

Malawi National Adaptation Plan

Education Sector M&R Framework and Indicator Definition Sheets (IDS)



Ministry of Natural Resources

September 2026

Table of Contents

STRATEGY 1: STRENGTHEN THE RESILIENCE OF THE MALAWIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION	1
Adaptation Action 1: Strengthen the social protection system, including through implementing the school feeding programmes and rainwater harvesting	1
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	1
Adaptation Action 2: Strengthen remedial lessons for equitable quality learning amidst climate challenges by reviewing, updating, implementing, and monitoring relevant guidelines	1
Adaptation Action 3: Enhance preparedness for climate and disaster resilience in schools by regularly conducting disaster drills and adjusting the school timetable	2
Adaptation Action 4: Establish early warning system for the schools/children.....	2
Adaptation Action 5: Develop climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas.	3
Adaptation Action 6: Build knowledge on climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction by rolling out the revised primary and secondary curriculum and establishing climate change clubs in all schools.....	3
Adaptation Action 7: Include concepts related to climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction in teacher education and professional development by updating and making available in-service training materials and developing CPD content on psychosocial support	4
STRATEGY 3. STRENGTHEN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS	4
Adaptation Action 8: Enhance school safety through district and school-level planning for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.....	4
Education Sector – Indicator Definition Sheets.....	1
STRATEGY 1: STRENGTHEN THE RESILIENCE OF THE MALAWIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION	1
Adaptation Action 1: Strengthen the social protection system, including through implementing the school feeding programmes and rainwater harvesting	1
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	5
Adaptation Action 2: Strengthen remedial lessons for equitable quality learning amidst climate challenges by reviewing, updating, implementing, and monitoring relevant guidelines	5
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	10
Adaptation Action 3: Enhance preparedness for climate and disaster resilience in schools by regularly conducting disaster drills and adjusting the school timetable	10

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	15
Adaptation Action 4: Establish early warning system for the schools/children.....	15
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	21
Adaptation Action 5: Develop climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas.	21
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	25
Adaptation Action 6: Build knowledge on climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction by rolling out the revised primary and secondary curriculum and establishing climate change clubs in all schools.....	25
STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS	31
Adaptation Action 7: Include concepts related to climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction in teacher education and professional development by updating and making available in-service training materials and developing CPD content on psychosocial support	31
STRATEGY 3. STRENGTHEN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS	36
Adaptation Action 8: Enhance school safety through district and school-level planning for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.....	36

EDUCATION SECTOR INDICATORS

STRATEGY 1: STRENGTHEN THE RESILIENCE OF THE MALAWIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Adaptation Action 1: Strengthen the social protection system, including through implementing the school feeding programmes and rainwater harvesting

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (by 2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	% of schools implementing climate-smart feeding & rainwater harvesting	~30%	≥90%	% of schools	SHN (School Health & Nutrition) reports
Outcome	% of children benefitting from school feeding in vulnerable districts	Low	≥85%	% of learners	EMIS, SHN surveys
Impact	Reduction in dropout rates due to food insecurity & shocks	High in drought years	≥50% reduction	% dropout	EMIS, household surveys

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 2: Strengthen remedial lessons for equitable quality learning amidst climate challenges by reviewing, updating, implementing, and monitoring relevant guidelines

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	No. of remedial lesson guidelines reviewed & disseminated	0	≥1 updated guideline	Number of guidelines	MoE/DQAS reports
Outcome	% of disaster-affected schools implementing remedial lessons	<10%	≥80%	% of schools	School records, inspectorate

Impact	Improvement in learning outcomes in disaster-affected districts	Low	≥50% improvement	Exam pass rates	National Assessment Reports
---------------	---	-----	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

Adaptation Action 3: Enhance preparedness for climate and disaster resilience in schools by regularly conducting disaster drills and adjusting the school timetable

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	No. of schools conducting annual disaster drills	<10%	≥80%	% of schools	School records, DEO reports
Outcome	% of schools in disaster-prone areas with tested emergency response	Very low	≥85%	% of schools	MoE inspection, EMIS
Impact	Reduced school disruption during disasters	High risk	≥60% reduction	% reduction in incidents	MoE disaster monitoring

Adaptation Action 4: Establish early warning system for the schools/children

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	%. of schools with monitoring equipment	0%	≥50%	% of schools	School records/DCCMS
Output	% of schools receiving early warning messages	0%	>80%	% of schools	School records/DCCMS
Outcome	% of children knowledgeable of early warning response	<10%	≥85%	% children	MoE/DCCMS
Impact	Reduced loss of life & property during school disasters	High risk	≥60% reduction	% reduction in incidents	MoE disaster monitoring

Adaptation Action 5: Develop climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas.

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	% of schools with climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas	Low	≥80%	% of schools	MoE curriculum unit reports
Outcome	% of learners with uninterrupted access to learning materials	<20%	≥85%	% of learners	EMIS, learner assessments
Impact	Sustained learning continuity despite disasters	Low	≥70% resilience index	Learning continuity index	MoE resilience scorecards

Adaptation Action 6: Build knowledge on climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction by rolling out the revised primary and secondary curriculum and establishing climate change clubs in all schools

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	% of schools with active climate change clubs	<10%	100% of schools	% of schools	EMIS, school activity reports
Output	% of teachers trained to be patrons and matrons of the climate change clubs	<10%	100% of schools	% of teachers	EMIS, school activity reports
Output	No. of schools implementing revised curriculum	<5%	≥90%	% of schools	MoE curriculum roll-out reports
Outcome	% of learners demonstrating climate adaptation knowledge	Low	≥70%	% of learners	National assessments
Impact	Learners empowered as agents of climate resilience	Weak	≥60% adoption	Youth climate action index	Independent evaluations

Adaptation Action 7: Include concepts related to climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction in teacher education and professional development by updating and making available in-service training materials and developing CPD content on psychosocial support

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	No. of teacher training modules on climate change & psychosocial support	0	≥3 CPD modules	Number of modules	DTED/Teacher colleges
Output	No. of teachers trained in climate change and psychosocial support	0	10,000	Number of teachers	DTED/Teacher colleges
Outcome	% of teachers applying climate-smart pedagogy & psychosocial support	<20%	≥70%	% of teachers	Teacher appraisals, supervision
Impact	Improved learner resilience to climate shocks	Low	≥60% resilience index	Learner well-being index	MoE resilience evaluations

STRATEGY 3. STRENGTHEN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

Adaptation Action 8: Enhance school safety through district and school-level planning for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management

Indicator Level	Indicator Name	Baseline	Target (2030)	Metric	Means of Verification
Output	No. of districts with contingency plans for school safety	3	28 districts	Number of districts	District plans, MoE reports
Outcome	% of schools with functional DRM committees	Very low	≥90%	% of schools	EMIS, MoE safety audits

Impact	Safer school environments in climate-prone areas	Weak	≥70% safety index	Safety assessments	MoE DRM evaluations
---------------	--	------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Education Sector – Indicator Definition Sheets

The Education Sector IDSs establish standardized methodologies for tracking the contribution of education-sector interventions to climate resilience and adaptation under the Malawi NAP.

