



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DG DEVELOPMENT

Development Policy and Sectoral Issues
Human and Social Development

Tools for monitoring progress in the education sector

Version 26.02.2003

Tools for monitoring progress in the education sector

Introduction

Increasing attention is devoted to indicators as monitoring tools in the framework of the new instruments for development aid. The Commission's "Communication on education and training in the context of poverty reduction" of 6 March 2002¹ stressed that in the context of budgetary support and the sector-wide approach, output, outcome and impact indicators should be common to all donors. These indicators should be owned by developing countries in the framework of the Poverty Reduction Strategies. This approach was endorsed by the ensuing Council Resolution on "Education and poverty"² of 30 May 2002. Following up on the Council resolution, a working group comprised of EU Member States education experts was set up with the mandate of jointly defining common indicators in the field of education. The present document is based on the work carried out in this working group.

The present document aims to offer EC delegations clarifications regarding the use of indicators as monitoring tools as well as clear-cut options for the choice of appropriate indicators in the light of specific local conditions.

The proposed indicators are for **multiple purposes**. They can be used in the context of annual reviews, for macro-economic support linked to social sector indicators, for the follow-up of education SWAs and sector plans, for the Fast Track Initiative, etc.

Main principles for education indicators

The Commission and the Member States' approach regarding education indicators is based on the principles below. These principles are relevant for work on indicators in the whole education sector, but the current policy priority is on primary education. This is in line with both the "Education for All" (EFA)³ framework and the education Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁴:

1. One must distinguish between **three different levels of monitoring**: the international level, the national level and the level of donor programmes. The international level focuses on EU donors' international agreements with regards to monitoring progress towards the EFA and MDGs. The national level relates principally to EU donors' involvement in financing national education plans and

¹ COM(2002)116 final

² 8958/02 (Presse 147)

³ Adopted by the international community at the World Education Forum in Dakar on 26-28 April 2000, the EFA framework sets six goals in the field of education, two of which were included in the MDGs.

⁴ The MDGs were adopted by a special UN Summit in September 2000. In the field of education, the MDGs aim to give a full primary education to all boys and girls by 2015 (i.e. universal primary education), and to eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and for all levels of education by 2015 at the latest.

the need to measure progress inside the country's education plan. The level of donor programmes refers to the need to measure progress made within a sector towards the development of a national education plan or towards a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp).

2. At the national level, the Commission and Member States will promote **harmonisation of common education indicators at country level** on the basis of the indicators elaborated by the recipient country.⁵ Common indicators are elaborated at country level inside the policy dialogue between government and donors. The basis of any monitoring system should be to bring support to local data analysis for local decision making and to monitor progress in delivering the goals of the national development framework. Common guidelines on education indicators between the Commission and Member States would decrease transaction costs and facilitate the policy dialogue and monitoring at country level.
3. Indicators for monitoring should focus on **performance** in the education sector, that is principally on *education outcomes*, without neglecting *input* into the education sector, which is particularly important for donors using general budgetary support⁶. There is a need for many donors to dispose of a limited set of measurable indicators at country level on the basis of which commitments can be made. The final analysis and interpretation of the outcomes should be done in the framework of the annual review process.⁷ The context (i.e. number of AIDS orphans, teachers affected by HIV/AIDS, private sector delivery, etc.) should be taken into account in this analysis.
4. The overall framework for common indicators between government and donors at country level should be **flexible** in its nature. Otherwise, indicators agreed at one moment in time risk to become obsolete. However, in order to monitor progress it is important that chosen indicators are likely to evolve on an annual basis⁸.
5. The Commission communication on education and training in the context of poverty reduction stresses that indicators should be few in number, simple,

⁵ In some countries, governments in consultation with donors have established a common core data set of 10-20 sector indicators (cf. Annex 1). These are in some cases used by all budget supporting/sector support agencies to release funds. Some countries are building second generation education indicators sets based on experience with greater focus on outcome measures.

⁶ The current emphasis in the CSP indicative frameworks is on *outcome* indicators in education (in particular access and system efficiency). *Input* is measured only in a few countries. Only three countries include *impact* indicators.

⁷ Education indicators chosen in the indicative framework of CSPs are normally connected to or inspired by national education plans. In some countries, where a strong SWAp exists, outcome indicators are directly taken from indicators agreed inside the SWAp.

