**Module 1: Planning and budgeting**

*The purpose of the* ***planning and budgeting core function*** *is to develop strong and responsive subsector plans – across all levels of government – for equitable provision of quality pre-primary education, making efficient use of available financial, human and physical resources.*

**Module 1** outlines four key goals and associated measures that can lead to progress in strengthening this core function of the pre-primary subsector:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Goal 1: Develop an evidence-based and equitable plan for the delivery of quality pre-primary services**. *A national and/or accompanying subnational plan is evidence-based, strategic and feasible, identifying ways to effectively mobilize existing human, physical and financial resources to reach desired targets and ensure equitable allocation of resources and provision of services*.**Goal 2: Identify budget needs and financing mechanisms**. *Subsector plans need to be costed well to support advocacy for public resources and to ensure that budget allocations are based on actual costs. Financing modalities need to account for such factors as family income patterns, parents’ employment status, needs of children with disabilities and ethnic/language backgrounds. A well-costed plan serves as a strong advocacy tool for further investment by external partners and donors*.**Goal 3: Establish clear governance and accountability structures for implementation of the plan.** *There are strategies in place to improve and/or establish good governance practices and management across the pre-primary system that can enable effective plan implementation. Central and local authorities have a shared understanding of the subsector’s aims and their accountability in terms of implementing the pre-primary education plan*.**Goal 4: Monitor plan implementation and identify necessary course correction.** *A strong monitoring and evaluation framework in the context of a subsector plan enables course corrections during implementation and allows for making modifications in governance and roles, as needed*. |

The 14 measures listed below reflect progress against these goals. To evaluate whether each measure is being addressed, consider the associated questions. **In cases where not all of the questions are important or relevant in your context, you might decide to focus on only some of them**.

The questions in Module 1 assume that policy options for pre-primary education have already been discussed and, at least to some extent, have been agreed upon.[[1]](#footnote-1) This type of consensus would cover, for example, the pre-primary programme’s duration (e.g., one year of universal pre-primary education or a combination of approaches) and hours of operation (e.g., full or half days). The intention is to offer questions that will help users evaluate and reflect on the plan for pre-primary services and the governance needed to make this plan effective.

Note that questions highlighted in green cover play-based learning aspects, while questions highlighted in turquoise cover equity and inclusion considerations. Content highlighted in yellow is specific to humanitarian considerations. Where there is an overlap between equity and humanitarian considerations, humanitarian information is color-coded turquoise and referred to as an equity consideration.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Goal 1: Develop an evidence-based plan for the delivery of high-quality pre-primary services***A national and/or accompanying subnational plan is evidence-based, strategic and feasible, identifying ways to effectively mobilize existing human, physical and financial resources to reach desired targets and ensure equitable allocation of resources and provision of services*. |

**Measure 1 – The plan is based on data and evidence. Data are used to determine the conditions and scope of current service availability and gaps in access.**

*A comprehensive plan is based on solid national evidence and assessment of the availability of current services, the various service providers that can be leveraged, the effectiveness of existing services in terms of results for children, and the data available in terms of access and quality.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Is an evidence-based, data-driven national pre-primary plan (stand-alone plan or as part of a sector-wide education plan) in place? And is this plan appropriately endorsed and signed by the key sector stakeholders and partners?

**Q2** Does the pre-primary education plan stand alone? Or is it part of an overarching education sector plan, if one has been established in the country?

**Q3** Is the plan informed by data and evidence on access and equity? Consider the following elements for analysis:

1. Service availability and gaps across the country, including:

- gross enrolment rate for pre-primary education;

- net enrolment rate for pre-primary education;

- % of children who have access to publicly funded or subsidized pre-primary education;

- % of children who have access to pre-primary education in private schools; and

- % of children who attend pre-primary services regularly.

1. Demand for services, including the percentage of non-enrolled children whose families express a desire to send their children to preschool.
2. Patterns of access to services from an equity perspective, such as:

- disparities related to poverty, the urban-rural divide and vulnerable populations (e.g., do families pay in cash or in kind to access pre-primary services?);

- % of children attending a pre-primary programme by household wealth;

- availability of pre-primary schools or programmes in poor, remote, rural and otherwise disadvantaged locations.

