.
- **Indicators that are expressed in qualitative terms are marked with a "(Q)."** Indicators can be framed as either quantitative or qualitative measure of progress toward a result. Qualitative indicators can be mistaken for results statements, inputs, or indicators that require only a "yes" or "no" report. However, qualitative indicators are a valid supplement to quantitative ones and reporting on a qualitative indicator requires a descriptive narrative with observations (often of behavior or perception). These narrative descriptions can supplement quantitative measures (numbers and percentages) with a richness of information that brings a program's results to life. Most of the qualitative indicators on this list can be reworded to specifically reflect the measurement needs of a particular education program, and some of them can be reworked and reworded as quantitative indicators, if an Operating Units anticipates being able to collect quantitative data.
- **Slashes mean "or."** Slashes are used to avoid having to spell out several indicators that differ by only one word. For example "percent/number" is used to indicate that either percent or number can be used for that indicator. In some cases, frequently towards the beginning of an activity, when the percentage calculated would be very low, tracking the total number might be more informative. Since number is needed to calculate percents, it may be just as easy to report both the number and the percent.
- ***Suggested new wording for the Agency Basic Education SO and Program Approach statements is in italics.*** The Basic Education Indicators Working Group has suggested new wording that differs slightly from the current USAID Strategic Plan (September, 1997).
- **Mission Operating Units are encouraged to refine the wording of the Approach-level indicators to make them more useful and appropriate for their specific program.** For several of the indicators, the Working Group did not think it would be fruitful to use wording that would be inappropriately specific to devise here in Washington. However, at the same time, Operating Units that have chosen an indicator

with exactly the same meaning as one on the list, are encouraged to use the wording on the list. This effort will help begin to provide some uniformity to indicators used throughout the Agency.

The scope or target of an indicator can be modified to reflect the emphasis of a particular country's program. Most of the indicators on this list were written without an explanation of whether they are meant to be measured at the national, regional, district or program area, or whether the group indicated is the national population or a subset of that population. The scope appropriate for each indicator will vary according to a Mission's needs. For example, in Nepal, the focus of the literacy program is on women instead of "adults" (see Approach 3.1.8), and the indicators under that approach can be modified accordingly. (In fact, many of the indicators on this list can be disaggregated by gender and/or age when it is appropriate to do so.) Likewise, the quality indicators under 3.1.3 can be applicable to any group of schools specified.

The indicators on this list reflect results at varying levels. The indicators on the list are meant to cover widely disparate results defined by Operating Units, from those of a higher level to those of a lower level of impact. The indicators at the SO level are at a higher level than the indicators at the Program Approach level. And, some of the SO-level indicators (such as percentage of cohort enrolling in grade five) are at a higher level than some of the other SO indicators (such as gross access rate in the first grade). At the Agency Program Approach level, some of the indicators in the indicator clusters on this list are written as a continuum of milestones on the way to the ultimate, higher-level result. For example, the indicators under 3.1.2, Cluster A range from "Existing Education Management Information System (EMIS) reviewed and recommendations for improvements made," a lower level indicator for use at the beginning of EMIS reform, to "EMIS providing accurate, timely and useful data in place" and "Number of national/regional/district-level policy decisions made using EMIS data in the past year," higher-level indicators for use after EMIS reform is well underway. Also, indicators of "numbers or percent of a group receiving training," are generally considered to be lower-level indicators, more appropriate at the beginning of an activity or as an indicator of a lower-level result. Finally, in some sections, such as 3.1.1, Cluster A, the amount of indentation of the indicators correlates with the indicator's level of detail and specificity. For example, "Compulsory education policy formulated" is one of many more specific and detailed indicators indented under the more general indicator "Revised or new national education and related policies formulated."

The particular levels of indicators appropriate for a given country program will depend on the history and current state of education and education programs in that country. However, within any given strategic framework, higher level indicators need to be used to measure higher level results and progressively lower level indicators to measure progressively lower level results—creating a logical flow from the top of the framework to the bottom. (Please note that the level of an indicator does not necessarily reflect the

indicator's importance to the overall program. Sometimes the indicators at the lower levels measure lower-level results that are critical for the success of the overall program.)

- **This list is quite long, but Mission's lists can be short.** In general, Missions are encouraged to select the smallest number of indicators that provide enough information to manage programs well and to determine progress. This list is long because a wide variety of indicators are needed to be useful for the greatly disparate programs in the LAC, AFR, and ANE regions. Hopefully, as a first step towards the long-term goal of some comparability across countries (especially at the Agency SO level), there is enough of a selection in this list for Mission Operating Units to choose some of these indicators while developing others that are not on the list, as necessary.
- **This list is not comprehensive.** Although the indicators currently in use by the missions (as shown on R4s) were the indicators upon which this list was built, Missions still may not find the indicators on this list that they need to effectively monitor their programs. Education programs are complex, varied and multi-faceted. We would greatly appreciate being informed about education indicators that are currently in use and could not be found on this list so that we can discuss their incorporation into the list at future meetings of the working group.