⁸ Many education indicators inside the CSP indicative framework, but not all, specify targets in time. The main difficulty is that many of the chosen indicators do not substantially change on an annual basis.

relevant, readily **measurable**⁹ and achievable. It is also important to distinguish between indicators and the objectives they are connected to.¹⁰

6. In line with the Commission policy, education indicators should contribute to focusing on poverty reduction. The purpose of indicators is not only to measure progress and results, but also to express general policy priorities. **Equity** becomes therefore an essential and transversal issue. Education indicators, in particular those measuring access, completion and learning outcomes, need to be disaggregated, wherever possible, by sex and urban/rural¹¹ (i.e. first grade intake rate of rural girls). Another breakdown, when possible¹², should focus on groups with special needs.
7. The prime focus is currently on primary and basic education. However, there are **other areas for indicators** which are not covered by the core indicators focused on basic education. In many countries and for most donors, basic education is not the only sub-sector supported in education. Continued work is thus needed to harmonise donors' demands towards developing countries also in other areas. This could be sub-sectors (e.g. vocational training), horizontal aspects (e.g. skills development), cross cutting issues (e.g. AIDS and education or life skills) or progress towards a SWAp.

Definition of indicators

The refinement of indicators requires a minimum common agreement on the definition of indicators. There are currently different definitions and categorisations of indicators among the various actors in education.¹³ The current move towards closer donor co-ordination and the search for new instruments for sector development have also highlighted the importance of agreeing upon a common categorisation. The proposed "Guidelines for the use of Indicators in country performance assessment" lay the ground for a common categorisation and definitions of indicators among EU Member States.

⁹ Some of the education indicators in the CSP indicative frameworks are very difficult to measure because they are *too vague* (i.e. "enactment of appropriate legislation...", "appropriate curricula", "conditions and availability of basic education infrastructures", "additional teachers", etc.).

¹⁰ Sometimes education indicators included in the CSP indicative frameworks are in fact *objectives* (i.e. "Access to ECD facilities", "ICT equipment to primary schools supplied", "Quality and capacity of VET [vocational training] institutions", etc.) Alternatively, a policy objective is automatically converted into an indicator by putting a percentage sign before it, which makes it too vague to define and measure (i.e. "% of poor primary school children access to adequate school books", "% of population having access to education").

¹¹ Many of the education indicators in CSPs are disaggregated by sex and urban/rural area. This breakdown is principally applied to outcome indicators (although some countries disaggregate output indicators, e.g. the number of equipped schools and trained teachers in rural areas vs. urban areas). However, no country has selected an input indicator allowing to measure equity.

¹² With current data systems not all these breakdowns are possible in all countries.

¹³ What some actors denominate "input" to education is for other actors "outcome" or "process". Some definitions restrict input to financial resource allocations while others includes both the system and the service delivery capacity. The same confusion goes for performance. Some actors might conceive as an outcome what for others is an impact. These differences are also related to the complexity of time in the education sector.

Input indicators

In the proposed EU Guidelines on development indicators, “input” measures the financial, administrative and regulatory resources provided by government and donors to a specific sector. For the education sector, it is relevant to also include a measure of policy resources and progress. These more qualitative indicators (to which the answer is ‘yes’ or ‘no’ inside a timeframe) are frequent in the currently identified CSP education indicators.¹⁴ At international level, there are, apart from the financial input, no indicators to measure progress on administrative, regulatory or policy investments by government.¹⁵ Instead, different approaches have been proposed, such as benchmarking inside a common framework or an assessment against an “indicative framework”.

In this context, most donors highlight the existence of an education sector policy and strategic action plan elaborated by government in close consultation with civil society. This focus is stressed by both EFA plans and the education “Fast Track Initiative” (FTI) (combining a “credible” education policy and a PRSP). There is a consensus among donors of the importance of the existence of a coherent national education policy in ensuring an efficient and sustainable use of resources. Differences occur in qualitative assessment: are the donors to assess what is a “credible” education plan and in that case on the basis of which criteria? Inside the FTI, a specific “indicative framework” has been elaborated to stress some key features common to already successful country policy plans.