- availability of pre-primary schools or programmes in the context of emergency settings and for refugees, populations on the move or internally displaced persons;

- availability of pre-primary schools or programmes that conform or align with universal design of learning principles to ensure that the diverse needs of children are met.

1. Availability of programmes in terms of features that are likely to meet families need, e.g., half day or full day, school year or full-year, etc.
2. Distances from home to pre-primary service locations that facilitate children’s regular attendance at pre-primary schools or other programmes.

**Q4** Is the plan informed by evidence and data on quality? This includes:

1. *analysis of structural quality* – the aspects of structural quality are often determined by policies and regulation; they include, for example:

- health, hygiene and safety;

- infrastructure, learning and play materials;

- programme duration and hours of operation;

- working conditions, e.g., number of children to number of teachers and maximum size of classroom groups;

- accessibility of infrastructure and facilities for children with disabilities;

- requirements for teachers’ formal education and continuing professional development; and

- financial resource management.

1. *analysis of process quality* – this is assessed with measures of children’s everyday experiences, e.g., social, emotional, physical and instructional aspects (e.g., play-based pedagogy and learning) as well as gender responsiveness of interactions between children, teachers and their peers, and staff-family relationships.
2. *analysis of quality differences across provider types, location, and in emergency settings – examine to what extent* quality standards and their application –both structural and process- are the same across settings and providers within a national context.

**Q5** Is the plan informed by evidence of effectiveness and efficiency in the country’s current pre-primary systems, including analysis of the effect of pre-primary education on children’s learning and development as well as on children’s transition to primary school, repetition rates in lower grades, early dropout and learning outcomes?[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Measure 2 – The plan is sound, realistic and achievable.**

*The plan is developed within a realistic sense of current system capacities and the current availability of services and resources. It builds on existing provision of pre-primary services (government, private and civil society). It directs future investments towards achieving high-quality teaching and learning practices, rather than simply creating more ‘slots’ for pre-primary services. It sets realistic targets and timelines, and identifies practical, achievable ways to strengthen existing financial, human and physical resources.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Does the plan make effective use of the different types of pre-primary provision in your country to maximize resources for and equitable coverage of pre-primary services? For example, how is private provision or provision by civil society, faith-based institutions or providers in refugee camp settings or responders to humanitarian emergencies leveraged or used to the greatest advantage?

**Q2** Are there realistic short- and long-term targets and timelines for service provision and/or expansion of services, taking into account the current state of service availability, access gaps, and the system’s capacity to deliver or manage provision?

**Q3** Are there clear strategies and funding allocations towards the goal of achieving high-quality, play-based teaching and learning practices, including pedagogy, curriculum and learning environment? Are existing strategies and allocations harmonized with strategies and allocations in humanitarian responses, and/or are strategies and budgets “crisis- sensitive” in order to transition to pre-primary needs in crisis responses?

**Q4**  If there are gaps or inequities in financial, human and physical resources, are there feasible, practical avenues available to address the gaps – for example, additional public resources that can be leveraged, community contributions and resources, development partner funds, funds from humanitarian proposals, plans or mechanisms and/or funding from private foundations?

**Q5** Are costed annual operational and implementation plans established to support the implementation of the plan’s strategies and activities?

**Q6** Does the plan consider and/or leverage activities that may be available from other sectors, such as health, protection, nutrition, humanitarian and other subsectors?

**Measure 3 – The plan is efficient and equitable.**

*In this context, ‘efficiency’ refers to the ability to produce desired results with the most effective use of available resources. An efficient and equitable plan is likely to produce the desired outcomes for children, including marginalized and at-risk groups. The plan reflects equitable distribution of resources related to pre-primary access, programme quality and children’s developmental outcomes. Priority needs are identified according to the principles of fairness, inclusiveness and equity. There is evidence that strategies reflect efficient deployment of resources by all partners, maximizing the impact of these resources to produce positive outcomes.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Does the plan identify disadvantaged, marginalized or vulnerable groups and families by types, location and condition, and address their needs (e.g. households from the poorest wealth quintile, persons with disabilities, single headed households, refugees, internally displaced persons, ethnic or linguistic minorities)?[[3]](#footnote-3) Are some groups not included?