A Few Additional Indicator Tips

- **The difference between a result and a qualitative indicator is one of definition.** A result is what is to be accomplished. Indicators help to answer the question of what it will look like when that result is accomplished. Sometimes, an indicator that sounds like a lower-level result can serve as a qualitative indicator of a higher level result. For example, "National exam standards for primary school completion defined" could be a lower-level result, or it could be a qualitative indicator of a higher-level result such as "Educational systems strengthened."
- **Indicators can be added to a results framework over time.** However, the most useful information is gleaned from tracking the same indicators, when possible, over several years.
- **Annual reporting is not required for all indicators.** Although the Agency requires annual reporting, some indicators can be chosen that do not produce annual data if they are paired with a proxy indicator that does.

Future: Household Surveys

Future MEASURE-DHS+ Household Surveys will offer a new questionnaire module that will help track education indicators. G/HCD and G/PHN are collaborating to analyze and disseminate the education data collected from DHS household surveys conducted in 39 countries over the past 10 years. The two Centers are also working through the new G/PHN MEASURE-DHS+ contract to develop a module of questions about education that can be used with future MEASURE-DHS+ surveys. This module will contain questions that will help track the SO-level indicators of enrollments, gender disparities, repetition and completion rates, as well as several other indicators on the list in this document, particularly those related to community and family barriers to education, community participation, and nonformal education. The survey module will also be used to investigate issues best elucidated at the household level, such as reasons for non-enrollment or drop-out. We look forward to collaborating with Mission-based Operating Units and country policy makers to develop survey questions of greatest usefulness to government and Mission policy and program needs.

Indicators for USAID Goal 3: Human capacity built through education and training¹

USAID Objective 3.1. *Access to high quality basic education, especially for girls, women and other underserved populations, expanded (suggested new wording)* [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Access to quality basic education, especially for girls and women, expanded]

Indicators:²

- Net primary school enrollment ratio, *by sex* (Definition: the number of primary students of primary school age divided by the total primary school age population)
- Gross primary school enrollment ratio,³ *by sex* (Definition: the number of primary students of any age divided by the total primary school age population)
- *Primary school Gender Parity Index (Definition: girls' gross enrollment ratio divided by the boys' gross enrollment ratio) (suggested new wording—is an estimate of the number of girls per boy in primary school)* [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Ratio of girls' enrollment ratio to boys' enrollment ratio]
- *Primary school repetition rates, by sex⁴ (suggested new indicator)*
- Retention/Survival rate to grade five, *by sex* (Percentage of cohort enrolled in grade five; proxy for fourth grade completion rate⁵) (suggested new wording) [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Percentage of cohort *reaching* grade five]
- *Gross Access Rate in first grade, by sex (first grade GER; suggested new indicator)*
- *National primary school achievement test scores for reading, math and science by sex (in that order of subject priority) and at appropriate grades⁴ (e.g., after completion of second, fourth and sixth grades⁶) (suggested new indicator)*

¹The indicators in this document can be specified to apply to national, regional, district or program areas.

²Data should be disaggregated according to country needs and data availability. All countries should disaggregate data for these indicators by gender. It may also be useful to disaggregate by region, urban/rural residence, religion, or ethnicity.

³Net enrollment ratio should be used where available. Caution should be used when comparing net enrollment ratios with gross enrollment ratios.

⁴Data for this indicator are readily available in the LAC region.

⁵Given wide country differences in the number of years in primary school, fourth grade completion is the best available measure of completion that can be used for cross-country comparisons and USAID reporting on overall progress in basic education. "Survival rate to grade five" has been chosen for the same reason by the OECD, UNESCO and UN as the completion indicator for tracking the DAC goals for education.

⁶In general, the tests administered for this indicator need to be assessed for their reliability and validity as measures of student performance. There are also several additional factors that can be taken into consideration when considering the use of student achievement tests as an indicator. The first factor is whether or not a criterion-referenced test (CRT) is used to evaluate student performance or if a norm-referenced test (NRT) is the desired

Discussion: Since many student-level changes take several years to achieve, most student-level indicators are suggested at the Agency SO level. However, some student-level indicators change more quickly than others. For example, the gross access rate (gross enrollment in first grade) could rise significantly years before an improvement was seen in fourth grade completion rates. Also, since different countries are in very different stages of educational development, the time needed to measure a positive impact of programs at the student level can vary widely.

