



DATA AND EVIDENCE FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS (DEEP)

Mapping of Systems Diagnostic and Assessment Tools and
Approaches

Submitted: June, 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“This study/report/publication is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this study/report/publication are the sole responsibility of EnCompass LLC and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.”

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CIFF	Child's Investment Fund Foundation
DEEP	Data and Evidence for Education Programs
DFID	Department for International Development
ECCN	Education in Conflict and Crisis Network
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EGMA	Early Grade Mathematics Assessment
EGRA	Early Grade Reading Assessment
ESA	Education Sector Analysis
ESP	Education Sector Plan
GEFAQ	General Education Quality Analysis Framework
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
LAMI	Literacy Assessment for Multilingual Instruction
LLA	Literacy Landscape Assessment
MoE	Ministry of Education
PSDP	Priority-Setting and Decision Protocol
PSPPD	Programme to Support Pro-poor Policy Development
RERA	Rapid Education and Risk Analysis
RESEP	Research on Socio-Economic Policy
RISE	Research on Improving Systems of Education
SABER	Systems Approach for Better Education Results
SI	Social Impact
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WSR	Whole System in the Room

BACKGROUND

Since the beginning of the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) engagement in supporting education development globally, education sector assessments have been used by USAID Missions as a primary tool for understanding the key issues in the sector, including education access, measures of quality and relevant aspects of the regulatory framework. Under 2011 USAID Education Strategy, education sector assessments started to include standardized learning assessments, such as Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA). Data from these assessments significantly enhanced the value of education sector assessments by providing concrete data on education quality at primary grade level for the system overall as well as for specific geographic areas and/or population subgroups. In the majority of countries these assessments provided the first ever objective snapshot of student achievement in reading and math in primary grades. Similarly, in youth development programming, USAID Missions rely on assessments of labor market, youth-related policies and context-specific political dynamics to inform youth workforce development and civic engagement activities.

USAID is not the only donor agency currently working to improve methods and tools used in sector assessments and diagnostics in the education sector. In fact, all major donors are engaged in similar efforts. For example, the World Bank has recently developed a new diagnostic approach that builds on their Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) diagnostic. DFID is funding pilots of five different approaches to education system diagnostic, including an expert-led diagnostic approach under Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE). The UN agencies supported the development of a range of system assessment tools and methods aimed to assess specific elements of the education system. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation that recently launched their first education research portfolio is very interested in supporting assessment and diagnostic efforts, as well. In June, DFID is hosting its annual RISE conference during which Gates Foundation is partnering with USAID to convene a workshop on a review of existing and nascent approaches to education system assessments and diagnostics. During this workshop which will take place in Washington, DC on June 18th, we will convene all key actors involved in education system/sector assessment/diagnostic, to identify areas of overlap as well as gaps, and advance donor collaboration and assessment data sharing agreements.

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this document is to provide a reference that can inform discussion on existing and nascent approaches to education system diagnostics. This document contains a series of briefs, representing 14 separate tools and approaches that were designed to:

- 1) Generate better understanding of the state of the education sector and systems
- 2) Diagnose gaps and constraints that play a role in sub-optimal access and learning outcomes
- 3) Identify and prioritize interventions to improve access and learning outcomes

Each brief contains responses to fifteen questions, which cover the following characteristics: development/ implementation status, objectives, boundary/scope, and nature of implementation.

It is our hope that these briefs will serve as a useful reference during your discussion on systems diagnostics.