For every approved indicator, the IDS defines what is being measured, why it is relevant to adaptation, how it should be calculated, the applicable baseline and target, data sources, means of verification, reporting frequency, disaggregation requirements and institutional responsibilities.

The sheets enable consistent monitoring of climate-resilient education infrastructure, continuity of learning during climate-related disruptions, climate-change knowledge and skills, institutional preparedness and the integration of climate adaptation into education planning and delivery.

STRATEGY 1: STRENGTHEN THE RESILIENCE OF THE MALAWIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Adaptation Action 1: Strengthen the social protection system, including through implementing the school feeding programmes and rainwater harvesting

IDS 01: % of schools implementing climate-smart feeding & rainwater harvesting

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	% of schools implementing climate-smart feeding & rainwater harvesting
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools in the reporting universe that are simultaneously implementing a climate-smart school feeding arrangement and an operational rainwater-harvesting system during the reporting year.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks whether schools are putting in place two practical social-protection and water-security measures that reduce disruption of attendance, nutrition and school operations during droughts and other climate shocks.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools meeting both implementation criteria.
Calculation Method	Define minimum implementation standards for climate-smart feeding and rainwater harvesting. Count a school only when both standards are met and documented, then divide by all schools in the reporting universe.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools meeting both climate-smart feeding and rainwater-harvesting criteria} \div \text{Total number of schools in the reporting universe}) \times 100$

Field	Description
Numerator	Schools meeting both agreed climate-smart feeding and operational rainwater-harvesting criteria.
Denominator	All schools in the reporting universe.
Baseline	~30%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥90%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	SHN programme records; school feeding records; school water/rainwater-harvesting inventories; EMIS school register.
Means of Verification	SHN (School Health & Nutrition) reports
Data Collection Method	Compile school-level implementation checklists through SHN/school reporting; verify equipment/functionality and feeding implementation through district supervision or sampled site checks.
Disaggregation	District; education level; rural/urban; school management type where available; climate-risk category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with termly administrative updates where available.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (School Health & Nutrition and planning/EMIS functions), with district education offices and participating schools as operational data providers.
Data Quality / Verification	Use a single school identifier; confirm that both components are operational, not merely planned or installed; reconcile school counts with the EMIS register and conduct sampled physical verification.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source indicator combines two interventions. For defensible reporting, a school should be counted in the numerator only when both feeding and rainwater-harvesting criteria are satisfied. The source baseline (~30%) and target (≥90%) are retained unchanged.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows expansion of school-level nutrition and water resilience measures that support equitable access during climate stress.

IDS 02: % of children benefitting from school feeding in vulnerable districts

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome

Field	Description
Indicator Name	% of children benefitting from school feeding in vulnerable districts
Indicator Definition	Percentage of enrolled children in districts classified as vulnerable who receive the defined minimum school-feeding benefit during the reporting period.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures the reach of the social-protection response to learners most exposed to food insecurity and climate-related shocks.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of learners in vulnerable districts receiving school feeding.
Calculation Method	Identify vulnerable districts using the approved vulnerability classification. Deduplicate beneficiary records and divide eligible learners who received the minimum defined feeding benefit by total enrolled learners in those districts.
Formula	$(\text{Number of enrolled learners in vulnerable districts receiving the defined school-feeding benefit} \div \text{Total enrolled learners in vulnerable districts}) \times 100$
Numerator	Enrolled learners in vulnerable districts who received the defined minimum school-feeding benefit.
Denominator	Total enrolled learners in the same vulnerable districts.
Baseline	Low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥85%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	EMIS enrolment records; SHN beneficiary registers; school feeding distribution records; vulnerability classification/list of districts.
Means of Verification	EMIS, SHN surveys
Data Collection Method	Aggregate school feeding registers and EMIS enrolment by district; match beneficiary and enrolment totals using agreed reporting periods and school identifiers.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; school level; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with termly monitoring where programme records permit.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (SHN and EMIS/planning functions), district education offices and schools; other programme partners as data providers where relevant.

Field	Description
Data Quality / Verification	Reconcile beneficiary totals against enrolled learner counts; prevent double counting across terms/schools; verify district vulnerability classification and sampled beneficiary registers.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is qualitative ('Low') while the target is quantitative. The qualitative baseline is retained; a numeric 2025 reference percentage should be established from EMIS/SHN records without replacing the source baseline label.
Link to Adaptation Result	Demonstrates whether climate-vulnerable learners are increasingly protected from food insecurity that can interrupt schooling.

IDS 03: Reduction in dropout rates due to food insecurity & shocks

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Reduction in dropout rates due to food insecurity & shocks
Indicator Definition	Relative reduction, compared with the 2025 reference level, in the dropout rate attributable to food insecurity and climate-related shocks among learners in the defined reporting population.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Assesses whether adaptation and social-protection measures are translating into sustained school participation during droughts, floods and associated livelihood/food-security shocks.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% reduction in the attributable dropout rate versus the 2025 reference rate.
Calculation Method	Estimate the annual dropout rate attributable to food insecurity and relevant shocks using consistent reason-for-dropout coding. Compare the current rate with the validated 2025 reference rate.
Formula	$((2025 \text{ attributable dropout rate} - \text{Current attributable dropout rate}) \div 2025 \text{ attributable dropout rate}) \times 100$
Numerator	Difference between the validated 2025 dropout rate attributable to food insecurity/shocks and the current attributable dropout rate.
Denominator	Validated 2025 dropout rate attributable to food insecurity/shocks.
Baseline	High in drought years

Field	Description
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥50% reduction
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	EMIS dropout records; school registers; household surveys; shock/disaster records; reason-for-dropout records where available.
Means of Verification	EMIS, household surveys
Data Collection Method	Calculate dropout rates from enrolment and dropout records; classify attributable reasons using a standard coding protocol and triangulate with household or rapid post-shock surveys.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; shock/hazard type; vulnerability category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with post-shock analysis after major climate events.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (EMIS/planning functions), district education offices and schools, with household-survey/statistical data providers as applicable.
Data Quality / Verification	Apply the same dropout definition and attribution rules over time; verify denominator populations; triangulate school-reported reasons with household evidence in sampled areas.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline ('High in drought years') is qualitative and is retained. Reporting the ≥50% reduction target requires a numeric 2025 attributable dropout-rate reference value to be documented during baseline validation. Climate/shock attribution must use a consistent rule.
Link to Adaptation Result	Captures the ultimate access/resilience result: fewer learners leaving school because climate shocks undermine household food security or schooling.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 2: Strengthen remedial lessons for equitable quality learning amidst climate challenges by reviewing, updating, implementing, and monitoring relevant guidelines