Regarding financial resources, the principal measure used by donors focus on the **financial resources channelled to the education sector**. This indicator is particularly important in measuring government investment in education when the Commission has channelled its support through the general budget. In broad terms, three different indicators are used by donors to measure this input: Government spending on education as a percentage of GDP; Government spending on education as a percentage of total public expenditure¹⁶; and Public expenditure on primary education as a percentage of total public expenditure on education. Some members of the EU working group on education indicators also mentioned other indicators, such as the proportion between investments, salaries and other operating costs (partly measured by non-salary recurrent spending as a proportion of recurrent spending for primary education¹⁷). The specific choice of indicators for financial resources differs from one country to another, but there is a general agreement among donors of the importance of measuring financial resources allocated to the education sector as a sign of political commitment.

¹⁴ These input indicators for education measure: reforms, revision of a sector policy, legislation, adoption of an improved national curriculum, implementation or monitoring system put in place, etc.

¹⁵ However, at local level, some indicators can be found or elaborated to measure progress on administrative, regulatory or policy investments by government.

¹⁶ This distinction can be useful for some countries. For instance, Niger dedicates 30.5 % of the national budget to education, but only 2.9 % of its GDP, since the tax base is very weak in the country. The education sector is under-financed in spite of a favourable budget share for the ministry of education. This example also illustrates the importance of approaching indicators in the context of the PRSP.

¹⁷ In some countries, CSP indicators measure expenditure by budget categories (i.e. non-salary expenditure in education budget).

There are two frequently mentioned measures of administrative input: **institutional capacities** and **organisation/structure of the sector**. The strength of institutional and human capacities in the education sector and in the financing system of recipient countries is essential for an efficient use of resources for the benefit of pupils. At the same time, many countries are involved in a process of decentralisation, which could be coherent with an education SWAp, and which moves the decision making process closer to end beneficiaries. The indicators of these measures are in some countries included in the national education plan.

Finally, examples of **regulatory initiatives** taken by a country to support their education policy are, for instance, the adoption of a new law on teaching staff, the abolition of school fees or the abolition of compulsory school uniforms. In particular, the abolition of school fees usually leads to a rapid increase in the demand for education, in particular for poor families. This measure has been stressed as key in ensuring a fast progress towards EFA. It must however be balanced with reinforced resources reaching the schools in order to ensure quality and equity.

Output indicators

Output indicators are an essential part of both the **quantitative** capacity of the education system and the **quality** of the education provided. In fact, increasing emphasis is placed on the quality of education at country, regional and international level. The capacity of the education system is directly linked to the quality of the education provided. Typical examples of output indicators focusing on an increased system capacity for education are the number of teachers trained or the number of schools constructed. More directly quality-related indicators measure for instance curriculum development or teacher salary as a percentage of GDP per capita. This latter indicator measures budgetary sustainability of the education system as well as motivation and social sustainability of teaching staff. Another quality-related indicator is the level of recruitment of primary education teachers (e.g. the proportion of teachers having completed a secondary school education). Standardised tests of knowledge and level of teachers' qualifications are being developed at country or regional level, which open new perspectives in improving measurement of quality.

Output indicators measure the building stones that go into the education system, as a result of the inputs. This includes infrastructure, human resources, pedagogic material or implementation of education reforms. Most output indicators in the current CSP indicative frameworks focus on **infrastructure**, such as construction or rehabilitation of schools, construction of teaching centres, etc. The main indicator chosen to measure progress is in this case pupil-classroom ratio. Other frequently chosen output indicators in the indicative frameworks focus on **human resources**. This output is measured by indicators such as pupil-teacher ratio, retention and distribution of skilled teachers, number of teachers having a formal training in initial education or homologation of teacher diplomas for a specific region (i.e. Latin America). Output in the form of **pedagogic materials** supplied to the schools is measured by different indicators: textbook ratio or book/pupil ratio, learning material developed, available ICT equipment, libraries, laboratories, etc. Finally, output of **implementation of policy reforms** are, for instance, measured, by curriculum development in primary schools or in teacher training establishments, decentralisation and capacity building, number of schools inspected, etc.

Outcome indicators

The Commission communication and Council resolution on education and poverty reduction state that the focus of monitoring should be on outcomes and results. There is a broad consensus among EU donors that the following aspects are important for the monitoring of the outcomes in education: **access** to education, **efficiency** of the education system, and **learning outcomes**. This can be complemented by the more transversal dimensions of **equity** and **quality**, as mentioned above.