USAID LLA LITERACY LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	LLA Literacy Landscape Assessment
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	USAID Global Reading Network
Who is the point of contact?	Eirini Gouleta (egouleta@usaid.gov) Melissa Chiappetta (mchiappetta@usaid.gov)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	In development – Pilot-ready draft anticipated by the end of July
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool in its current state has not been piloted yet. However, the first draft of the tool (Literacy Assessment for Multilingual Instruction - LAMI). was developed and piloted in Morocco by Eirini Gouleta in collaboration with Mission Staff and Social Impact (SI). Lessons learned from LAMI have informed the development of LLA. LLA will be piloted in the future.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Toolkit; however, the annex will contain actual instruments that can be adapted to different contexts and countries. The annex will also describe the LLA analysis approach.
What was the stated objective?	LLA's objective is to identify gaps in the system that create barriers to learning. The current focus of LLA is to understand the specific context for which the intervention is planned for and to help develop a theory of change and activities that are contextually appropriate. By identifying gaps and aligning them with ministry's and USAID's objectives, LLA will help USAID prioritize where and how to intervene and will provide an understanding of what other donors and partners are doing to strengthen the country's journey to self-reliance. LLA's political economy, which maps different donor's strategic country objectives, can inform how USAID could partner with other donors address those gaps.
Who is expected to implement?	USAID would contract with an implementing partner or evaluation firm. The LLA could be carried out in advance of an implementation project to inform project design. Alternatively, it could be carried out by an implementation firm to identify needed changes in their existing project design.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Local government, USAID Mission, implementing partner
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The LLA tools are focused on but not ‘bounded’ by the education sector. However, there are factors that impact student access to and performance in school that occur outside the education sector (e.g., health and nutrition). If the LLA indicates these factors are creating barriers to education objectives, LLA staff will seek input from colleagues in other sectors, but LLA will not expand to an assessment of those sectors.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	The first pilot of the LLA in the form of LAMI in Morocco was initially designed to be brief and carried out and finalized in three to four months. However, practice showed that this was not possible and the pilot from the start to the report of the results took a year. Estimates on duration need to range between six months to one year. Cost and duration will depend on whether secondary data from student assessment, teacher interviews, and classroom observations, etc. are already available.
What will the end product look like?	A detailed report with recommendations. The report will include data visualizations (i.e., a network analysis or systems map) that shows where things are working well and where barriers exist.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	LLA consists of a guide book and a workbook. The guide book is a Word file that takes users through a systematic approach to gathering contextual information about a country or region’s literacy landscape. It does this at three levels/environments: (1) the education system level (policies and plans, standards—what is supposed to be happening), (2) the learning environment (schools, formal and non-formal—this looks at what is actually happening), and (3) the home and community environment—how families and communities support literacy. The workbook is an excel sheet where users input the data they have gathered. The workbook provides 1 templates for qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. The heart of the workbook is a table of evidence-based standards and corresponding guiding questions.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	LLA is a flexible tool that provides information needed to inform both evidence-based and context-specific project designs. LLA allows researchers to explore and identify the diversity of contexts that are present within a single country.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, you will need a team of senior evaluators who also have a deep understanding of the education sector, be multiculturally aware and competent. LLA must be adapted for each country; it is not a ‘canned’ approach.

LABOR MARKET ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Key Approaches to Labor Market Assessment
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Workforce connections – FHI 360 is the implementer and USAID the funder
Who is the point of contact?	Nancy Taggart (Nataggart@usaid.gov) Olga Merchan (Omerchan@usaid.gov)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Piloted in Latin America and used in Kenya, Zimbabwe, Indonesia, Guatemala, Honduras, and Jamaica (http://www.wfconnections.org/tags/lma_finding).
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Toolkit that encompasses approaches and tools
What was the stated objective?	Designed to inform new USAID activity designs and identify needed shifts or adjustments in the implementation of existing activities whose goal is workforce development
Who is expected to implement?	USAID would contract with an implementing partner or research firm. This could be carried out in advance of an implementation project to inform the design of the implementation. Alternatively, it could be carried out by an implementation firm to identify needed changes in their program design.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	USAID missions, other donors, local government, implementing partners
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The toolkit explores the entire “workforce development” system and is cross-sectoral

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	Normally this takes 1.5–5 months to implement. However, the duration can vary depending on the scope. For a rapid single industry assessment, this could be completed in 6 weeks. For a multi-region, multi-industry assessment it could take 8–10 months.
What will the end product look like?	A report that includes recommendations with analysis of the different promising for these industries necessary services and support to growth sectors, and other interventions that may be needed to strengthen the labor market.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	A user-friendly six module framework for conducting a comprehensive, actionable, quantitative, and qualitative analysis of the labor market. The modules taken together ([1] economic context, [2] demand for skills, [3] supply of skills, [4] systems and stakeholders, [5] policy, [6] alignment) map out the counters of labor supply and demand and help users identify interventions needed to address any labor market misalignment and improve function.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	This is much more comprehensive than other approaches and it provides more of an emphasis on skills. It is flexible and can be adapted for use in formal as well as informal labor.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, you will need a team of senior evaluators, labor market experts, economists, and research assistants. Students or youth can also support this assessment by collecting grassroots data from students and youth.