Please note: Since each Mission program is unique and countries are at different stages of educational development, indicators at the Mission SO and IR levels do not necessarily correspond to the Agency SO and Approach levels of the indicators on this list. For example, a Mission might use an Agency SO-level indicator (such as "national primary school achievement test scores for reading") at the Mission IR level, or an Agency Approach-level indicator (such as the "school teaching/ supervision quality index") at the Mission SO level, depending on the status of education and education programs in the country.

testing approach. CRT's are closely linked to the curriculum that is being implemented while NRTs are not linked to the curriculum. CRTs are used to illustrate how well the students assimilate and comprehend what they are being taught while NRTs permit student ranking within a school and at a national level. CRTs provide a mechanism for assessing how effective the teaching/learning system is and where remediation is needed. NRTs provides a mechanism to sort students and can be used to control access to higher levels within the education system. NRTs can also allow a country to compare the performance of its students with those of students in other countries. Traditionally, NRTs have been used to identify students who have the greatest potential to succeed academically. This assumption is being challenged and the value of wide-scale NRTs is under scrutiny.

In cases where a system can afford the cost of implementing only one exam approach, CRTs are preferable. CRTs are frequently used in conjunction with continuous assessment. CRTs should not be developed until a curriculum has been revised and meets the educational needs of a country. Of course, all tests need to be as neutral as possible with respect to underserved populations and gender. Also, it is clear that meaningful comparisons in test scores over time can be made only if the testing instrument used does not change.

A second factor is the timing of testing. When CRT testing is done in grades 2, 4, and 6, student progress and system efficiency can be carefully monitored and adjustments made in a timely fashion. By the time students have completed grade 2 they should have acquired a sufficient level of reading fluency (vocabulary, phonetic skills, comprehension skills, etc.) so that their test scores can highlight systemic problems as opposed to individual student deficiencies. In systems where indigenous languages are used until grade 3, there is sufficient justification to delay testing until the end of that year. In general, however, it is preferable that tests be first administered earlier rather than later in the primary cycle in order to benefit from the system remediation opportunities. (Grade 1 test scores, however, are difficult to interpret because they reflect deficiencies or strengths in children's readiness for school rather than education and school system factors. Grade 2 is the earliest that students are academically strong enough to test the education system and reveal student wastage due to poor teaching, poor instructional materials, inappropriate curriculum, etc.) In cases where an education system can afford to develop multiple tests in several indigenous languages, consideration should be given to the possibility of administering the test in grade 2.

Program Approach 3.1.1. Policies to promote access to primary education improved (suggested new wording) [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: 3.1.1 Policies and institutions which promote universal access to primary education increased]

Indicator Cluster A. Policies that promote primary education reviewed/formulated/adopted/implemented

Indicators:

- Current education and related policies reviewed (Q)
- Revised or new national education and related policies formulated⁷ (Q)
 - Compulsory education policy formulated (Q)
 - Laws limiting child labor formulated (Q)
 - Minimum and maximum age of school entry law formulated (Q)
 - Teachers terms of service rationalized (i.e. teachers roles verified, teachers redeployed, teachers paid a living wage, teachers fired for non-performance) (Q)
 - Policy encouraging private and NGO education providers formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding student assessment (type, use of results) formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding national curriculum or decentralized, locally-developed curricula formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding school management and governance formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding community involvement formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding standards for pre- and in-service teacher training formulated (Q)
 - Policies regarding the minimum set of/the provision of instructional materials required for each classroom formulated⁸ (Q)
- Input on newly formulated education policies solicited from NGOs/the private sector/regional and district education officers (Q)
- Revised or new national education and related policies adopted⁹ (Q)

⁷The indicators of "policies formulated" listed in this section are meant to be exemplary. The particular policies targeted will vary from country to country.

⁸Instructional materials include teachers' supplies and student materials, as well as desks, chairs, blackboards, etc.

- Revised or new national education and related policies implemented¹⁰ (Q)
 - Strategy for policy implementation created and funded (Q)
 - Input on effective policy implementation at local and regional levels solicited from NGOs/the private sector/regional and district education officers (Q)
 - Authorization provided to those required to carry out policies (Q)

Discussion: The list of policies is not meant to be comprehensive. Nor are all of the policies listed considered important for all countries. The policies suggested are examples that may or may not be appropriate given local circumstances and history.