IDS 04: No. of remedial lesson guidelines reviewed & disseminated

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	No. of remedial lesson guidelines reviewed & disseminated
Indicator Definition	Number of remedial-learning guideline documents that have been formally reviewed/updated, approved for use and disseminated through the education system.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks availability of an institutionalized operational instrument for restoring learning after climate- and disaster-related disruption.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Number of updated remedial lesson guidelines completed and disseminated.
Calculation Method	Count each distinct guideline once after evidence confirms completion of review/update, formal approval and dissemination to the intended users.
Formula	Σ distinct guideline documents meeting all three criteria: reviewed/updated + approved + disseminated
Numerator	Not applicable; this is a count indicator.
Denominator	Not applicable.
Baseline	0
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥ 1 updated guideline
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE/DQAS document registers; approval records; dissemination lists; digital publication records; training/orientation records.
Means of Verification	MoE/DQAS reports
Data Collection Method	Review DQAS/MoE records and confirm the status of each guideline against a completion checklist.
Disaggregation	Guideline type/education level; dissemination channel; district/recipient category where useful.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, and upon completion of each guideline cycle.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education, particularly the quality assurance/guidelines function (DQAS), with relevant curriculum and district structures supporting dissemination.
Data Quality / Verification	Count only approved final versions; avoid counting drafts, duplicate formats or repeated dissemination of the same guideline as separate guidelines; retain version and approval dates.

Field	Description
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source target is '≥1 updated guideline'. A guideline is counted only when review/update and dissemination are both evidenced; this prevents counting a draft or an undistributed document.
Link to Adaptation Result	Provides the guidance needed for schools to organize remedial learning consistently after climate-related disruption.

IDS 05: % of disaster-affected schools implementing remedial lessons

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of disaster-affected schools implementing remedial lessons
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools identified as disaster-affected during the reporting period that implement remedial lessons in accordance with the applicable guideline or minimum standard.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures uptake of learning-recovery measures where climate and disaster events have disrupted instructional time.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of disaster-affected schools implementing remedial lessons.
Calculation Method	Establish the list of disaster-affected schools for the reporting period. Verify implementation against minimum criteria and divide implementing schools by all disaster-affected schools.
Formula	$(\text{Number of disaster-affected schools implementing remedial lessons} \div \text{Total number of disaster-affected schools}) \times 100$
Numerator	Disaster-affected schools meeting the defined remedial-lesson implementation criteria.
Denominator	All schools classified as disaster-affected during the same reporting period.
Baseline	<10%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥80%
Target Year	2030

Field	Description
Data Source(s)	School records; inspectorate/DQAS supervision records; DEO disaster-affected school lists; remedial timetables and attendance records.
Means of Verification	School records, inspectorate
Data Collection Method	Match disaster-affected school lists with school remedial-learning records and verify implementation through supervision/inspection or sampled checks.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; education level; duration of disruption; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and after major disasters affecting schooling.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (DQAS/planning functions), district education offices, inspectors and affected schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Use a documented definition of 'disaster-affected' and a minimum implementation standard; ensure numerator schools are drawn from the same affected-school denominator.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The baseline and target are percentages; implementation should mean actual delivery of remedial lessons, not merely preparation of a timetable or plan.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows the extent to which disrupted schools restore instructional time and protect equitable learning.

IDS 06: Improvement in learning outcomes in disaster-affected districts

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Improvement in learning outcomes in disaster-affected districts
Indicator Definition	Percentage improvement from the 2025 reference level in the selected examination pass rate or other nationally approved learning-outcome measure for learners in disaster-affected districts.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tests whether remedial and continuity measures translate into measurable recovery of learning performance after climate/disaster disruption.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% improvement in selected exam pass rate(s) versus 2025.
Calculation Method	Use the same assessment, grade/subject scope and district classification over time. Calculate the relative

Field	Description
	change in the selected pass rate from the validated 2025 reference rate.
Formula	$((\text{Current pass rate} - 2025 \text{ pass rate}) \div 2025 \text{ pass rate}) \times 100$
Numerator	Difference between current and 2025 pass rate in the defined disaster-affected district population.
Denominator	Validated 2025 pass rate for the same assessment/population.
Baseline	Low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥50% improvement
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	National Assessment Reports; examination datasets; district disaster-affected classifications; school performance records.
Means of Verification	National Assessment Reports
Data Collection Method	Extract comparable assessment results for disaster-affected districts and compute the relative change using a fixed indicator specification.
Disaggregation	Sex; district; grade/education level; subject/assessment; disability status where available; hazard exposure category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual or according to the national assessment/examination cycle.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (assessment/examinations, DQAS and planning functions), with district education offices as supporting data providers.
Data Quality / Verification	Hold assessment scope and pass-rate definition constant; document any examination-system changes; check district classification and cohort comparability.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is qualitative ('Low') but the target is '≥50% improvement' and the source metric is exam pass rates. A numeric 2025 pass-rate reference is therefore required for calculation while retaining the qualitative baseline in the IDS.
Link to Adaptation Result	Indicates whether adaptation measures preserve or restore education quality in disaster-affected areas.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 3: Enhance preparedness for climate and disaster resilience in schools by regularly conducting disaster drills and adjusting the school timetable

IDS 07: No. of schools conducting annual disaster drills

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	No. of schools conducting annual disaster drills
Indicator Definition	Proportion of schools in the reporting universe that conduct at least the required annual disaster drill and retain evidence of the exercise.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures routine school preparedness and practical readiness to act during climate- and disaster-related emergencies.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools conducting the required annual disaster drill, consistent with the source metric and percentage baseline/target.
Calculation Method	Count schools with evidence of at least one qualifying drill during the school/reporting year and divide by all schools in the reporting universe. Also retain the absolute count for management use.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools conducting at least one qualifying annual disaster drill} \div \text{Total number of schools}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools with documented completion of the required annual disaster drill.
Denominator	All schools in the reporting universe.
Baseline	<10%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥80%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	School drill records; DEO reports; school safety/DRM logs; inspection records.
Means of Verification	School records, DEO reports
Data Collection Method	Schools submit drill dates, type, participation and after-action records; district structures consolidate and sample-verify reported drills.
Disaggregation	District; school level; hazard/drill type; rural/urban; climate-risk category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with termly school safety monitoring where feasible.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education, district education offices and schools, with disaster-management partners supporting technical standards where applicable.
Data Quality / Verification	Require dated drill evidence and after-action documentation; prevent multiple drills at one school from inflating the school count; reconcile denominator with EMIS.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source indicator name says 'No. of schools' but the baseline (<10%), target (≥80%) and source metric (% of schools) are percentage-based. The IDS therefore retains the name unchanged but reports the primary measure as a percentage, with the absolute school count as a supplementary figure.
Link to Adaptation Result	Demonstrates increased preparedness of schools to respond safely and consistently to disasters.

