**Annex 1: Pilot instrument of the UNESCO General Education Quality Analysis/Diagnosis Framework (GEQAF)**

**Analytic Tool, Relevance and Responsiveness**

**Paramount Question:**  **Have we ensured that our general education system derives its purpose and strategic direction from its development context(s)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Diagnostic question** | **A brief summary of responses to the diagnostic question from a Team of national education policy makers, planners, managers and experts conducting the diagnosis and analysis** | **Priority actions and knowledge gaps identified in the process of addressing the diagnostic question** |
| **Country level relevance** | | |
| 1. How do we articulate our vision/concept for development of our country? Where is the vision/concept articulated? How and with whom is the vision/concept shared? Where is the evidence of a shared understanding of this vision/concept? How is the vision/concept operationalized? Where is the evidence that it informs our general education system? What are the mechanisms for keeping the vision/concept current? **[technical note I.3 views on development]** |  |  |
| 1. What are the key dimensions of the operational definition of the development concept? Who gets involved in this operational definition? Where is the evidence of their involvement? **[Promising practice I.1]** |  |  |
| 1. Where in the country does the responsibility for operational conceptualization of development lies? How do these loci of responsibility interact with and inform the strengthening of the development relevance of the general education system? How adequate and sustainable are the response mechanisms? |  |  |
| 1. How is the responsiveness of our general education system to our concept of development ensured and sustained? Where is the evidence of this sustained responsiveness? |  |  |
| 1. How is the general education system positioned to benefit from national development? How is the education system positioned/ranked among key levers of national development? |  |  |
| **Labor market and world of work responsiveness** | | |
| 1. What are the mechanisms for ensuring labor market/world of work responsiveness of general education? **[promising practice I.2]** Where is the evidence that these mechanism work? **[Promising practice I.3]** |  |  |
| 1. How do we attain and sustain labor market / world of work responsiveness? What are the key markers of labor market / world of work responsiveness? Where is the evidence of this sustained relevance? **[Promising practice I.4]** |  |  |
| **External global level responsiveness** | | |
| 1. How do we ensure and sustain the general education system responsiveness to global development challenges and opportunities? Where is the evidence of sustained global relevance? |  |  |
| 1. How is the general education system positioned to benefit from global development opportunities? How is the education system protected from global development threats? |  |  |
| **External individual level responsiveness** | | |
| 1. How do we ensure that the general education system optimally responds to development needs of individual learners, to their aspirations and to the aspirations of their families, households and communities? How does the system learn about these levels of needs and aspirations? Where is the evidence that these mechanisms work? |  |  |
| **Internal system coherence and responsiveness** | | |
| 1. What are the mechanisms for ensuring that different levels of the general education system are internally coherent, support each other and mutually reinforce each other? How do we ensure that different aspects of the general education system internally cohere, support and mutually reinforce each other? |  |  |
| 2. How do we support learner transitions between levels of the general education system and across the same levels of different pathways? |  |  |

The diagnosis and analysis above should culminate into identifying critical problems requiring urgent attention and the necessary information and knowledge for addressing them. It is also necessary to clearly formulate action plan and clear identification of roles and responsibilities and timelines as well as required human, financial and organizational resources which the action plan might entail. At this stage it is a question of prioritizing the priorities and knowledge gaps identified in the right most column of the table above to focus action on those areas severely hampering progress.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priorities for action, Relevance/Responsiveness** | |
| 1. Where and which are the most formidable sources of disconnect between the country’s development needs and the general education system? How can we redress the disconnect? Where and which are the most critical sources of dissonance between different clients’ development needs and the general education system? How can we redress the dissonance? |  |
| 1. What are the most urgent steps needed to reduce disconnect and to assure adequate and sustainable responsiveness of the general education system? |  |

**Annex 2: Format for feedback on the piloting of the individual Analytic Tool of GEQAF**

***To be completed at the end of the discussion of each Analytic Tool***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analytic Tool: Relevance and Responsiveness** | |
| 1. Which questions did you find unclear or hard to understand? If so how would you suggest they be reformulated? |  |
| 1. Which of the questions did you find less relevant in your context? Why? |  |
| 1. Which questions of critical importance in your context are missing in the toolkits? |  |
| 1. Which questions did you find too demanding on data and information relative to the significance of the issue for ensuring quality education? |  |
| 1. Would you have preferred more and detailed question or were the set of questions in the toolkit adequate to discuss the issues in depth? |  |
| 1. To what extent did this toolkit help you analyze the issues raised comprehensively? |  |
| 1. What kind of further support materials you would have needed for a more in-depth analysis? |  |
| 1. How much time was allocated for the discussion of this toolkit? Would it have required more or less time and if so how much? |  |
| 1. Would you use this toolkit in the future? Is so, how often? |  |

**Annex 3: Summative evaluation of GEQAF and the guidelines for piloting**

To be completed by the pilot Core Team with inputs from Heads of Departments and/or agencies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The procedure of implementation** | |
| 1. What significant adjustments did you make to the procedure suggested for piloting by UNESCO and why? |  |
| 1. What further improvements to the UNESCO guideline and piloting instrument would you suggest? |  |
| 1. To what extent do you think the results from applying the UNESCO education quality framework have been worth the time and resources you have invested in the exercise? |  |
| 1. Do you think you would use the framework (or parts of it) from time to time to check the pulse of your education system? If so, how often? |  |
| 1. What next steps were agreed or proposed to address major challenges identified during the diagnostic exercise? |  |
| 1. Who will be responsible and for what in following up on actions agreed or proposed |  |