International attention has focused on access and system efficiency, but there is a clear move towards devoting greater attention to equity, quality and learning outcomes as progress towards EFA proceeds in many countries. At country level, all these five aspects should be measurable in the national monitoring.

Access to education

This has been the prime focus in the monitoring of progress towards EFA and the MDGs. **Net enrolment rate** (NER)¹⁸ is used as the core indicator in the EFA context. Another widely used indicator for access is the **gross enrolment rate** (GER)¹⁹. These two indicators are often used in parallel to complement each other. In the current CSP indicative frameworks, primary NER is the most frequently used indicator to measure access. However, some countries have chosen primary GER. Some education experts and donors criticise the use of NER to measure access as it doesn't take into account children who enter late at school. They instead stress the use of GER, possibly combined with the **first grade net intake rate**²⁰. To sum up, the preferred approach is to combine two indicators, either NER and GER or GER and net intake. The use of NER alone should be avoided.

Education system efficiency

The efficiency of the education system, and in particular of the school system, is important but difficult to measure. In the context of the move towards increasing emphasis on learning outcomes, it is important to conceive efficiency indicators principally as proxies for real learning outcomes. The prime indicator for system efficiency in this sense is **primary completion rate**²¹. It helps us understand how the resources put into the education sector have been transformed into results from the childrens' point of view. Other relevant indicators for measuring system efficiency are

¹⁸ Net enrolment rate (NER) is defined by UNESCO as: "The number of pupils in the official age group for a given level of education enrolled in that level expressed as a percentage of the total population of that group".

¹⁹ Gross enrolment rate (GER) is defined by UNESCO as: "The number of pupils enrolled in a given level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the population in the relevant official age group. Note that GER can be higher than 100% as a result of grade repetition and entry at younger and older ages than the typical grade-level age".

²⁰ The first grade net intake rate, as defined by UNESCO, corresponds to: "New entrants in the first grade of primary education who are of the official primary school-entrance age, expressed as a percentage of the population of the same age".

²¹ The primary completion rate is defined by the World Bank as: "The total number of students successfully completing (or graduating from) the last year of primary school in a given year, divided by the total number of children of official graduation age in the population".

the drop out rate, the survival rate and the transition rate (from primary to secondary education).²²

Learning outcomes

In some countries it is possible to measure learning outcomes thanks to the existence of national certification systems and standardised examinations.²³ Work at regional level is proceeding, but no comparisons are yet possible. Currently, learning outcomes are also measured by focusing on youth literacy rates (or adult literacy rates). However, data systems still need to be further developed in many countries. In addition, literacy rates change mainly on the medium and long term, not showing direct results from increased input into the education sector. Therefore, **for the time being, measures of the efficiency of the school system serve as proxy for learning outcomes.**

Impact indicators

Impact implies more than a learning outcome. It suggests, at individual level, the ability to utilise knowledge and skills. At country level, it refers to the impact of investments in education. Examples are technical skills for employment, youth employment rates, female literacy for empowerment, literacy for livelihoods, etc. A provisional proxy indicator suggested for the relation between training and employment was the ratio between, on the one hand gross admission rate in vocational training and tertiary education, and on the other hand the percentage of the active population employed in the industrial or tertiary sector.

In the CSP intervention framework, very few indicators measure education impact. Sometimes the indicator “adult literacy” is mentioned. Another example is the percentage of graduates from education and training system finding sustainable employment or self-employment.

For questions, clarifications and comments, please contact the Education Team in Unit DEV.B.3 ‘Human and social development’:

Johan STIERNA – 65.004 – johan.stierna@cec.eu.int

Anton JENSEN – 58.179 – anton.jensen@cec.eu.int

Denis BARESCH – 68.848 – denis.baresch@cec.eu.int

Marja KARJALAINEN – 96.380 – marja.karjalainen@cec.eu.int

²² These indicators are selected in some of the CSPs indicative frameworks. However, many countries do not have any indicators at all to measure system efficiency.

