

INTRODUCTION

The Global Education Policy Dashboard (GEPD): An innovative tool to measure drivers of learning outcomes in basic education

GEPD uses 3 data collection instruments to report on nearly 40 indicators that operationalize the World Development Report 2018 framework to track 3 areas for progress in education- Practices, Policies, and Politics. Using these indicators, the dashboard highlights areas where countries need to act to improve learning outcomes and allows a way for governments to track progress as they act to close gaps in these areas. For more information on GEPD, please visit www.worldbank.org/global-education-policy-dashboard

Figure 1. GEPD framework (practices, policies and politics), expanding on WDR 2018 framework



INSTRUMENTS OF DATA

The **School Survey** consists of 8 modules to collect data across 200-300 schools on practices (the quality of service delivery in schools) and de facto policy indicators. It consists of streamlined versions of existing instruments together with new questions to fill gaps in those instruments.

The **Policy Survey** collects information via interviews with ~200 officials per country at federal and regional level to feed into the policy de jure indicators and identify key elements of the policy framework.

The **Survey of public officials** collects information about the capacity and orientation of the bureaucracy and political factors affecting education outcomes. This survey is an education-focused version of the civil-servant surveys from the Bureaucracy Lab, WBG.

KEY TAKEAWAYS, PERU, 2020

- Learning poverty is substantial, and rural children lag far beyond urban children in learning.
- Disparities are driven by differences in practices (less than ½ of variation explained by within-school differences).
- Of all practice indicators, teacher skills & children's capacity for learning at primary entry explain low learning the best.

- Infrastructure is advanced, but internet access and accessibility to kids with disabilities are still poor (just 8% & 54% in rural schools).
- Policy frameworks are comprehensive, but the de facto implementation varies across types of policies. E.g. teaching support.
- Bureaucratic capacity scores are affected by the lack of recognition of good performance for individuals, units, and departments.

Table 1. Key GEPD Outcome Indicators

Indicator	Value
Learning poverty	56%
Proficiency by End of Primary	54%
Proficiency on GEPD Assessment	33%
Literacy proficiency	61%
Numeracy proficiency	23%
Proficiency by Grade 2/3	NA
Net Adjusted Enrollment Rate	NA


Source: UIS, GLAD, GEPD, World Bank, Peru, 2020. For information on indicators, please consult the World Bank [GEPD](#), [GLAD](#) and [Learning Poverty](#) repositories.

Notes: (1) Proficiency on GEPD assessment means % students with knowledge > 80%. (2) Proficiency by end of primary uses threshold as per Minimum Proficiency Levels set by GAML(UIS). (3) All indicators are on a scale of 0-5 unless measured in %. (4) Green indicates indicator 'on-target', yellow indicates 'requires caution', red indicates 'needs improvement'.

LEARNING OUTCOMES: 56% LEARNING POVERTY, 33% GEPD PROFICIENCY IN GRADE 4


Learning poverty is defined as the share of children at end of primary age below minimum reading proficiency, adjusted for out of school children. Learning poverty in Peru is 5% points worse than the average for Latin America & Caribbean (excluding high income) region and 27% points worse than the average for Upper middle income countries.

Figure 2. Learning poverty comparison



Notes: Grey circles represent other countries. Yellow circle represents Peru. Other circles represent average learning poverty in Peru's region and income group.

GEPD grade 4 proficiency of 33% means 33% students score greater than 80% in GEPD assessment. Student proficiency is 38 points higher in language compared to numeracy, 2 points higher for boys compared to girls, and 23 points higher in urban areas compared to rural areas.

Figure 3. GEPD Grade 4 proficiency, Peru

COMPARING DE-FACTO PRACTICES AND POLICY LEVERS

Practice indicators measure quality of service delivery in schools such as student performance, teacher knowledge, principal management skills, etc. Policy lever indicators measure how well school, personnel and student policies governing these practices are implemented. Comparing de-facto practice and policy lever indicators allows identification of low-scoring policy levers that affect observed practice indicators.

