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

**Analytic Tool, Governance**

**Paramount Question:**  **To what extent does governance of our education system support the attainment and sustainability of high quality education and effective learning experiences.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| **Governance at the institution level**  |
| 1. How effective are ***existing governance structures at the institution level (***ECCE administration, School Councils/School Management Committee, adult learning organisation, adult literacy provider, prison administration, etc***)*** in helping to improve teaching and learning? What is the support mechanism in place to enable governing bodies at the institution level to shoulder their responsibilities? Where is the evidence that it works?
 |  |  |
| 1. How inclusive and participatory is the process of constituting the governance and accountability structures at the institution level? Does the composition of the governance body reflect the diversity of critical stakeholders? What are the criteria for identifying these stakeholders? What are the mechanisms for their effective engagement? Where is the evidence of the effectiveness of that engagement? [See an example of a good practice from Nepal that shows highly participatory and democratic nature of forming school management committees **Promising Practice XII.1]**
 |  |  |
| 1. What is the role of leadership in promoting learning? How effective are the existing mechanisms for recruiting heads of institutions that are able to exercise instructional or learning leadership (Technical Note XII.3) ? Where is the evidence to show that leadership mad a difference in learning in our country? **[Link to Analytical Tool on Teachers/Educators**] [See an example of a good practice from Singapore that illustrates the rigor involved in the recruitment and development of school principals. **Promising Practice XII.2]**
 |  |  |
| 1. What measures are adopted to make institutional operations transparent and make them accountable for performance? Is information related to finance, staff performance, quality of learner achievement, or any other aspects of management made available to stakeholders, parents of pre-school and school children, to students’ and learners’ associations, civil society and local community members? How effective have these transparency measures been in improving the quality of education? [See an example of a good practice from Uganda that illustrates the use of Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys in tacking the flow of funds in education. **Promising Practice XII.3]**
 |  |  |
| **Governance at the intermediate level**  |
| 1. How clear are the lines of authority and functional responsibilities between the provincial and district authorities defined and delineated so that each authority is aware of its role for quality education? Where is the evidence to confirm that educational authorities pay attention to quality learning?
 |  |  |
| 1. What kind of plans and programmes do the regional and local bodies prepare for quality education? How effective are these plans in setting the quality agenda and driving quality improvements in educational institutions?
 |  |  |
| 1. How adequately are provincial and local authorities resourced to support the educational institutions, administrators and facilitators/teachers for quality education through proper guidance, educational leadership and professional support? **[Link to the Analytical Tool on Financing]**
 |  |  |
| 1. How are provinces/regions/districts or other bodies at the local level held accountable for their performance and results?
 |  |  |
| **Governance at the national level** |
| 1. How do different actors/stakeholders participate in the policymaking process? Are there any evidence suggesting that there is a strong national ownership of and commitment to policies and programs for improvement of education quality?
 |  |  |
| 1. How effective have various levels of governance been in discharging the roles and responsibilities entrusted to them? Have we done a review of our education governance? What lessons can we draw on the balance between centralization and decentralization of education governance? **[Link to Analytical Tool** on **financing]**
 |  |  |
| 1. Have we adequate national capacity to translate policies and strategies into plans and programs?How do we know that the plans and programs are implemented effectively?
 |  |  |
| 1. What coordination mechanisms exist between the central and decentralized bodies to ensure the delivery of quality education? What is the extent of information sharing, consultation and joint work with various line ministries and other key stakeholders? **[Example of good practice from China on literacy coordination, Promising Practice XII.4]**
 |  |  |
| 1. What mechanisms are in place to hold public officials and service providers accountable for results? How have we ensured that the accountability system takes account of quality and equity objectives? Has the media been effective in enhancing transparency and accountability in the education sector**? [Example of good practice from Brazil on the use of report card to improve school accountability, Promising Practice XII.5]**
 |  |  |
| **Monitoring and evaluation** |
| 1. What are the mechanisms and processes that exist in the country for quality assurance***[[1]](#footnote-1)*** of different types and levels of education?Are there structures with a clear mandate for promoting quality?What aspects of quality learning form the objects of monitoring and evaluation? ***[Link to* Analytical Tools on** ***curriculum, teacher training, assessment, financing]*** How effective are these structures in assuring quality? What is the evidence of their effectiveness?
 |  |  |
| 1. How effective is the existing regulatory framework in in ensuring that education institutions in the non-state sector satisfy required minimum quality standard and deliver value for money to the learners? **[**Example of a good practice from Pakistan in regulating non-public schools for quality education, **Promising Practice XII.6] [Link to Analytical Tool** on **financing]**
 |  |  |
| 1. How far does the existing system provide accurate and up-to-date information about the functioning of the education system? Does the information system provide data on instruction and learning, examination results? What other indicators are used to refer to quality? Is information readily accessible to decision-makers/managers at different levels? Is there evidence that policymakers use the data and the analysis in their decision? **[Link to assessment toolkit] [**Example of a good practice from New Zealand on school review that generates information on the performance of education institutions which is widely disseminated to the concerned stakeholders, **Promising Practice XII.7]**
 |  |  |

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 (Governance)** |
| 1. What are the key areas to be addressed urgently to further develop our governance system in the education sector to achieve quality education?
 |  |
| 1. What are the knowledge gaps which need to be filled for an evidence-based reform on the system of education governance?
 |  |
| 1. What are the required actions to deal with the priority constraints and the identified knowledge gaps?
 |  |

**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: Governance** |
| 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
 |  |

1. The concept of quality assurance is elaborated in Technical Note # 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)