²³ I.e. MLA, PASEC, SACMEQ

Overview of indicators to monitor progress in the education sector

INPUT indicators:

- Government spending on education as a percentage of total public expenditure
- Public expenditure on primary education as a percentage of total public expenditure on education

OUTPUT indicators:

- Pupil-teacher ratio
- Pupil textbook ratio
- Average primary teacher salary as a percentage of GDP per capita
- Non-salary recurrent spending as a proportion of recurrent spending for primary education
- Primary teachers with equivalent secondary education degree as a % of total teacher population

OUTCOME indicators:

Dissagregate by sex and geographical zone, whenever possible

- Gross enrolment rate
- Net enrolment rate
- Completion rate (grade 6)
- Average repetition rate
- Average drop out rate

IMPACT indicators

- Youth literacy rate (15-24 years old)

Annex 1: Examples of core education indicators at country level²⁴

These are two examples of scenarios, where different indicators are used. In the case of Uganda, the indicators are the ones agreed upon inside of a SWAp; in the case of Burkina Faso, the indicators respond to monitoring inside a macro-economic support given by the Commission.

Uganda

1. Public expenditure for education
2. Part of public expenditure for education that goes to primary education
3. Pupil-teacher ratio
4. Pupil-classroom ratio
5. ASER in grade 7
6. Public expenditure management
7. Teacher recruitment
8. Equitable access
9. Monitoring and evaluation process through the national monitoring system (EMIS)

Burkina Faso

1. Level of execution of social sector budgets
2. Share of national budget to decentralised bodies
3. Opinion poll
4. Price gap resulting
5. Gross enrolment ratio
6. ASER in the first year of primary education
7. Adult literacy rates
8. Gross enrolment ratio by gender, rural areas and in the 20 poorest countries
9. Average per pupil unit cost in primary education

²⁴ Source: Development Researchers Network and FTP International: "Evaluation of EC support to the education sector in ACP countries", May 2002

Annex 2: Examples of education sector indicators in CSPs/intervention frameworks

Category 1: CSPs with education as focal or non focal sector

Country	Financing programmed	Input indicators	Ouput indicators	Outcome indicators
Angola	Education non focal sector (30 million euro)		Pupil/classroom ratio at first level	Gross primary enrolment classes 1-6
			Pupil/teacher ratio at first level	School success rate (first level)
			Trained basic level teachers	
Botswana	Education focal sector (31.2 million euro)		Number of schools inspected within the new inspectorate framework	% of graduates from education and training system finding sustainable employment or self-employment
				Non-attendance rate
				Drop out rate
				Repetition rate
Comoros	Education focal sector (16 million euro)		Number of teachers with certificate	Enrolment rate
				Ratio of success in exams
				Ration of girls finalising their studies
Dominican republic	Education focal sector (54 million euro)		Modernisation of curriculum in teacher training establishments	% of population having access to education
				% of successful national exams
				Transition rate to secondary schools
				Drop out rate
				Pre school coverage (4 and 5 years old) in defavoured regions
Fiji	Education focal sector (17, 3 million euro)		Number of rehabilitated and well equipped schools in rural areas	Drop out rate
				Performance by all final examinees
				Rate of unemployment decreases in particular in rural areas <i>impact</i>
				Urban drift reduced <i>impact</i>
				Emigration of trained persons decreases <i>impact</i>
Haiti	Education focal sector (54 million euro) + 28 million euro reliquat from 8 th EDF		Elaboration and update of school mapping on central and district level	Net enrolment rate (disaggregated by rural area)
				Reduction of difference between gross and net enrolment rates
				Ratio of success of exams in 6 th and 9 th class
				Ratio of admission in secondary school from primary
				1 grade admission ratio of girls in secondary education
				Drop out rate
Repetition rate				