Indicator Cluster B. Adequate resources for basic education allocated

Indicators:

- Education as percentage of national budget/expenditures
- Primary education as percentage of education budget/expenditures
- Percent of primary budget allocated (expenditures) to recurrent non-salary budget/expenditures (or percent to salaries)
- Percent of education budget/expenditures for instructional materials
- Per student budget/expenditures for instructional materials
- Percent of teacher training budget for in-service teacher training and support
- Resource allocations reflect needs calculated from EMIS data (Q)

Discussion: Whether the indicator of improvement in allocation contains the word "budget" or the word "expenditures" depends on which of these is the main identified impediment to adequate basic education resources. (As stated in the introduction, many of these indicators are meant to be adapted to the specific needs of individual countries.)

Indicator Cluster C. Decision-making and/or accountability regarding public resources decentralized to intermediate and local levels

⁹This indicator could apply to a package of policies or for a single policy

¹⁰Other indicators of "policies implemented" such as "curriculum being used" or "teachers trained" can be found in other sections of this list of indicators.

Indicators:

- Key responsibilities and their supporting authority decentralized to regional/district level (Q)
- EMIS data accessible and used locally (Q)
- Decentralized education budget regularly disbursed to local/regional level on time and in amounts that promote equity (Q)
- Authority to hire/fire teachers decentralized (Q)
- Decentralized procurement authority established (Q)

Discussion: While there is broad recognition that decentralization can improve basic education access and quality, this policy should not be viewed as an infallible one to be implemented in all countries. For example, decentralization may be inappropriate if it is used as a means to circumvent a weak central government. Before proceeding with decentralization, a number of factors need to be evaluated, such as: What are the financial implications of decentralization of decision making? Is the national government using decentralization as a mechanism to shift some of the financial responsibility to regional or local communities? If so, do these communities have a financial base to support this burden? Is there the capacity to provide needed initial training support to localities? Is there a mechanism for ensuring that the proper school and system level education quality standards will be maintained?

To be most effective, the decentralization of planning and management of basic education needs to be carried into the community level. Groups such as the village education committee need to be given specific and meaningful roles, responsibility and authority. Ideally, the scope of these roles and functions is progressively enlarged as communities gain experience and confidence.

Program Approach 3.1.2. *Institutional capacity to promote access to primary education improved (suggested new wording)* [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: 3 1 1 Policies and institutions which promote universal access to primary education increased]

Indicator Cluster A. Better program and policy planning and analytic capabilities established

Indicators:

- Existing education management information system (EMIS) reviewed and recommendations for improvements made (Q)

- EMIS revamped (data collection disaggregated¹¹ and standardized, data analysis computerized, personnel and supervisors trained) (Q)
- EMIS providing accurate, timely and useful data in place (Q)
- Statistical data produced at national and regional levels (Q)
- Country statistical yearbook published within X months of start of academic year (Q) (Or, number of months after start of academic year that country statistical yearbook is published)
- EMIS data used in policy discussions and decision making (Q)
- Number of national/regional/district-level policy decisions made using EMIS data in the past year
- District/regional/national education sector strategic plans prepared (Q)
- Education sector evaluations conducted and information used (Q)

Indicator Cluster B. Better financial planning, management, and accounting procedures implemented/utilized

Indicators:

- Annual detailed budget prepared (Q)
- Budgetary norms established (cost/student) (Q)
- Effective accounting systems in place and utilized (Q)
- District/regional/national financial reports prepared (Q)
- Ministry of Finance provides funds to Ministry of Education in timely fashion (Q)
- Cost-effectiveness analyzed as the change in achievement test scores in relation to the per student cost of education (Q)
- Local materials used in school/school furniture construction (Q)
- Double-shift classrooms implemented¹² (Q)
- Competitive procurement process instituted/implemented (Q)

¹¹ Data should be disaggregated according to country needs. However, all countries should disaggregate education statistics by gender, when possible. It is also useful to disaggregate by region, district, and urban/rural residence, and, in some settings, by religion or ethnicity.

¹² Double-shift classrooms have been found to be most effective in urban areas. Considerations include ensuring a sufficient number of hours of instruction per student per day and a sufficient number of teachers to prevent teachers from becoming exhausted.