IDS 08: % of schools in disaster-prone areas with tested emergency response

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of schools in disaster-prone areas with tested emergency response
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools located in designated disaster-prone areas whose emergency response arrangements have been tested through a drill, simulation or actual event and formally reviewed.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Assesses whether high-risk schools have moved beyond written plans to tested, actionable emergency procedures.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools in disaster-prone areas with a tested emergency response.
Calculation Method	Define disaster-prone areas using the approved risk classification. Count schools with a current emergency response arrangement tested within the required period and divide by all schools in those areas.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools in disaster-prone areas with a qualifying tested emergency response} \div \text{Total number of schools in disaster-prone areas}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools in disaster-prone areas with documented test and review of emergency response arrangements.
Denominator	All schools in designated disaster-prone areas.
Baseline	Very low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥85%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE inspection records; EMIS; school emergency plans; drill/simulation reports; district risk maps/lists.
Means of Verification	MoE inspection, EMIS
Data Collection Method	Link the official high-risk school list to inspection and drill records; verify that each counted school has evidence of testing and lessons/action points.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; school level; rural/urban; risk category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and following major exercises or events.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (inspection/safety and EMIS functions), district education offices and schools; relevant disaster-risk authorities as technical partners.

Field	Description
Data Quality / Verification	Use one approved risk classification; verify date and scope of testing; exclude schools with plans that have not been tested within the prescribed validity period.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	A 'tested emergency response' should include activation, observation/evaluation and documented corrective actions. The test validity period should be standardized nationally.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows operational readiness of schools most exposed to climate and disaster hazards.

IDS 09: Reduced school disruption during disasters

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Reduced school disruption during disasters
Indicator Definition	Relative reduction from the 2025 reference level in qualifying school-disruption incidents caused by disasters, using a nationally standardized incident definition.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether preparedness actions reduce the frequency of serious disruption to schooling when disasters occur.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% reduction in qualifying school-disruption incidents versus 2025.
Calculation Method	Count qualifying disaster-related school-disruption incidents using a fixed threshold (for example, closure or major interruption meeting the approved definition) and compare the current rate/count with the validated 2025 reference.
Formula	$((2025 \text{ disruption-incident rate} - \text{Current disruption-incident rate}) \div 2025 \text{ disruption-incident rate}) \times 100$
Numerator	Difference between the 2025 and current qualifying school-disruption incident rate.
Denominator	Validated 2025 qualifying school-disruption incident rate.
Baseline	High risk
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥60% reduction
Target Year	2030

Field	Description
Data Source(s)	MoE disaster monitoring records; school closure/interruption records; DEO incident reports; disaster event records.
Means of Verification	MoE disaster monitoring
Data Collection Method	Maintain a standardized incident register linked to schools and events; calculate annual disruption incidence using a consistent denominator or exposure rule.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; school level; duration/severity of disruption; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and after major disasters.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (disaster/safety and planning functions), district education offices and affected schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Apply a consistent incident threshold and avoid counting the same continuous disruption as multiple incidents; validate event dates and affected-school lists.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline ('High risk') is qualitative. A numeric 2025 disruption incidence reference must be established for the $\geq 60\%$ reduction calculation. If exposure varies strongly by year, a rate per disaster event or per exposed school should be preferred over a raw count.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether preparedness is translating into fewer serious interruptions to education during disasters.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 4: Establish early warning system for the schools/children

IDS 10: %. of schools with monitoring equipment

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	%. of schools with monitoring equipment
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools with the minimum specified, installed and functional monitoring equipment required to support school-level hazard/early-warning monitoring.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks the physical readiness of schools to receive, observe or generate information needed for timely climate/disaster warnings and protective action.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools with functional monitoring equipment meeting the agreed minimum specification.
Calculation Method	Define the eligible equipment package by school/risk type. Verify availability and functionality, then divide qualifying schools by all schools in the reporting universe or approved coverage universe.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools with the required functional monitoring equipment} \div \text{Total number of schools in the defined reporting universe}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools meeting the minimum functional monitoring-equipment standard.
Denominator	All schools in the defined reporting universe.
Baseline	0%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥50%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	School asset/equipment registers; DCCMS-supported equipment records; school records; inspection/maintenance logs; EMIS school register.
Means of Verification	School records/DCCMS
Data Collection Method	Compile school equipment inventories and verify functionality through inspection, maintenance records or sampled tests.
Disaggregation	District; school level; equipment type; hazard type; functionality status; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with updates after installation or major maintenance cycles.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education and schools, with DCCMS as a technical/data partner for monitoring and warning equipment specifications where applicable.
Data Quality / Verification	Count only installed and functional equipment; define equipment standards before data collection; reconcile assets with school identifiers and verify a sample physically.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The indicator name is retained exactly from the framework, including its punctuation. The numerator must be based on an agreed minimum equipment specification; equipment that is present but non-functional should not qualify.
Link to Adaptation Result	Measures the enabling infrastructure for school-level early warning and preparedness.

IDS 11: % of schools receiving early warning messages

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	% of schools receiving early warning messages
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools that receive at least one relevant, timely early-warning message through an approved channel during periods when warnings are issued.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures coverage of the school early-warning communication chain so that schools can take protective action before climate and disaster hazards.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools receiving relevant early-warning messages.
Calculation Method	Use message transmission/delivery logs and school confirmation records. Count schools that received a relevant warning within the required lead time and divide by schools expected to receive that warning.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools confirming receipt of a relevant early-warning message} \div \text{Number of schools targeted/expected to receive that warning}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools with verifiable receipt of relevant early-warning messages.
Denominator	Schools targeted or expected to receive the relevant warning during the reporting period.
Baseline	0%
Baseline Year	2025

Field	Description
Target	>80%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	School records; DCCMS warning dissemination logs; SMS/platform delivery logs; DEO communication records.
Means of Verification	School records/DCCMS
Data Collection Method	Match DCCMS/communication-platform dissemination records with school acknowledgements or verified delivery status for warning events.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; message channel; school level; warning lead time; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Event-based, aggregated quarterly and annually.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education and DCCMS, with district education offices and schools supporting dissemination confirmation.
Data Quality / Verification	Distinguish 'sent' from 'received'; deduplicate schools across channels for each warning event; verify timestamps and relevance to the recipient location.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	For comparability, the denominator should be schools targeted/expected to receive a specific warning rather than all schools when a warning is geographically limited. Annual reporting should aggregate event-level coverage using a documented rule.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether hazard information reaches schools in time to trigger protective action.