Namibia	Education focal sector (15 million euro)	Put teacher demand-supply system in place Finalise human resource development plan and the implementation of SWAp Decentralisation progress as planned	Management information system in place	Primary net enrolment
			Life Long Learning opportunities	Survival rate to 7 grade
				Access to secondary school
				Skills level of 6 years old
				Minimise the HIV/AIDS spread
				Literacy rate
				Increased output of competent personnel for employment from higher education and vocational training
				% of learners in all education institutions receive formal education on reproductive health, sexuality and HIV/AIDS
Papua New Guinea	Education focal sector (35 million euro)		Every primary and elementary school in PNG inspected during 2004 and thereafter	Enrolment in vocational training (break down by sex, age, region and employment)
				Number of qualified workforce
				Numbers graduating from general education, vocational and in-service training (break down by sex)
				Enrolment rate in vocational training
				Enrolment rate in primary education
South Africa	Education focal sector (appr. 100 million euro)	None	None	Number of females at all levels
				Increase in internal examination pass rates
St Kitts and Nevis	Education focal sector (2,9 million euro)		Curriculum provided for computer lab and training	Pool of adults and women skilled in IT related fields
			Hardware and software provided	
			Provision of essential training for tutors	
St Vincent	Education focal sector (4.5 million euro)		Secondary schools physical and operational environment greatly improved	Enrolment rate
			Design life of school building extended	Drop out rate at secondary school level
			100 % trained professional secondary teaching force	% of successful exam (GCE and CXC) (disaggregated by rural areas)
				Increased number persons with secondary and tertiary education in the labour force
Swaziland	Education focal sector (20 million euro)	% of non salary expenditure in education budget	Adoption of an improved national curriculum by 2004	Access to ECD facilities
		Enactment of appropriate legislation or amendments to statutory instruments	Pupil/teacher ratio	Net enrolment rate basic education
		Modern system of inspection	Construction of teacher centers and supply of ICT equipment	Survival rate at primary school
		Revised policy for assessment and testing adopted	ICT equipment and training to primary schools supplied	Repetition rate at primary school
		Regulatory and educational pre-school reforms adopted and implemented		Drop out rates
		Barriers to access (gender, HIV/AIDS, social, geographical) reduced		Quality and capacity of VET institutions

Trinidad & Tobago	Tertiary education focal sector (16, 6 million euro)			Enrolment in tertiary education
Tuvalu	Education focal sector (3 million euro)	Annual rate of national investments in education Tender procedures for constructions of living quarters for teachers	Improve education facilities for primary school teachers	
			Number of living quarters completed	
			Lower student teacher ratio	
			Improve school maintenance at both primary and secondary schools	
			Supply books, furniture, photocopying machines and computers	
Number of community based projects developed by NGOs				
Vanuatu	Education focal sector (10 million euro)			Number of qualified workforce
				Number of graduates from general education, vocational and in-service training
				Transition rate primary to secondary school
				Drop out rate secondary school
				Ratio girls to boys in junior secondary school
% increase in graduates from tourism school				
Zimbabwe	Basic education focal sector (40 million euro)		Number of primary schools repaired, rehabilitated and constructed in districts with low human development indicators	% of children in disadvantaged geographical areas attending primary school (disaggregated by sexes)
			Schools/textbook ratio in districts with low human development indicators	% of poor primary school children access to adequate school books
			Curriculum development and learning materials developed inside EC project	
			Primary school teacher training system by EC project	
Zambia	Education non focal sector (10 million euro) Macroeconomic support (specific attention to poverty reduction including equitable access to social services) (90,0 millions euro)		Conditions and availability of basic education infrastructures	Existing BESSIP indicators
			Retention and distribution of skilled teachers	
			Appropriate curricula	
			Appropriate teaching materials	
Decentralisation and capacity building				
Tanzania	Education focal sector (43.5 million euro) (same as PRSP indicators)	All schools inspected every 2 yrs	Additional teachers	% of girls to boys in basic and secondary education
	Macroeconomic support (98.6 million euro) Basic education one of seven priorities in PRSP and GoT will allocate significant funds to priority sectors in its PRSP	All school accounts audited annually	Additional classrooms Book/pupil ratio	Transition rate from primary to secondary education Drop out rate (annual) Net primary enrolment rate Secondary enrolment rate Number of students passing 7 exam % of out of school youth in non formal education Adult literacy "Improvement in key social indicators"