**Q2** Does the plan aim for free provision of services for all pre-primary learners? How does the plan ensure equity for families that are unable to contribute towards the costs of pre-primary services?

**Q3** Does the plan account for potential differences (in learning outcomes and quality of pre-primary programmes) between regions or districts by directing more resources where they are needed most based on equity considerations? Are humanitarian or refugee needs part of equity-based targeting by the national government, or are there parallel structures and actors only for supporting pre-primary education in humanitarian and/or refugee settings in the country?

**Q4** Does the plan cover the needs for physical resources that reflect quality features, for example:

- pre-primary infrastructure, such as school buildings, learning centres, and water, sanitation and hygiene facilities that are appropriate for young children’s characteristics and needs, including children with disabilities and pre-positioning infrastructure that may be needed in emergencies or for refugee settings (i.e. temporary learning spaces for young children);

- classroom equipment (tables, chairs, rugs, etc.) suitable for pre-primary play-based learning environments including equipment needed for children with disabilities (i.e. assistive devices, ramps, etc.) and pre-positioning equipment needed in emergencies or for refugee settings (i.e. rugs and mats for temporary learning spaces);

- curriculum and teaching and learning materials, such as games, toys, books, art supplies, manipulatives and teachers’ guides to support pre-primary children’s play-based learning and development (including children with disabilities and pre-positioning curriculum and teaching and learning materials, such as kits, play materials, psychosocial support curriculum, and caregiver well-being curriculum needed in emergencies or for refugee settings);

- training materials (toolkits, videos, etc.) that promote effective teaching practices for the pre-primary age group (including training materials on play-based pedagogy), including inclusive pre-primary education and training materials to support pre-primary service providers in emergency and refugee settings;

- quality assurance tools and infrastructure, such as service quality assessment manuals and information management systems, including how to harmonize tools and systems used in emergency settings by national government and humanitarian actors in emergencies if not part of an integrated system or in contexts where there are multiple providers and quality assurance mechanisms.

**Q5** Does the plan address efficient deployment and use of existing resources, such as infrastructure, personnel and teaching-learning materials?

**Q6** Does the plan take into account and respond to national data on frequency of children’s absence or dropout from pre-primary programmes, including in emergency and refugee settings?

**Q7** Does the plan address issues of compliance with regulated teaching loads, school hours and number of school days? Are these consistent with recommended pre-primary practices? Are compliance issues in emergency or refugee settings specified and addressed? If different from national compliance issues, how do issues in emergency or refugee settings compare and contrast?

**Measure 4 – Strategic priorities outlined in the plan are unified, clearly connected to one another and meet overall policy goals.**

*Broader policy goals are translated into strategic interventions to strengthen capacities at all levels and efficiently allocate financial, human and physical resources. The plan includes a well-organized, unified set of strategies across various elements of the subsector, with strong and coherent links between the planned activities and expected impact.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Is the pre-primary subsector plan well-positioned to be integrated into the education sector plan or other national or sub-national multi-sectoral development or humanitarian plans, including elements of evidence generation, mapping and costing, etc.? (Not all countries have education sector plans – and some countries have an education sector plan, but the timing of its development does not align with the pre-primary plan’s development. As with all questions in this tool, users are invited to identify whether specific questions are an appropriate priority in their country context.)

**Q2** Does the pre-primary plan development process align with the timeline of the overall education sector plan development? Is articulating a pre-primary plan as part of humanitarian education or multi-sectoral efforts a priority and does it align with the timeline of the sector- or multi-sectoral national government and/or humanitarian actors’ efforts?

**Q3** Does the plan include unified, well-connected strategies based on identified challenges across various elements of the subsector (for example, connections between curriculum implementation and teacher quality improvement) and across education subsectors (for example, transition issues from pre-primary to primary)?