IDS 12: % of children knowledgeable of early warning response

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of children knowledgeable of early warning response
Indicator Definition	Percentage of assessed children who meet the agreed proficiency threshold for understanding warning signals and the correct protective response.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether early-warning systems are usable by learners, not only whether messages or equipment exist.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of assessed children meeting the early-warning response knowledge standard.
Calculation Method	Administer a standardized age-appropriate knowledge/response assessment. Count assessed children meeting the pass/proficiency threshold and divide by all children assessed.
Formula	$(\text{Number of assessed children meeting the early-warning response proficiency threshold} \div \text{Total number of children assessed}) \times 100$
Numerator	Assessed children meeting the defined knowledge/response threshold.
Denominator	All children included in the valid assessment sample.
Baseline	<10%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥85%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE/DCCMS assessment or drill records; school safety assessments; learner questionnaires; drill observation records.
Means of Verification	MoE/DCCMS
Data Collection Method	Use standardized learner questionnaires and/or drill-based observation with a representative sampling or census approach as specified.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; school level; hazard type.
Reporting Frequency	Annual or biennial, and after major awareness/training cycles.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education, schools and DCCMS as a technical partner for warning content and response protocols.

Field	Description
Data Quality / Verification	Use a validated instrument and fixed proficiency threshold; ensure age/language appropriateness; document sampling and non-response; conduct scorer quality checks.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	Knowledge should include both recognition of the warning and the required response. The pass threshold and assessment items must be standardized before baseline quantification.
Link to Adaptation Result	Demonstrates that children can translate early-warning information into appropriate protective behaviour.

IDS 13: Reduced loss of life & property during school disasters

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Reduced loss of life & property during school disasters
Indicator Definition	Relative reduction from the 2025 reference level in qualifying school-disaster incidents resulting in loss of life and/or material property damage.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Assesses the ultimate protective effect of school early-warning and preparedness measures on people and education assets.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% reduction in qualifying loss-of-life/property-loss incidents versus 2025, consistent with the source metric.
Calculation Method	Apply a standard incident definition, record school disaster events involving fatalities and/or property loss, and compare the current incident rate with the validated 2025 reference rate.
Formula	$((2025 \text{ qualifying incident rate} - \text{Current qualifying incident rate}) \div 2025 \text{ qualifying incident rate}) \times 100$
Numerator	Difference between the 2025 and current rate of qualifying school disaster incidents involving loss of life and/or property.
Denominator	Validated 2025 qualifying incident rate.
Baseline	High risk
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥60% reduction
Target Year	2030

Field	Description
Data Source(s)	MoE disaster monitoring; school incident reports; DCCMS/disaster event records; post-disaster damage/loss assessments where available.
Means of Verification	MoE disaster monitoring
Data Collection Method	Compile event-based school disaster incident records and validate fatalities/property-loss occurrence through official or post-event documentation.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; school level; fatality/injury/property-loss category; severity; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Event-based, with annual aggregation.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education, schools and district education offices, with DCCMS/disaster-management structures as technical/verification partners.
Data Quality / Verification	Use unique event and school identifiers; distinguish fatalities/injuries/property loss; prevent duplicate reporting across agencies; verify incident severity and event dates.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline ('High risk') is qualitative, while the target requires a $\geq 60\%$ reduction. A numeric 2025 incident-rate reference is required for calculation. Because the source metric is 'reduction in incidents', the IDS does not replace it with monetary loss; monetary damage may be reported as supplementary information.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether school early-warning and preparedness reduce the most serious human and asset consequences of disasters.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 5: Develop climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas.

IDS 14: % of schools with climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	% of schools with climate-proof learning continuity systems including digital backups for disaster-prone areas
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools that have an operational learning-continuity system meeting the agreed climate/disaster-resilience standard, including accessible digital backup arrangements where required for disaster-prone areas.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks institutional readiness to maintain or rapidly restore teaching and access to learning materials when physical schooling is disrupted.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools meeting the approved climate-proof learning-continuity standard.
Calculation Method	Assess schools against a standardized continuity checklist covering plan, backup materials/data, access arrangements, responsibilities, testing and recovery procedures. Count schools meeting the threshold and divide by all schools in the reporting universe.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools meeting the climate-proof learning-continuity standard} \div \text{Total number of schools in the reporting universe}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools meeting the full minimum continuity-system threshold.
Denominator	All schools in the defined reporting universe.
Baseline	Low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥80%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE curriculum unit reports; school continuity plans; digital backup inventories/logs; EMIS school register; inspection records.
Means of Verification	MoE curriculum unit reports

Field	Description
Data Collection Method	Conduct annual school self-reporting against the continuity checklist, validated through district supervision and sampled system/backup tests.
Disaggregation	District; school level; disaster-prone/non-disaster-prone; continuity modality; rural/urban; connectivity category.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with updates after system tests or major disasters.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (curriculum, ICT/digital learning, planning/EMIS functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Verify functionality rather than existence of plans or devices; test restoration/access to backups; apply the same minimum standard to numerator classification.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is qualitative ('Low'). A numeric 2025 percentage should be established using the agreed continuity-system checklist. The digital-backup requirement should be risk- and feasibility-sensitive but must be defined before measurement.
Link to Adaptation Result	Measures the system capacity required to sustain learning despite climate and disaster disruption.

IDS 15: % of learners with uninterrupted access to learning materials

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of learners with uninterrupted access to learning materials
Indicator Definition	Percentage of learners who retain access to the minimum required learning materials throughout a climate/disaster disruption or within the nationally defined maximum acceptable interruption period.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether continuity systems actually protect learner access, including for learners in disrupted or hard-to-reach settings.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of learners meeting the uninterrupted-access criterion.
Calculation Method	For relevant disruption periods, determine whether each learner/learner group had continuous or timely restored access to the defined minimum material set, then divide qualifying learners by all learners in scope.

Field	Description
Formula	$\left(\frac{\text{Number of learners meeting the uninterrupted-access criterion}}{\text{Total number of learners in the reporting population}} \right) \times 100$
Numerator	Learners with continuous or timely restored access to the defined minimum learning materials.
Denominator	All learners in the defined reporting population.
Baseline	<20%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥85%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	EMIS; learner assessments/surveys; learning-platform access logs; school distribution records; continuity programme records.
Means of Verification	EMIS, learner assessments
Data Collection Method	Triangulate school distribution records, platform/offline access logs and learner surveys, particularly in disaster-affected areas.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; access modality; connectivity status; disaster-affected status.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and after major disruptions.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (curriculum/digital learning and EMIS functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Define the minimum material package and maximum acceptable interruption; avoid counting nominal platform access without evidence of learner access; reconcile learner denominators with EMIS.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The term 'uninterrupted' requires a standardized operational threshold. Where literal zero interruption is unrealistic, the national protocol should define the maximum permissible interruption and apply it consistently.
Link to Adaptation Result	Demonstrates whether continuity systems preserve practical access to learning resources during shocks.