**Category 2: CSPs with macroeconomic support linked to social sectors,
specifying education indicators**

Country	Financing programmed	Input indicators	Output indicators	Outcome indicators
Burkina Faso	Macroeconomic support partly linked to poverty reduction strategy and progress in social sectors (150 million euro)	% of national budget to basic education	Pupil/teacher ratio	Net enrolment rate by sex and regions
	Institutional capacity building in social sectors (25 million euro)	Budgetary execution rate in basic education sector	Pupil/textbook ratio	Completion rate by sex and regions
% of education budget at regional level		Equality in school fees		
Burundi	Macroeconomic support, in particular in the social sectors, education and health (31,5 million euro)	Social budgets/total budget		“Indicateurs sociaux (santé et education...)”
		Political document on education		“Scolarisation, nombre de maitres, écoles...”
Côte d’Ivoire	Macroeconomic support targeted to health and education (85 million euro)			Access to education, in particular in rural areas
Djibouti	Macroeconomic support linked to equitable access to social services (12,8 million euro)			Net enrolment rate in primary education (dissaggregated by gender)
				Drop out rate in primary education (dissaggregated by gender)
		Transition rate from primary to secondary (dissaggregated by gender)		
Etiopia	Macroeconomic support (not targeted but linked to PRSP and using EC expertise in social sectors to measure impact of budgetary aid on social sectors) (96 million euro)	% of national budget to allocated to education		Gross enrolment rates in primary education Ratio of girls to boys in primary education
Jamaica	Macroeconomic support to avoid debt and fiscal policy reinforcement (30 million euro)	Total government expenditure on education		Primary school enrolment
		Expenditure on education as a percentage of the overall budget expenditure		Number of grade 11 students passing English and Mathematics exam University enrolment
Lesotho	Macroeconomic support with special attention to poverty reduction and equitable access to social services (45 million euro)	GoL annual recurrent budgetary allocations for education maintained at a minimum of 25 %		Net overall completion of 7 primary school
Niger	Macroeconomic support with special attention to poverty reduction to ensure equitable access to social services (education and health) (95 million euro)	Generalisation of findings in pilot schools		Gross enrolment rate (dissaggregated by sexes)
		Adoption of the new law on teachers		% that succeed exams (dissaggregated by sexes) Repetition rate
Madagascar	Macroeconomic support not targeted (targeted during 8 th EDF) and related only through result indicators (those in the PRSP)			Number of pupils in primary schools
				Number of new entrance in school
				Enrolment rate in primary (public and private)
				Repetition rate in class 11 in school
				Drop out rate in class 7
Uganda	Macroeconomic support (93.5 million euro)		Pupil/teacher ratio	Net enrolment (dissaggregated by sex and regions)
			Pupil/textbook ratio	Transition rate from primary to post primary institutions
			Pup[il/classroom ratio	% of girls to boys in 7 grade

Mali	Macroeconomic support not targeted but goals in poverty reduction, in particular equitable access to social services (100 million euro)	Part of recurrent budget allocated to education sector	Pupil/teacher ratio in primary education	First grade intake rate in primary education
		Part of basic education in recurrent budget of education	Pupil/textbook ratio	Gross enrolment rate in primary (disaggregated by sex and region)
		Budget execution rate in education sector		Drop out rates (disaggregated by sex and region)
				Literacy rate
Rwanda	Macroeconomic support (50 million euro)	Rate of budget execution in education sector 2002, 2005 and 2010	None	Net enrolment rate
		Rate of budget execution in primary, secondary and higher education in 2002, 2005 and 2010		Drop out rate
				Repetition rate
				Transition rate from primary to secondary
Sierra Leone	Macroeconomic support to support PRSP, main objective basic social services in education and health to poor (50 million euro)	State budget allocated to social sectors		Enrolment rate in rural areas
		Resources effectively allocated and disbursed for social sector expenditure		
Senegal	Macroeconomic support with explicit link to poverty reduction, in particular sector programmes in health and education (53 million euro)	Part of national budget to education (in 1999 it was 33 %)		Net enrolment in primary (taux de scolarisation)
				Gross enrolment (taux d'accès) (disaggregate by sex and rural)
				1 grade intake rate (taux d'inscription)
				Literacy rate (disaggregated by sex)

Category 3: CSPs with macroeconomic support but not specifying education indicators

Country	Financing programmed	Input indicators	Output indicators	Outcome indicators
Guinea	Macroeconomic support (special attention to poverty reduction, in particular to ensure equitable access to social services) (47 million euro)	None	None	None
Guyana	Macroeconomic support with a PRSP focused on social services and social infrastructure. Education has the highest priority in PRSP but by many other donors. (14,9 million euro) + (48 % of the HIPC funds will go to social sectors)	None	None	None
Kenya	Macroeconomic support . Special attention to poverty reduction in particular equitable access to social services (51 million euro)	None	None	None
Malawi	Macroeconomic support specially focused on the social sectors (education and health) (70 million euro)	None	None	

Category 4: Other situations

Central African republic	Macroeconomic support with no mention of social sectors (20 million euro)	Budgetary allocations to education		
Somalia	No education sector support, nor macroeconomic support			School enrolment
				Quantitative and qualitative progress in sector/project evaluations