Indicator Cluster C. Educational systems improved

Indicators:

School schedules¹³

- Number of days in school year
- Number of hours per day that teachers teach [versus do administrative work]

Curriculum

- Curriculum reviewed/revised/implemented to meet educational needs of students and to eliminate stereotyping (Q)

Teachers/supervisors

- Pre- and in-service teacher training programs use and teach appropriate pedagogy (Q)
- Pre- and in-service teacher training programs include local content/materials in the curriculum and teach the inclusion of local content/materials in the curriculum (Q)
- Percent of teachers trained to minimum standards
- Percent of teachers receiving in-service training in past year
- Average annual hours of in-service training per teacher
- Percent of teachers effectively applying X (country specific) methodology
- Percent of teachers paid on time
- Percent of headmasters who have received management training
- Percent of teachers/administrators who have had an annual performance review within the past year

Material Resources

- Percent of classrooms/teachers with minimum set of instructional materials
- Average cost of textbooks
- Textbook dissemination structure in place/used (Q)
- Student:textbook ratio in reading/math/science
- Textbooks have undergone a revision to eliminate stereotyping (Q)
- Reading/math/science textbooks are substantive/accurate/at the appropriate skill level (Q)
- Government-supplied educational materials reach schools before the beginning of the school year (Q)

¹³The district or region may be the best level for determining school schedules that best suit the needs of the local children and their families.

Assessment/Testing

- National assessment instruments designed/in place/implemented to evaluate what students have learned and how they are performing in reading and math (or just reading) after completion of second, fourth and sixth grades (Q)
- National exam standards for primary school completion defined/tested (Q)

Program Approach 3.1.3: School learning environment improved (suggested new wording) [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Learning environments through teacher training, better instructional materials, media and methods improved]

Indicator Cluster A. Quality of school buildings improved**Indicators:** (All are qualitative)

- School building quality index (see discussion; rating scale of 0 to 40 points for each school surveyed using zero to five points for each criterion with zero = worst or non-existent and five = best): good quality and sturdy roof; solid wall construction; adequate space for students; adequate ventilation; adequate lighting; electricity; readily accessible potable water; latrines with privacy

Indicator Cluster B. Adequate materials and equipment for schools provided**Indicators:** (All are qualitative)

- School materials/equipment quality index (see discussion; rating scale of 0 to 55 points for each school surveyed using zero to five points for each criterion with zero=worst or non-existent and five= best): an adequate number of reading and math textbooks per class; textbooks are used during instruction; textbooks can be taken home by students; classrooms have blackboards and chalk; classrooms have minimum set of instructional materials; classrooms have storage place for classroom supplies; classrooms have desk and chair for teachers; school has reference materials; each student has a chair or adequate space on a bench; each student has adequate space at a desk or table; each student has writing materials (e.g., paper and pencil or pen)

Indicator Cluster C. High quality school teaching and supervision provided**Indicators:** (All are qualitative)

- School teaching/supervision quality index (see discussion; rating scale from 0 to 35 points for each school surveyed using zero to five points for each criterion with zero=worst or non-existent and five= best): all teachers have at least minimum level of pre-service qualification; all teachers receive in-service training each year; the student:teacher ratio allows for effective instruction; teachers assess students on an ongoing basis and keep records of results; teachers receive ongoing instructional support (teacher-teacher or principal-teacher); teachers are rarely absent; teachers undergo continuous assessment.

Discussion: Indicators for this approach are clustered into three categories of school-level quality—the school building, school materials and equipment, and school teaching and supervision. In an attempt to provide an illustrative example of how the very complex issue of measuring school quality could be simplified, we have experimented here with three indexes or rating scales. These scales are meant to be used in school surveys, with each school receiving a score (e.g., from 0 to 40 for Cluster A, from 0 to 55 for Cluster B or from 0 to 35 for Cluster C). We are aware that any given criterion within an index is not of equal importance to the other criteria in that index and the level of importance of each item varies among countries and changes with time. Therefore, the creation of such indexes would require discussion within each country, and the resulting indexes would be useful for comparisons over time or among regions or districts of the same country, but they would not be useful for inter-country comparisons. Some of the questions to consider in developing indexes include: How many elements should be included? What is the relationship of the elements or "sub-indicators" of the index? On what basis should each element be weighted?

These indexes have been created primarily for the purpose of generating discussion. Because of the lack of agreement within the education community about the definition of and the best way to measure school quality, plans are now underway to convene a separate working group to focus only on this issue. This group will be informed by lessons learned about monitoring improvements in education quality from USAID's experience with Fundamental (or Standard) Quality (and Equity) Levels (FQL in Benin, FQEL in Guinea, and SQL in Ghana). In the meantime, we would appreciate any feedback on the usefulness or potential usefulness of such indexes as those proposed here.

Please note that the criteria listed in the indexes can easily be broken out into individual qualitative indicators, and some can be reworded as quantitative

indicators, for example, "classrooms have minimum set of instructional materials" (a qualitative indicator requiring a descriptive narrative report) can be reworded as "percent of classrooms with minimum set of instructional materials," a quantitative indicator.