**Q4** Are there logical, explicit links between the planned activities and their expected outcomes?

**Q5** Does the plan address issues of capacity-strengthening at all levels, e.g., building the knowledge and commitment of local education officials as well as national authorities for adequate planning and efficient utilization of resources?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Goal 2: Identify budget needs and financing mechanisms***Subsector plans need to be costed well to support advocacy for public resources and to ensure that budget allocations are based on actual costs. Financing modalities need to account for such factors as family income patterns, parents’ employment status, needs of children with disabilities and ethnic/language backgrounds. A well-costed plan serves as a strong advocacy tool for further investment by external partners and donors.* |

**Measure 5 – The plan is comprehensively costed and based on data-driven projections and estimates that cover enrolment (as well as retention and transition, where appropriate) and quality inputs as well as human and physical resources*.***

*Activities are clearly defined and costed for all planned programmes and activities in the subsector, and cover teachers, curriculum, family engagement, quality and regulation, employment status, needs for the most marginalized children[[4]](#footnote-4) (including children with disabilities) and ethnic/language backgrounds. The well-costed plan serves as a strong advocacy tool for further investment by external partners and donors.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Is the plan based on realistic and actual simulations and projections as well as equity considerations, including a costing/financial framework with multi-year forecasting of expenditures?[[5]](#footnote-5) Does the plan address the needs of vulnerable or underserved populations[[6]](#footnote-6), such as children on the move (i.e. refugees, IDPs, and other migrant populations), children from ethnic and linguistic minorities and children with disabilities?

**Q2** Does the budget consider resources that may be available from other actors (e.g. humanitarian actors) or sectors, such as child protection, health, nutrition and other subsectors, for example, teacher training costs may be linked to tertiary education budgets?

**Q3** Does the budget link planned targets and activities to actual costs at the national, regional and/or local levels based on equitable funding formulas? For example, are budget allocations for recruitment, training, support and deployment for teachers based on actual costs, and do the allocations take into account disparities or gaps in resources?

**Q4** Does the budget include costs related to core functions, such as workforce recruitment and development, curriculum implementation, family engagement and quality assurance?

**Q5** Is the budget implementation consistent with allocated expenditures? For example, does the subsector receive the full budgeted amount annually? If not, what has been the trend over the past three years?

**Q6** Is the budget crisis-sensitive, meaning, may allocations be transitioned to crisis-related pre-primary needs in emergencies and does it include allocations for preparedness infrastructure, curriculum, human resource capacity, and teaching and learning materials (see Measure 3)?

**Measure 6 – Resource needs, gaps and funding strategies have been identified and are monitored.**

*Possible budget gaps are articulated, and there is a strategy for identifying additional sources of funding for activities if a shortfall is identified. The plan outlines monitoring mechanisms to identify actual levels of funding and to assess their effects on access, quality and demand.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Does the plan identify budget gaps within the simulation model/costing framework? Do budget gaps include pre-positioning required for pre-primary provision in emergencies?

**Q2** Does the plan include strategies for resource mobilization and prioritization of the pre-primary budget within the education budget to address funding gaps – identifying, for example, additional sources of funds and efficiency savings? Are such strategies realistic and attainable?

**Q3** What kind of monitoring mechanisms are outlined in the plan to track the levels of funding and assess their effect on access, quality, effectiveness and equity?

**Q4** Are there strategies to use the costed plan to advocate to potential donors and others about investment needs and priorities (including prioritization of pre-primary budget within education budget and needs to transition plans in crisis and emergencies)?

**Measure 7 –The financial framework of the plan is realistic. Financing formulas reflect the greater investments that are needed to reach the communities where children are the most vulnerable.**

*Thoughtful examination of existing financial resources and practices – domestic and international – helps determine the potential sources and optimum financing structures to ensure the equitable and efficient allocation of available resources. Resource allocations to the subnational and local levels are adequate in relation to their role in implementing the planned interventions.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Does the financial framework identify existing financial resource expenditure practices, both domestic and international? Where are there gaps?

