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

**Analytic Tool, Teaching**

**Paramount Question:**  **Do our teaching processes facilitate or impede the attainment of quality education and effective learning experiences for all our learners?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| **Understanding an effective teaching process** | | |
| 1. What is our operational understanding of effective or quality teaching? Who defines this understanding? What is the role of research and innovation in determining our operational definition of effective or quality teaching? Where is the evidence that our evidence is informed by research and innovation? How is this understanding documented and shared? Where is the evidence of it being shared? How does this understanding take into account the diversity of our education settings, learners and teachers as significant factors in our definition of quality/effective teaching? |  |  |
| 1. How do we collect information on core teaching methods **[Technical note VI.2, different teaching methods]** and repertoires used in our general education system? How are these repertoires selected? How effective are they in facilitating learning effectiveness and the acquisition of desired competencies? What is the evidence of their effectiveness? |  |  |
| **Equity and effective teaching** | | |
| 1. How do we ensure that all learners in our general education system are exposed to effective teaching as we operationally define it? Where is the evidence of equitable exposure to effective teaching? Where there is inequity, what are our available remedial measures? Where is evidence that these measures work? How do we track the differentiated impact of effective teaching for diverse learners? What dimensions of diversity do we use to track differentiated impact? |  |  |
| **Monitoring and supporting teaching** | | |
| 1. What mechanisms do we have for identifying and documenting ineffective teaching?? Once identified, what remedial actions do we employ? How regularized and/or institutionalized are these remedial measures? How effective are these measures in supporting effective teaching? Where is the evidence that they work? |  |  |
| 1. Who evaluates teaching? Who are the involved stakeholders? How are stakeholders who evaluate teaching selected? Are learners, parents and teachers part of these stakeholders? How effective is stakeholder participation? Where is the evidence of this effectiveness? How do we use feedback from the assessment of teaching effectiveness? Where is the evidence of this use? What impact has this use had? Where is the evidence of the impact? |  |  |
| 1. How are outcomes from national, regional and international assessments utilized in our evaluation of the teaching process? |  |  |
| 1. How do we support and incentivize effective teaching? How do we sustain effective teaching? **[Technical note VI.3, pedagogical freedom or prescriptive curriculum]** |  |  |
| **Conditions for teaching** | | |
| 1. How do we operationally define environments that support and/or induce effective teaching as we operationally define it? What are the levels of these environments? What are the key features of these environments? What are the most impactful features? How do they manifest across the diverse contexts of our general education system? Where is the evidence of the impact of these environments and/or their specific elements across specific contexts? **[Link to the Analytical Tool on learning environment]** |  |  |
| 1. To what extent and how are ICTs being integrated in teaching and learning to achieve desired learning outcomes? Do we know if the introduction of ICTs has improved teaching effectiveness as we operationally define it? Where is the evidence of this improvement? |  |  |

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 (Teaching)** | |
| 1. What particular strengths do we have to achieve our goals with regard to effective teaching? What are the problem areas hindering effective teaching? |  |
| 1. What are the changes we need to consider to further improve the outcome of the teaching process? What other key areas beyond the classroom need to be integrated in our reform and improvement plans? |  |
| 1. What are the knowledge gaps which need to be filled for an evidence-based policy and strategy to improve teaching in our schools to achieve the goal of quality education for all? |  |
| 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: Teaching** | |
| 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 |  |