IDS 16: Sustained learning continuity despite disasters

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Sustained learning continuity despite disasters
Indicator Definition	Composite learning-continuity performance, expressed through a standardized learning continuity index, capturing the extent to which education services and learner access are maintained or rapidly restored during disasters.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Provides an impact-level measure of education system resilience beyond any single continuity input or output.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Learning continuity index (0–100 or percentage of maximum possible score).
Calculation Method	Score agreed components such as instructional continuity, access to learning materials, restoration time and continuity-system functionality; normalize component scores and combine them using pre-approved weights.
Formula	$(\Sigma \text{ weighted component scores achieved} \div \Sigma \text{ maximum weighted component scores}) \times 100$
Numerator	Weighted learning-continuity points achieved across the approved index components.
Denominator	Maximum possible weighted learning-continuity points.
Baseline	Low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥70% resilience index
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE resilience scorecards; school closure/continuity records; EMIS; learner access data; digital/offline learning records.
Means of Verification	MoE resilience scorecards
Data Collection Method	Apply the approved resilience scorecard to schools/districts exposed to disasters and aggregate scores using a documented weighting and population rule.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; school level; disaster-prone status; continuity modality; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and after major disasters, with periodic index review.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (planning/M&E, curriculum and EMIS functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Freeze index components, scoring anchors and weights for a reporting cycle; test inter-rater reliability; retain underlying component data for audit and interpretation.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is 'Low', target is '≥70% resilience index', and metric is 'Learning continuity index'. The IDS operationalizes the index on a 0–100 scale so that ≥70 represents at least 70% of the maximum resilience score, while retaining the source wording unchanged in the target field.
Link to Adaptation Result	Summarizes whether the education system can sustain learning services through climate and disaster shocks.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 6: Build knowledge on climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction by rolling out the revised primary and secondary curriculum and establishing climate change clubs in all schools

IDS 17: % of schools with active climate change clubs

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	% of schools with active climate change clubs
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools with a climate change club that meets the nationally agreed minimum criteria for being active during the reporting year.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks sustained school-based participation mechanisms through which learners build climate knowledge, leadership and practical adaptation engagement.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools with active climate change clubs.
Calculation Method	Define 'active' using minimum criteria such as designated patron/leadership, documented activity plan, regular meetings and at least one documented climate/DRR activity. Divide qualifying schools by all schools.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools with climate change clubs meeting the active-club criteria} \div \text{Total number of schools}) \times 100$

Field	Description
Numerator	Schools with clubs satisfying all minimum active-club criteria.
Denominator	All schools in the reporting universe.
Baseline	<10%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	100% of schools
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	EMIS; school activity reports; club registers/minutes; activity plans; district supervision records.
Means of Verification	EMIS, school activity reports
Data Collection Method	Schools report club status and evidence annually; district/EMIS processes validate status through records and sampled visits.
Disaggregation	District; school level; rural/urban; club activity type; school management type where available.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with termly school activity updates where feasible.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (curriculum/EMIS functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Apply a minimum active-club standard; do not count dormant or nominal clubs; use unique school identifiers and verify a sample of reported activities.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The target is 100% of schools. An 'active' club must be defined consistently so that registration alone does not qualify a school.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows institutionalization of learner participation and climate/DRR engagement across schools.

IDS 18: No. of schools implementing revised curriculum

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	No. of schools implementing revised curriculum
Indicator Definition	Proportion of schools implementing the revised primary/secondary curriculum components on climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction in accordance with the approved roll-out standard.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures practical curriculum uptake, a core pathway for mainstreaming climate and DRR knowledge into education.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools implementing the revised curriculum, consistent with the source metric and percentage baseline/target.
Calculation Method	Verify implementation using criteria such as receipt/use of revised materials, teacher delivery evidence and inclusion in schemes/lesson records. Divide qualifying schools by all schools expected to implement the revised curriculum.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools meeting the revised-curriculum implementation criteria} \div \text{Total number of schools expected to implement the revised curriculum}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools meeting the minimum revised-curriculum implementation criteria.
Denominator	All schools expected to implement the revised curriculum.
Baseline	<5%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥90%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE curriculum roll-out reports; school timetables/schemes; teacher records; inspection reports; EMIS.
Means of Verification	MoE curriculum roll-out reports
Data Collection Method	Compile roll-out and school implementation records, then verify implementation through inspection/supervision and sampled classroom/document review.
Disaggregation	District; primary/secondary; rural/urban; curriculum phase/cohort.
Reporting Frequency	Annual during roll-out and consolidation.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (curriculum and quality assurance functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Separate material distribution from actual implementation; use fixed implementation criteria; reconcile denominator with the approved roll-out universe.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source indicator name says 'No. of schools', but the baseline (<5%), target (≥90%) and metric (% of schools) are percentage-based. The IDS retains the name but uses percentage as the primary measure, with the absolute count reported alongside it.
Link to Adaptation Result	Tracks whether climate change and DRR content is actually reaching classrooms through the revised curriculum.

IDS 19: % of learners demonstrating climate adaptation knowledge

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of learners demonstrating climate adaptation knowledge
Indicator Definition	Percentage of assessed learners who meet the agreed proficiency threshold on climate-change adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction knowledge/competencies.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether curriculum and school activities are producing demonstrable learner understanding relevant to climate resilience.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of assessed learners meeting the climate-adaptation knowledge standard.
Calculation Method	Administer standardized assessment items mapped to the revised curriculum. Count learners meeting the proficiency threshold and divide by all learners with valid assessment results.
Formula	$(\text{Number of assessed learners meeting the climate-adaptation proficiency threshold} \div \text{Total number of learners with valid assessment results}) \times 100$
Numerator	Assessed learners meeting or exceeding the agreed proficiency threshold.
Denominator	All assessed learners with valid results.
Baseline	Low

Field	Description
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥70%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	National assessments; curriculum-linked learner assessments; examination/assessment datasets.
Means of Verification	National assessments
Data Collection Method	Embed standardized climate/DRR items in national or representative assessments and score using a defined proficiency standard.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; school level; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	According to the national assessment cycle, with annual school-level monitoring where available.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (assessment/curriculum functions), with schools and district structures supporting assessment administration.
Data Quality / Verification	Use curriculum-aligned, validated items; maintain a stable proficiency cut-score; document sampling and test-form changes; conduct scoring and data-entry checks.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is qualitative ('Low') and the target is quantitative. A 2025 numeric proficiency estimate should be established from a comparable assessment without replacing the source baseline descriptor.
Link to Adaptation Result	Demonstrates that climate and DRR curriculum implementation is translating into learner knowledge.