**Q2** Does the financial framework ensure equitable and efficient allocation of available resources, in light of populations and areas of greatest need and potential impact? Where are there possible inequities or inefficiencies?

**Q3** Does the financial framework ensure allocations to subnational levels, based on mandate, coverage and scope?

**Q4** Does the financial framework take into account the rate of inflation in allocating resources to activities?

**Q5** Does the financial framework take into account modifying and/or transitioning allocations based on needs in emergencies?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Goal 3: Establish clear governance and accountability structures and strategies for implementation of the plan***There are strategies in place to improve and/or establish good governance practices and management across the pre-primary system that can enable effective plan implementation. Central and local authorities have a shared understanding of the subsector’s aims and their accountability in terms of implementing the pre-primary education plan*. |

**Measure 8 – Responsibilities and accountability for implementation and financing are clearly defined and coordinated through mutually consistent communication.**

*Implementing institutions and individuals across the subsector – at all levels – know precisely what they are expected to do and feel a sense of ownership and accountability in their role in fulfilling the goals of the pre-primary action plan. Policy directives that specify authority, accountability, funding and roles for management of the subsector can be especially helpful.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Are there clear lines of authority across all levels (from national to regional to local) as well as identified roles and responsibilities towards implementation of the plan? Are there gaps or ambiguity in identification of some responsibilities? Are these articulated for emergency responses, and are they the same or different when transitioning to an emergency response and/or for refugee settings?

**Q2** Are there clear policy directives specifying the timelines and roles/responsibilities for pre-primary services provision? If there are national policy directives, are these translated into local level policies or directives or supplemented by local-level guidance or operational guidelines? Do policy directives include pre-primary provision in emergencies and/or refugee settings or other marginalized groups (e.g. ethnic and linguistic minorities)?

**Q3** Are there subnational laws or regulations that specify authority, funding, roles and responsibilities in the decentralized education offices that are responsible for pre-primary education?

**Q4** Is there evidence that government and non-government entities, at different levels, have a sense of ownership and understanding of the plan and of their roles in the plan, including in emergency response and refugee settings? Do some entities lack this understanding or sense of ownership?

**Q5** Are there standards for service delivery that are intended to enhance and strengthen accountability to the intended beneficiaries? Are there similar or alternative standards for service delivery in emergencies and/or refugee settings?

**Q6** Is there an office or other management structure at the district or school level specifically for pre-primary services? Is such an office or management structure equipped with sufficient staff and budget?

**Measure 9 – Ownership is reflected in the development and implementation of the plan.**

*Mutual ownership of and accountability to the pre-primary subsector plan can be achieved through the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in the early development of the plan, provision of feedback, participation in decision-making, and recognition of contributions to the plan’s success.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Was there broad participation in the plan development process, including the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders?

This may include: development and implementing partners, decentralized actors, civil society, media, training institutions, universities, organizations representing people with disabilities and other marginalized groups (refugees, internally displaced persons), religious leaders, private providers, communities and families, as well as other relevant sectors (ex. health, social protection, etc.). In addition, ideally gender parity representation should be sought.

**Q2** How do the plan development and implementation processes allow for contributions and feedback to the decision-making process from all relevant stakeholders?

**Q3** Are stakeholders involved in decision-making based on feedback, and how are contributions appreciated?

**Measure 10 – The national (macro-level) plan and subnational (micro-level) plans are coordinated and complementary in meeting policy goals.**

*This coordination includes alignment of targets and timelines. There is a robust communication strategy – or plans to develop one – linking central and local levels to help stakeholders align objectives, strategies and activities of the subsector plan. Investments in management staff and planning specialists at the subnational levels help ensure the coherence and quality of the pre-primary subsector.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Are the subnational plan’s targets and timelines aligned with the national pre-primary plan’s targets and timelines?

**Q2** What communication and accountability mechanisms exist? Do these ensure coordination and complementarity between national and subnational levels? Do these ensure coordination and complementarity with humanitarian actors or national entities responsible for emergency coordination and response?