(We decided to experiment with this approach after learning that the democracy, population and economic growth sectors use such indexes to monitor their programs. For example, PHN uses an index to monitor the level of quality of services at family planning service delivery points using a rating scale with one point for each of the following criteria: no stockouts of any method/brand; at least 3 modern methods available; private exam space in facility; staff trained in methods available and in counseling on side effects; state-of-the-art national guidelines (or clinical guidebook) available on site; facility opened and staffed at a minimum of 5 hours/day.)

Program Approach 3.1.4 *Distance education established or improved*

(suggested new wording) [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Expanded and improved distance education, community learning centers and communication technology supported]

Indicator Cluster A. Distance education for those without access to formal schooling or distance education to improve the quality of formal schooling established or improved

Indicators:

- Potential distance education target audiences identified (Q)
- Percent of out-of-school children enrolled in distance education program
- Percent of those who enroll (with no access to school) who successfully complete distance education program
- Number/percent of schools participating in distance education program
- Percent of the total number of students in participating schools who are taking part in the distance education program
- Distance education participants scores on criterion-referenced tests versus scores of those not participating

Indicator Cluster B. Communication technology to support distance education established or improved

Indicators:

- Percent of area in which target population lives within range of radio/television transmitter
- Number of radios/televisions per population in target population areas

- Number/diversity of opportunities for national/local access to communication channels that support distance learning (/Q)
- The level of national/local capacity to develop or adapt programming using communication for distance education (Q)

Discussion: For this program approach, the presence of a political climate conducive to developing distance education broadcast to desired audiences and the presence of in-country technical capability to develop adequate transmission coverage for the target population are assumed.

Program Approach 3.1.5 Community participation in educational policy and school management increased (from USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97)

Indicator Cluster A. Local NGOs and other private sector organizations actively involved in local basic education

Indicators:

- Percent/number of local NGOs working in basic education¹⁴
- Percent/number of schools with increased support for primary education from locally-funded NGOs and other private sector organizations¹⁵
- Percent/number of local NGOs and other private sector organizations working in basic education who have received relevant training (or who demonstrate the use or sharing of relevant training, an indicator that needs to be tailored to the specific situation)

Indicator Cluster B. Parent/community groups (i.e., parent-teacher associations, school committees and school boards) involved in local basic education

Indicators:

- Percent of primary schools with parent/community groups formed
- Percent of parent/community groups meeting regularly/at least X times per year

¹⁴A broad definition of "working in basic education" is meant here, including such programs as provision of school lunches and child care.

¹⁵This support could include assistance to teachers, such as providing them with housing or materials.

- Percent of parent/community groups with clearly defined local basic education decision-making roles
- Mechanism in place for local parent/community groups to communicate to district, regional and national levels of the Ministry of Education (Q)
- Percent of parent/community groups that have received relevant training (or who demonstrate the use or sharing of relevant training, an indicator that needs to be tailored to the specific situation)
- Percent/number of primary schools with increased parental/community support to schools (finance, labor, in-kind)

Indicator Cluster C. Parents involved in local basic education

Indicators:

- Percent of children who have had a parent meet with the child's teacher in past year
- Average number of times a parent has met with their child's teacher in the past year

Discussion: Experience has clearly demonstrated that increased community participation has a strongly positive impact on the schooling of children. Increased participation can be defined in three ways. First, organized NGO and other private sector organizations have been demonstrated to be productive development partners (e.g., South Africa). This is due in part to the broader perspective that these groups bring to the policy environment and dialog. Second, the formation and involvement of parent/community groups has proved especially effective for the improvement of school management. Finally, research in the U.S. and elsewhere has shown that increasing the participation of individual parents (both mothers and fathers) with their child's school and teachers has a tremendous payoff in terms of improved student attendance and increased achievement, as well as increased teacher attendance, motivation and morale. Gathering data on parent participation can be labor-intensive, but this data will probably stand out as an important proxy for qualitative changes in the education system.

Because each of the three groups represented by the three indicator clusters is composed of very different kinds of individuals with different mechanisms for participation and different roles, they are not grouped in the same indicator cluster. The first two groups frequently have a legal status and may consist of elected or appointed delegates with an established term of service. In contrast, parent participation is not through any clearly defined mechanism, nor does it include any formal decision-

making role. By including parents as a separate indicator cluster, we are underscoring the value of their participation.

One difficulty in defining parent/community groups (Indicator Cluster B) is because of the regional differences that exist both in terms of terminology of the names of the groups and the differences in roles that they are assigned. In some regions there is only one group—parent-teacher associations that are composed of elected members. The group has a decision-making role, albeit a limited one. In other regions, the parent-teacher associations consist of all of the parents that have children in a particular school and the group has no official role other than to host social events and general informative meetings. Additionally, in some areas all three parent/community groups mentioned in Indicator Cluster B (parent-teacher associations, school committees and school boards) exist simultaneously and have very different roles and responsibilities. Therefore, to simplify this indicator cluster, all of the various parent-community groups are meant to be included. More importantly, this cluster includes indicators that address both the level of activity of the group and the function of the group's role in decision-making.