RAPID EDUCATION AND RISK ANALYSIS (RERA) TOOLKIT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Rapid Education and Risk Analysis (RERA)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Commissioned and reviewed by USAID; Written by Education in Conflict and Crisis Network (ECCN)
Who is the point of contact?	Ashley Henderson (ahenderson@usaid.gov)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Field pilots conducted in Mali (Education Development Center), El Salvador (ECCN), and Afghanistan (Creative Associates International)
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Toolkit
What was the stated objective?	<p>A RERA is a situation analysis that examines the education sector, learners, and their communities as a dynamic system of multiple contextual risks and assets. It investigates how contextual risks, such as violence, insecurity, natural hazards, and health pandemics, impact education; how education influences these risks; and how these risks influence each other. The central focus of this analysis is the school community and its sources of resilience. The purpose of the RERA Toolkit is to guide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID education staff on procuring and overseeing RERA implementation 2. Implementing partners on implementing a RERA
Who is expected to implement?	Primary toolkit users: A RERA is conducted by USAID implementing partners in close collaboration with USAID education staff who lead the procurement and management of a RERA. Secondary toolkit users: national governments, other USAID staff, and USAID implementing partners, external partners, and civil society.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The procuring USAID mission, neighboring USAID missions, regional bureaus, and relevant sectoral and thematic USAID Washington offices, the Ministry of Education, and other relevant country-level partners.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	Integrated assessment of both the education sector and contextual risks
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	The total time and costs required to undertake a RERA will vary by context and need. However, it is generally estimated that field implementation of a RERA lasts approximately 2 to 3 weeks and that the entire RERA process can be completed within 4 months. If a RERA involves no fieldwork, it may take only 2 to 3 months. In any scenario, the RERA requires intentional tradeoffs between speed and rigor; therefore, it is important to explicitly document tradeoffs related to methodology, reporting, and stakeholder communications and engagement.
What will the end product look like?	Final report. The RERA final report must tell the story of how education in a given country is interacting with its complex, high-risk context. The report should be no longer than 25 pages in length, not including annexes.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	A RERA is a “good enough” situation analysis of the education sector, learners, and their communities as a dynamic system of relationships involving assets and multiple contextual risks. A RERA in particular investigates how risks impact the school community, how education influences risks, and how contextual risks influence each other. Similarly, a RERA illuminates cross-sectoral dependencies and opportunities to support school community resilience. A RERA ultimately informs USAID strategy and programming.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	A RERA is unique in that it integrates key methodological elements of a rapid education needs assessment and contextual risk analyses, such as conflict analysis, disaster risk assessment, and resilience analysis. A RERA employs an in-depth desk review, and if needed, primary qualitative data collection, and analysis to examine the two-way relationship between contextual risks and the education sector.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes. The toolkit recommends a professional RERA team with appropriate technical and functional areas of expertise including data collection and analysis and education and risk expertise. The toolkit includes a summary of the recommended RERA team composition, experience, and skills.

USAID EDUCATION SECTOR ASSESSMENTS

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	USAID Education Sector Assessments
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	USAID
Who is the point of contact?	N/A
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	These assessments do not follow a formalized process or guidance
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	N/A
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	An approach
What was the stated objective?	The objectives range but typically include an examination of conditions of the education sector or sub-sector and identification of key challenges and issues
Who is expected to implement?	USAID commissions private companies with relevant expertise to conduct these assessments
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	USAID uses findings to inform project and activity design
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The approach is highly flexible and can address the entire sector or specific sub-sectors
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	Varies depending on the scope

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What will the end product look like?	A comprehensive, lengthy report with recommendations
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	It typically addresses questions relating to the entire education sector or a sub-sector (such as primary grade reading) using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative methods typically include key informant interviews and stakeholder consultations. Quantitative data sources include Educational Management Information Systems (EMIS), national education statistics, and standardized assessments. Assessment teams triangulate data from different sources to answer assessment questions.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The approach is highly flexible and based on good practices in social science research. The major shortcomings of the approach are that assessment teams do not always have local knowledge, do not possess in-depth understanding of institutional or political constraints, and are constrained by available information.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, relatively high