**Q3** Are there investments to strengthen subnational or middle-level managers’ capacities for effective planning and coherence in implementing the plan? Where are the gaps in capacity-building?

**Measure 11 – The plan identifies and addresses capacity gaps and obstacles that could affect implementation.**

*Specialized pre-primary capacity is available across key institutions within the education system responsible for plan development and implementation. A capacity development plan included in the budget is one helpful tool for determining the personnel and skill development needs in central and decentralized administrations.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Does the pre-primary plan address the needs of a broad range of professionals working in the subsector, including those listed below?

- pre-primary teachers;

- pre-primary specialists, such as those who work with children who have disabilities;

- other pre-primary personnel (principals, supervisors, assistant teachers, caregivers, specialists,[[7]](#footnote-7) etc.);

- technical experts at the national and subnational levels;

- trainers, coaches, mentors, higher education personnel;

- quality assurance staff, such as inspectors and officers working in data collection and analysis;

- government staff and/or administrators responsible for pre-primary education at the national and subnational levels;

- personnel involved in pre-primary infrastructure design and construction;

- other staff needed for the delivery of pre-primary services (clerical, maintenance, housekeeping); and

- humanitarian field staff which may provide psychosocial, early learning and stimulation services in emergencies and refugee settings.

**Q2** Are there relevant institutions and individuals across the subsector (and across all levels, from national to district and school levels) with the necessary skills to plan and implement effectively, and to direct the use and allocation of resources in the context of pre-primary education? Where are the gaps?

**Q3** Are there initiatives in place to increase capacity and understanding of pre-primary education where needed? Where may there be gaps in those initiatives, for example, omission of specific groups, lack of resources or inequitable deployment of resources?

**Q4** Does the plan give attention to developing sustainable structures and processes at both national and subnational levels, and to developing the capacity for sustained, long-term pre-primary planning?

**Q5** Are current and anticipated human resource needs reflected in the plan and informed by data and analysis? Indicators to consider include:

- demand for and supply of pre-primary personnel;

- achievement of appropriate pre-primary pupil-teacher ratios;

- current/projected turnover of staff; and

- recruitment and training and upskilling needs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Goal 4: Monitor plan implementation and identify necessary course corrections***A strong monitoring and evaluation framework in the context of a subsector plan enables course corrections during implementation and allows for making modifications in governance and roles, as needed*. |

**Measure 12 – Data on service provision, effectiveness, equity and financial expenditure are available.**

*The systematic collection and aggregation of programmatic and financial data are established as a vital part of informing ongoing planning and budgeting. Careful monitoring of education expenditures and of leakages or reallocation of expenditures to other purposes is important, e.g., through sector expenditure reviews and through tracking expenditures distributed or disbursed to schools.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Are there mechanisms to systematically collect and aggregate programmatic and financial data to inform planning and implementation? Including humanitarian settings? How well are the mechanisms working?[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Q2** Are mechanisms in place to ensure fiscal discipline in the use of available resources to avoid unnecessary or excessive expenditures? When problems are identified, what mechanisms are in place to address these?

**Q3** Are systems in place to track and review education expenditures, including leakages and wastage? Are there harmonized or separate systems for tracking expenditures in emergencies and/or refugee settings? What mechanisms are available to address such issues?

**Measure 13 – Progress against the plan is regularly reviewed.**

*Planning is not finished once implementation begins. A significant amount of further planning and policy formulation also takes place during implementation. Therefore, regular feedback is needed on the results achieved, ongoing challenges, and relevant administrative and implementation processes that may require reassessment.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Are there mechanisms for regular, systematic review of the pre-primary action plan and/or pre-primary components of a sector or humanitarian plan at the national and subnational levels once implementation is under way?

**Q2** Are there ‘promising practices’ or models of service provision around the country that merit further attention because of innovation, cost-effectiveness or other unique elements, including in emergencies and refugee settings? How are these models documented as part of this review? Are local variations in implementation approaches also taken into account during the review?

**Q3** Is there a process by which the review findings can be used to inform improvements and adjustments to the plan and associated policy directives? Are such findings used for advocacy strategies and plans or policy advocacy dialogue, including to increase investments for pre-primary education in emergencies and refugee settings?