IDS 20: Learners empowered as agents of climate resilience

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Learners empowered as agents of climate resilience
Indicator Definition	Extent to which learners demonstrate climate-resilient agency through knowledge, participation and adoption of defined climate/DRR actions, measured using a standardized youth climate action index.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Captures the impact-level shift from awareness to learner participation and action that strengthens school and community resilience.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Youth climate action index and proportion of assessed learners meeting the defined adoption/agency threshold.
Calculation Method	Score approved components of learner agency (for example knowledge application, participation in climate/DRR activities and documented adaptive behaviours/actions). Calculate an index and classify learners meeting the adoption threshold.
Formula	Primary target measure: (Number of assessed learners meeting the youth climate-action adoption threshold ÷ Total assessed learners) × 100; supporting index = (Points achieved ÷ Maximum points) × 100
Numerator	Assessed learners meeting the pre-defined climate-action adoption/agency threshold.
Denominator	All assessed learners with valid youth climate action assessments.
Baseline	Weak
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥60% adoption
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	Independent evaluations; school climate-club/activity records; learner surveys; youth climate action assessments.
Means of Verification	Independent evaluations
Data Collection Method	Use periodic independent or standardized learner assessments, triangulated with documented participation/actions at school or community level.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; school level; type of climate action.
Reporting Frequency	Biennial or at major evaluation points, with annual programme monitoring.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (planning/M&E and curriculum functions), schools and independent evaluators where commissioned.
Data Quality / Verification	Predefine index domains, scoring and the adoption threshold; avoid equating attendance at a club with agency; verify claimed actions using school/community evidence where feasible.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source metric is 'Youth climate action index' while the target is '≥60% adoption'. To reconcile this without changing source fields, the IDS reports both the index and the percentage of learners meeting a defined adoption threshold; the ≥60% target applies to that adoption percentage.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether learners progress from climate knowledge to meaningful participation and adaptive action.

STRATEGY 2. ENSURE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTERS

Adaptation Action 7: Include concepts related to climate change and Disaster Risk Reduction in teacher education and professional development by updating and making available in-service training materials and developing CPD content on psychosocial support

IDS 21: No. of teacher training modules on climate change & psychosocial support

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	No. of teacher training modules on climate change & psychosocial support
Indicator Definition	Number of distinct teacher education/CPD modules on climate change, Disaster Risk Reduction and/or psychosocial support that are finalized, approved and available for use.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks development of the professional-learning content needed for teachers to deliver climate-smart pedagogy and support learners affected by shocks.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Number of approved and available CPD/teacher-training modules.
Calculation Method	Count each distinct module once when evidence confirms finalization, approval and availability for delivery through the designated teacher education/CPD system.
Formula	Σ distinct modules meeting all criteria: finalized + approved + available for delivery

Field	Description
Numerator	Not applicable; this is a count indicator.
Denominator	Not applicable.
Baseline	0
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥3 CPD modules
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	DTED/Teacher college module registers; approved training materials; CPD catalogues/platforms; approval minutes/records.
Means of Verification	DTED/Teacher colleges
Data Collection Method	Review DTED/teacher college and MoE training-material records against a standard completion checklist.
Disaggregation	Module topic; pre-service/in-service; delivery modality; target teacher cadre.
Reporting Frequency	Annual and upon approval of new/revised modules.
Responsible Institution(s)	Teacher education/development function (DTED) and teacher colleges, with the Ministry responsible for Education and relevant CPD structures.
Data Quality / Verification	Count only distinct approved final modules; avoid counting sessions, copies or minor formatting versions as separate modules; maintain version control and approval evidence.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source target is '≥3 CPD modules'. A module is counted when it is ready and authorized for use, not merely drafted.
Link to Adaptation Result	Provides the professional-development content required to build teacher capacity for climate/DRR and psychosocial support.

IDS 22: % of teachers applying climate-smart pedagogy & psychosocial support

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of teachers applying climate-smart pedagogy & psychosocial support
Indicator Definition	Percentage of assessed teachers who demonstrate application of the agreed minimum practices for climate-smart pedagogy and psychosocial support in their professional work.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether training content changes classroom/support practice rather than only increasing participation in training.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of assessed teachers meeting the application standard.
Calculation Method	Use a standardized appraisal/supervision rubric covering the required practices. Count teachers meeting the threshold and divide by all teachers validly assessed.
Formula	$(\text{Number of assessed teachers meeting the climate-smart pedagogy and psychosocial-support application threshold} \div \text{Total number of teachers validly assessed}) \times 100$
Numerator	Assessed teachers meeting the defined application threshold.
Denominator	All teachers with valid appraisal/supervision results in the reporting sample/population.
Baseline	<20%
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥70%
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	Teacher appraisals; supervision/lesson observation records; CPD follow-up records; school support records.
Means of Verification	Teacher appraisals, supervision
Data Collection Method	Integrate the practice rubric into teacher appraisal/supervision and periodically validate self-reported practice through observation or document review.
Disaggregation	Sex; district; school level; teacher cadre; training status; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Annual or according to the teacher appraisal/supervision cycle.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (teacher development and supervision/quality assurance functions), district education offices, schools and teacher colleges/CPD structures.
Data Quality / Verification	Use a standardized rubric and assessor guidance; calibrate supervisors; distinguish training attendance from actual application; sample-audit appraisal evidence.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The indicator combines two practice domains. The national measurement protocol should state whether teachers must meet minimum criteria in both domains or an overall composite threshold; the chosen rule must remain stable across years.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether teacher capacity-building is being converted into resilient pedagogy and learner psychosocial support.