Program Approach 3.1.6 Educational opportunities for girls improved (from USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97)

Indicator Cluster A. National strategy and policies for promoting girls' education reviewed, formulated, adopted and implemented

Indicators: (All are qualitative)

- National strategy for girls' education index (rating scale using one point for each criterion): government/private sector task force(s) on girls' education formed; current and previous policies/interventions in country reviewed; meeting with stakeholders held; national strategy formulated; national strategy authorized; committees formed and tasks assigned; information campaign conducted; government resources allocated; implementation of national strategy initiated¹⁶
- Current education and related policies affecting girls reviewed (Q)
- Key constraints for girls identified (Q)
- Comprehensive package of new national girls' education and related policies formulated/adopted/implemented¹⁷ (Q)

¹⁶The qualitative indicators that comprise this index can be separated into individual indicators and some can be reworded as quantitative indicators. For example, "Government resources allocated" can be reworded as "Amount of government resources allocated for girls' education."

¹⁷The indicators of "policies formulated" listed in this section are meant to be exemplary. The particular policies targeted will vary from country to country.

- Pregnancy policies that support girls' continued education formulated (Q)
- Minimum marriage age law written (Q)
- Sexual harassment and abuse policies formulated (Q)
- Number/percent of NGOs working to increase girls' educational participation
- Number/percent of NGOs working in girls' education that have received relevant training (or that demonstrate the use of relevant training, an indicator that needs to be tailored to the specific situation)

Discussion: Many of the indicators under Program Approach 3.1.1, Indicator Cluster A could also be included in this cluster. For example, policies relating to the minimum and maximum age of school entry, compulsory education, and child labor can have a disproportionate effect on girls.

Indicator Cluster B. School-based, education system and policy (supply-side) constraints for girls reduced

Indicators: (All are qualitative)

- Girl "friendly" school index (rating scale for each school surveyed using one point for each criterion): latrines with privacy available (segregated latrines for boys and girls where culturally necessary); school schedule adapted to girls' needs; majority of teachers trained in gender-aware pedagogies; majority of administrators trained in gender-aware pedagogies; availability of female tutors for girls¹⁸
- Primary teacher training curriculum reviewed/revise d/implemented to remove gender bias (Q)
- School curriculum and instructional materials reviewed/revise d/implemented to eliminate gender bias (Q)
- New gender-neutral curriculum disseminated and in use (Q)
- Percent of teachers and administrators trained in use of revised curriculum

¹⁸The qualitative indicators that comprise this index can be separated into individual indicators, or can be reworded as quantitative indicators, such as "percent of teachers trained in gender-aware pedagogies".

Indicator Cluster C. Family and community (demand-side) constraints for girls reduced

Indicators:

- Percent of parents who consider the nearest culturally appropriate primary school (coed or single sex) within a "safe" commuting distance for their daughters
- Economic incentive program implemented (e.g., scholarships, subsidies, school supplies and uniforms) (Q)
- Fee waivers implemented (Q)
- Voucher program (e.g., for school supplies, clothing, shoes) implemented (Q)
- Requirement for uniforms eliminated¹⁹ (Q)
- Flexible schedules that accommodate girls' chores implemented (Q)
- Percent of communities with affordable early child development programs (for girls' younger siblings)
- Percent of the public that considers girls' education valuable to society
- Endorsement of girls' full access to education by religious leaders (Q)
- Percent of schools with village committees to promote girls' education
- Percent of teachers who are female
- Incentive program for female teachers in rural areas implemented (Q)

Program Approach 3.1.7 *Educational* opportunities for underserved populations, rural populations, and other disadvantaged children improved

(suggested new wording) [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Opportunities for underserved populations, rural populations, and other disadvantaged children improved]

Indicator Cluster A. National strategy and policies for promoting the education of underserved populations reviewed, formulated, adopted and implemented

Indicators:

- Underserved populations identified and programs to address their needs prioritized (Q)
- Policies regarding equitable distribution of resources reviewed/drafted/implemented (Q)

¹⁹Where the requirement for uniforms is determined to be a significant barrier to enrollment.