**Q4** Does the review process highlight key results, challenges and opportunities as well as activities for the next planning and implementation cycle?

**Measure 14 – Reporting, feedback and consultation mechanisms are widely known, clear, transparent and adequate to maintain broad ownership during implementation.**

*There are transparent arrangements and processes for early childhood education stakeholders to review and validate the subsector results and performances. The plan also seeks to strengthen accountability to beneficiaries, for example, by providing a set of service delivery standards to be monitored.*

**Questions:**

**Q1** Are there mechanisms for reporting the results of the review process to stakeholders, including populations affected by emergencies and humanitarian actors?

**Q2** Are consultations around feedback and reporting well-known, transparent and adequate to maintain broad ownership during implementation? For example, are pre-primary principals invited to give feedback and do they receive understandable reports on reviews that are conducted? Are there independent mechanisms to validate the subsector results and performances? This could include, for example:

- joint sector monitoring;

- external evaluation of plan implementation;

- humanitarian cluster “moment of reflection” or response after-action review; and

- humanitarian needs overview process and/or programme reporting.

**Q3** Are there ways to increase accountability to beneficiaries, such as families using pre-primary services? For example, widely disseminated ‘minimum service standards’ for pre-primary service delivery or school report cards – including teacher qualifications, use of an approved curriculum, and health and safety requirements – can be reviewed by beneficiaries to assess compliance.

1. It is encouraged to use this tool to continually assess the effectiveness of such policy options (for example, throughout the Education Sector Plan’s implementation and review phases) and make any necessary adjustments or modifications. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The analysis should ideally cover equity and inclusion aspects (i.e., by gender, geographical location, socioeconomic status, etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Disadvantaged, marginalized and vulnerable young children and families are those that are socially and/or economically excluded in their communities due to vulnerability characteristics such as gender, geographic location (i.e. remoteness), disability status, orphanhood status, household wealth, household arrangements such as single headed households, being from a minority group (i.e. ethnic or linguistic minorities), and/or affected by conflict and crisis (i.e. migrants, immigrants, internally displaced persons, or refugees). This definition is adapted from: [UNICEF 2014](https://data.unicef.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Measuring-the-Determinants-of-Childhood-Vulnerability_Final-Report-5_8-LR-_172.pdf) and [UNICEF 2017](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/IRB_2017_06_Adol04.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The most disadvantaged, marginalized and vulnerable young children and families are those that are socially and/or economically excluded in their communities due to vulnerability characteristics such as gender, geographic location (i.e. remoteness), disability status, orphanhood status, household wealth, household arrangements such as single headed households, being from a minority group (i.e. ethnic or linguistic minorities), and/or affected by conflict and crisis (i.e. migrants, immigrants, internally displaced persons, or refugees). This definition is adapted from: [UNICEF 2014](https://data.unicef.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Measuring-the-Determinants-of-Childhood-Vulnerability_Final-Report-5_8-LR-_172.pdf) and [UNICEF 2017](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/IRB_2017_06_Adol04.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Note that costing needs to be based on actual expenditures and different prospects in terms of (i) service delivery and (ii) financial availability. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Disadvantaged, marginalized and vulnerable young children and families are those that are socially and/or economically excluded in their communities due to vulnerability characteristics such as gender, geographic location (i.e. remoteness), disability status, orphanhood status, household wealth, household arrangements such as single headed households, being from a minority group (i.e. ethnic or linguistic minorities), and/or affected by conflict and crisis (i.e. migrants, immigrants, internally displaced persons, or refugees). This definition is adapted from: [UNICEF 2014](https://data.unicef.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Measuring-the-Determinants-of-Childhood-Vulnerability_Final-Report-5_8-LR-_172.pdf) and [UNICEF 2017](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/IRB_2017_06_Adol04.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For example, curriculum specialists and special educators for children with disabilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. As mentioned in Measure 11, it is critical to ensure that the human resources involved in these mechanisms have the necessary capacity. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)