IDS 23: Improved learner resilience to climate shocks

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Improved learner resilience to climate shocks
Indicator Definition	Improvement in learner capacity to cope with, recover from and remain engaged in learning during climate-related shocks, measured through a standardized learner well-being/resilience index.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Assesses the impact of teacher practice and psychosocial support on learners' ability to withstand climate-related disruption.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Learner well-being/resilience index (0–100 or percentage of maximum score).
Calculation Method	Administer an approved learner well-being/resilience instrument covering relevant psychosocial and learning-engagement domains. Normalize and combine scores according to the fixed scoring protocol.
Formula	$(\text{Total resilience/well-being points achieved} \div \text{Maximum possible points}) \times 100$
Numerator	Total valid learner resilience/well-being points achieved under the approved scoring protocol.
Denominator	Maximum possible valid points for the assessed learner population/instrument.
Baseline	Low

Field	Description
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥60% resilience index
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE resilience evaluations; learner well-being assessments; school psychosocial support records; periodic surveys.
Means of Verification	MoE resilience evaluations
Data Collection Method	Conduct standardized learner assessments using age-appropriate tools and an agreed representative/census sampling approach.
Disaggregation	Sex; age/grade; disability status where available; district; school level; shock exposure; rural/urban.
Reporting Frequency	Biennial or at major evaluation points, with targeted post-shock assessments where needed.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (planning/M&E, teacher development and learner-support functions), schools and qualified evaluators.
Data Quality / Verification	Use a validated instrument; standardize administration and scoring; protect confidentiality; test internal consistency and sampling quality; document tool changes.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is 'Low', target is '≥60% resilience index' and metric is 'Learner well-being index'. The IDS operationalizes the score on a 0–100 scale, with ≥60 interpreted as at least 60% of the maximum index score, while retaining the source target text.
Link to Adaptation Result	Captures whether education-sector adaptation strengthens learners' capacity to cope with climate-related shocks.

STRATEGY 3. STRENGTHEN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

Adaptation Action 8: Enhance school safety through district and school-level planning for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management

IDS 24: No. of districts with contingency plans for school safety

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Output
Indicator Name	No. of districts with contingency plans for school safety
Indicator Definition	Number of districts with a current, documented contingency plan for school safety that addresses relevant climate/disaster risks and meets the minimum approval/completeness standard.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Tracks institutionalization of climate/disaster school-safety planning at district level.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	Number of districts with qualifying contingency plans.
Calculation Method	Assess each district against the approved contingency-plan checklist and count districts with a current qualifying plan.
Formula	Σ districts with a current contingency plan meeting the approved school-safety criteria
Numerator	Not applicable; this is a count indicator.
Denominator	Not applicable. For supplementary coverage reporting, 28 districts may be used as the full target universe reflected in the source target.
Baseline	3
Baseline Year	2025
Target	28 districts
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	District plans; MoE reports; district education planning records; plan approval/review records.
Means of Verification	District plans, MoE reports
Data Collection Method	Obtain district plans annually, assess completeness/validity against a standard checklist and record approval/review dates.
Disaggregation	District; plan status (draft/approved/current/expired); hazard coverage; review year.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with updates when plans are approved or revised.

Field	Description
Responsible Institution(s)	District education/planning structures, coordinated by the Ministry responsible for Education's planning/school-safety functions.
Data Quality / Verification	Count only current plans meeting minimum content and approval requirements; maintain version control; avoid counting outdated or generic district plans that do not address school safety.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline (3) and target (28 districts) are counts and are retained exactly. A plan validity/review period should be defined so that outdated plans are not counted as current.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows expansion of district-level planning capacity for safe, resilient schooling.

IDS 25: % of schools with functional DRM committees

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Outcome
Indicator Name	% of schools with functional DRM committees
Indicator Definition	Percentage of schools with a Disaster Risk Management committee that meets the agreed criteria for functionality during the reporting year.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Measures whether school-level governance arrangements for climate/disaster preparedness are active and capable of implementing safety actions.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	% of schools with functional DRM committees.
Calculation Method	Define functionality using criteria such as formal membership, defined roles, periodic meetings, current action plan, records and evidence of preparedness activity. Divide qualifying schools by all schools.
Formula	$(\text{Number of schools with DRM committees meeting the functionality criteria} \div \text{Total number of schools}) \times 100$
Numerator	Schools whose DRM committees meet all minimum functionality criteria.
Denominator	All schools in the reporting universe.
Baseline	Very low
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥90%
Target Year	2030

Field	Description
Data Source(s)	EMIS; MoE safety audits; school DRM committee records; minutes/action plans; district supervision records.
Means of Verification	EMIS, MoE safety audits
Data Collection Method	Include committee-status fields in EMIS/safety audits and validate reported functionality through document review and sampled visits.
Disaggregation	District; school level; rural/urban; hazard-risk category; committee composition where captured.
Reporting Frequency	Annual, with termly school safety monitoring where feasible.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (school safety/EMIS functions), district education offices and schools.
Data Quality / Verification	Do not equate committee existence with functionality; apply the same checklist and reference period; verify meeting/action records and reconcile denominator with EMIS.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline ('Very low') is qualitative. A numeric 2025 percentage should be established using the agreed functionality checklist while retaining the source baseline descriptor.
Link to Adaptation Result	Shows whether schools have active governance structures to plan, coordinate and act on climate/disaster risk.

IDS 26: Safer school environments in climate-prone areas

Field	Description
Indicator Level	Impact
Indicator Name	Safer school environments in climate-prone areas
Indicator Definition	Level of school safety and climate/disaster resilience in designated climate-prone areas, measured through a standardized school safety assessment-derived index.
Purpose / Relevance to Adaptation	Provides an impact-level measure of whether governance, planning and DRM actions are producing safer learning environments in high-risk areas.
Metric / Unit of Measurement	School safety index derived from standardized safety assessments, expressed as 0–100 or % of maximum score.
Calculation Method	Assess schools against approved structural, non-structural, preparedness, governance and continuity criteria; normalize and aggregate component scores using fixed weights.

Field	Description
Formula	$(\Sigma \text{ weighted safety points achieved} \div \Sigma \text{ maximum weighted safety points}) \times 100$
Numerator	Weighted school safety points achieved across approved assessment domains.
Denominator	Maximum possible weighted school safety points.
Baseline	Weak
Baseline Year	2025
Target	≥70% safety index
Target Year	2030
Data Source(s)	MoE DRM evaluations; school safety assessments/audits; district plans; school DRM records; relevant infrastructure/safety inspection data.
Means of Verification	MoE DRM evaluations
Data Collection Method	Conduct periodic standardized safety assessments in climate-prone schools and aggregate school/district scores using a documented weighting rule.
Disaggregation	District; hazard type; school level; structural/non-structural domain; rural/urban; risk category.
Reporting Frequency	Biennial or at major evaluation points, with annual administrative monitoring of key components.
Responsible Institution(s)	Ministry responsible for Education (school safety/planning/M&E functions), district education offices and schools, with technical risk/safety partners where required.
Data Quality / Verification	Use a fixed assessment tool, scoring anchors and weights; train assessors; conduct inter-rater checks; retain component-level evidence and document any tool revisions.
Methodological Notes / Assumptions	The source baseline is 'Weak', target is '≥70% safety index', and source metric is 'Safety assessments'. The IDS treats safety assessments as the measurement method and expresses the resulting safety index on a 0–100 scale so that the target can be measured consistently.
Link to Adaptation Result	Captures the ultimate governance result: safer, more resilient school environments in climate-prone areas.