Teacher effectiveness

Teacher content knowledge (39%) needs improvement. Teacher proficiency in language (41%) is 5 points higher than mathematics proficiency (36%). Teacher pedagogical skills score (34%) needs improvement, and teacher attendance (92%) is on target. Teaching - Monitoring & Accountability is the weakest policy lever(2.8/5).

Practice Indicators		Policy levers (Teaching)	
Content knowledge	39%	Attraction	3.6
Maths proficiency	36%	Selection & deployment	3.6
Language proficiency	41%		
Pedagogical skills	34%	Support	3.1
% Classroom culture	91%		
% Instruction practices	39%	Evaluation	4
% Socio-emotional skills	24%		
Teacher Attendance	92%	Monitoring & Accountability	2.8
		Intrinsic motivation	4.1

Notes: Content knowledge(& sub-indicators) indicate % teachers with knowledge>80%. Pedagogical skills(& sub-indicators) indicate % teachers with proficiency 3/5 or above.

Capacity for learning in Grade 1

Student proficiency in Grade 1 (53%) needs improvement. Executive function score(65)% is the lowest knowledge sub-score. Student attendance(93%) is on target. Center-Based Care is the weakest policy lever(2.6/5).

Practice Indicators		Policy levers (Learners)	
Capacity for learning	53%	Nutrition Programs	4.3
Numeracy score	90		
Literacy score	77	Health Programs	4.2
Executive score	65	Center based care	2.6
Socio-emotional score	75	Caregiver Skills Capacity	2.9
Student Attendance	93%	Caregiver Financial Capacity	4.5

Notes: Capacity for learning indicates % students with knowledge>80%. Sub-indicator scores refer to average subject knowledge on a 0-100 scale.

Inputs & Infrastructure

Basic inputs (4.1/5) are on target. Percent of schools with access to EdTech(78)% is the lowest score. Basic infrastructure (3.7/5) requires caution. Percent of schools with access to internet(54)% is the lowest score. Inputs & Infrastructure - Monitoring is the weakest policy lever(3.7/5).

Practice Indicators		Policy levers(Inputs)	
Basic inputs	4.1	Inputs and infrastructure standards	3.7
% Blackboard	82%		
% Stationery	96%		
% Furniture	84%		
% EdTech access	78%	Inputs and infrastructure monitoring	3.7
Basic infrastructure	3.7		
% Drinking water	91%		
% Functional toilet	68%		
% Internet	96%		
% Electricity	54%		
% Disability access	65%		

Notes: % refers to % schools with the given sub-component

School Management by principals

In school management, the lowest score is for principal's Instructional Leadership(3.3/5), whereas the highest score is obtained for Operational Management(4.3/5). School Management- Support is the weakest policy lever(3.5/5).

Practice Indicators		Policy levers(Management)	
Operational management	4.3	Clarity of functions	5
Instructional Leadership	3.3		
Principal School knowledge	3.6	Attraction	4.4
		Selection & Deployment	4.4
Principal Management skills	4.3	Support	3.5
		Evaluation	4.4

Notes: All scores are on a (0-5) scale.

POLITICS & BUREAUCRATIC CAPACITY INDICATORS

Politics and bureaucratic capacity indicators measure the capacity and orientation of the bureaucracy, as well as political factors affecting education outcomes. The highest score in politics and bureaucratic capacity is noted for Financing (5/5), and the lowest score is noted for National Learning Goals (3/5).

Indicator	Value
Quality of Bureaucracy	4
Impartial Decision-Making	3.3
Mandates & Accountability	4.2
National Learning Goals	3
Financing	5

Notes: All scores are on a (0-5) scale.

Disclaimer: GEPD numbers presented in this brief are based on multiple sources including GEPD instruments, UIS, GLAD and Learning Poverty indicators. For that reason, the numbers discussed here may be different from official statistics reported by governments and national offices of statistics. Such differences are due to the different purposes of the statistics, which can be for global comparison or to meet national definitions.