- Percent of identified underserved population receiving education from government or through NGOs (by contract)

Indicator Cluster B. School-based and education system (supply side) constraints for underserved populations reduced

Indicators:

- Inclusive curriculum developed (Q)
- Textbooks and teaching materials translated into local dialects (Q)
- Percent of teachers representing underserved groups
- Percent of teachers redeployed to underserved areas/groups
- Percent of teachers in underserved areas capable of reading/writing curriculum in local dialects

Indicator Cluster C. Family and community (demand-side) constraints for underserved populations reduced

Indicators:

- Average cost of primary education to family per student per year (uniforms, supplies, transportation) (Discussion: need cost of individual items)
- Percent of primary students who live within X-hours' commute to nearest primary school
- Flexible school schedules that accommodate need for child's labor at home implemented (Q)
- Economic incentive program implemented (e.g., scholarships, subsidies, school supplies and uniforms) (Q)
- Fee waivers implemented (Q)
- Voucher program (e.g., for school supplies, clothing, shoes) implemented (Q)
- Requirement for uniforms eliminated²⁰ (Q)

Discussion: Many of the indicators under other approaches also apply to underserved groups, when examined specifically for the underserved group in comparison with other groups in the country, e.g., disadvantaged group as a percent of the total gross access rate, the gross enrollment ratio for first grade.

Program Approach 3.1.8 *Adult literacy and/or early childhood development programs established or improved (suggested new wording)* [From USAID Strategic Framework, 9/97: Cost-effective adult literacy and early childhood development programs as complements to formal school systems improved]

²⁰Where the requirement for uniforms is determined to be a significant barrier to enrollment.

Indicator Cluster A. Integrated literacy programs developed and implemented for adult learners

Indicators:

- National adult literacy policies reviewed/revised/implemented (Q)
- Integrated, relevant adult literacy materials developed/implemented (Q)
- Number of development organizations in other sectors (non-literacy) adopting literacy materials²¹
- Basic literacy and numeracy assessment instrument developed/implemented (Q)
- Percent of those participating in literacy program who complete literacy course
- Participants' scores on literacy and numeracy criterion-referenced test (reading, writing and math scores)
- Frequency with which completers report reading
- Frequency with which completers report writing (other than just signature)
- Frequency with which completers report participating in discussions about what they have read/what they have heard on the radio/politics
- Frequency with which completers attend non-family group/organization meetings
- Percent of completers who check to be sure their children attend school

Discussion: Integrated literacy programs combine learning basic literacy and numeracy with meeting the additional development objective of acquiring information or skills relevant to students' lives, e.g., health, family planning, cooperative development, or income generation.

Indicator Cluster B. Early childhood development programs developed or improved

Indicators:

Assessment of Status

- National status of early childhood care, programs and funding assessed (Q)

²¹The adoption of literacy materials by groups promoting development in other sectors (such as health, family planning, microenterprise) is an effective way of spreading literacy and providing opportunities to make practical use of literacy because these groups are much more numerous than those that only promote literacy. Also, experience has shown that there is generally a willingness among development organizations to include literacy training in their programs.

- Young children most in need of ECD services identified (Q)
- Percent of pre-school children screened for physical disabilities

Policies

- Review/develop/implement policies for early childhood development (Q)
- Review/draft/implement laws and regulations supporting national child care and family policies (Q)

Programs

- Number/percent of local NGOs implementing or supporting early childhood programs for disadvantaged children
- Number/percent of local NGOs implementing or supporting early childhood programs for disadvantaged children that have received relevant training
- Percent of disadvantaged children enrolled in early childhood programs (models include formal pre-schools, non-formal child development centers, home day care, cooperative programs, cross-sectoral programs with, e.g., nutrition or credit to women)
- Number/percent of ECD programs for disadvantaged children in which parents/community are involved in decision-making
- National ECD curriculum for disadvantaged children developed (Q)
- Number/percent of ECD programs for disadvantaged children with pre-service training for caretakers
- Number/percent of ECD programs with objective evaluation criteria and appropriate instruments designed/used to provide ongoing feedback about program effectiveness

Discussion: Health-related ECD indicators include indicators for malnutrition, low birth weight, breastfeeding prevalence and immunization status, which are monitored by the health sector. These health-related indicators may be appropriate proxies for monitoring the effectiveness of ECD programs because of the cross-sectoral nature of ECD outcomes.

Discussion: USAID basic education policy places highest priority on promoting universal primary education. Cost-effective adult literacy and early childhood development (ECD) programs are supported as complements to USAID's efforts to expand primary education. As parents, particularly mothers, learn to read and write in adult literacy programs, they are more likely to ensure that their children go to school. ECD programs can be critical for providing the nutrition and mental stimulation required for children to be ready to enroll in school. In addition, ECD programs can free older siblings from their child care responsibilities so that they can go to school.