USAID/DFID EDUCATION SYSTEM DIAGNOSTIC APPROACH

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	USAID/DFID Education System Diagnostic
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creators: FHI360 (“the Whole System in the Room, or WSR” approach) and John Hopkins University (“Participatory Systems Mapping” approach) Funding agencies: USAID and DFID
Who is the point of contact?	Laura Savage (l-savage@dfid.gov.uk) Tjip Walker (stwalker@usaid.gov) Elena Walls (ewalls@usaid.gov)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	In pilot
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	N/A
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	An approach
What was the stated objective?	The participatory diagnostic process is designed to support three objectives: (1) achieve a shared understanding with local stakeholders regarding country-led investment priorities, and identify points of leverage and opportunities for targeted donor investment; (2) form partnerships with government, private sector, faith-based, and community organizations in support of donor investments; and (3) obtain government commitment on making necessary policy, regulatory, budgetary, and other pertinent decisions relating to donor investments.
Who is expected to implement?	Trained contractors
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Donors, in collaboration with governments and other stakeholders (i.e., private sector). Information from the participatory mapping will be used to inform donor funding decisions, government policy/budget decisions, intervention selection decisions, partnerships, and communication with internal and external stakeholders

QUESTION	RESPONSE
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	Whole or part of the education system
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	\$100,000–500,000, depending on the objectives and scope
What will the end product look like?	A report with a description of an agreed-upon understanding of the gaps in the education system that negatively affect learning outcomes, and a concrete plan for addressing them with shared responsibilities by the donors, government, and other stakeholders.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	<p>Step 1: Review secondary data with a focus on learning outcomes and marginalized groups.</p> <p>Step 2: Identify and involve relevant stakeholders; conduct a participatory process of system diagnostic to establish leverage points and opportunities for impact.</p> <p>Step 3: Match information on priorities, leverage points and opportunities with interventions that will most likely produce sustainable results. Negotiate commitments by stakeholders.</p>
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	It is highly participatory and inclusive; quick and relatively inexpensive to implement.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	TBD—the approach is still in pilot.

IDENTIFYING BINDING CONSTRAINTS IN EDUCATION REPORT

QUESTION	RESULTS/FINDINGS
Name of the tool/approach/method	Report title: <i>Identifying Binding Constraints in Education</i>
Creator and the funding agency (if different)	Authors: Servaas van der Berg, Nicholas Spaull, Gabrielle Wills, Martin Gustafsson, and Janeli Kotzé Author affiliation: Research on Socio-Economic Policy (RESEP), Department of Economics, University of Stellenbosch Funding Agency: Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD), a collaboration between the European Union and the Presidency of the Republic of South Africa (including the Department of Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation)
Who is the point of contact?	Nick Spaull (nicspaull@gmail.com)
Current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/ summary of findings)	N/A (see next item)
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach or something else?	<i>Identifying Binding Constraints in Education: Synthesis Report for the Programme to Support Pro-poor Policy Development (PSPPD)</i> is a report synthesizing the outcomes of a large research program conducted by RESAP (University of Stellenbosch) in 2015/2016; it is not in of itself of tool or approach designed for replication, though it did involve substantial primary source research utilizing numerous data collection tools. The research program produced 8 journal articles, 6 working papers, and 12 policy briefs; the report reviewed here is a synthesis across these materials.
The stated objective	The report aims to bring these findings together and show how their varied diagnoses and proposals hang together and provide a coherent portrait of the challenges in the education system as well as viable solutions.
Who is expected to implement	N/A
Who will be using the resulting information and how	N/A

QUESTION	RESULTS/FINDINGS
How the tool/method/approach is bounded: does it address the entire system, only education sector, only part of the education system, or can be adapted to any of the above?	<p>The research program focuses on the education sector, with a specific focus on learning to read in grades 1-3 (Foundational Phase). The report explains the focus by noting that all subjects in the South African curriculum from grade 4 on assume a child knows how to read.</p> <p>While the report applies the binding constraints diagnostic approach to analyze and explain early grade literacy outcomes, the theoretical approach represented by the binding constraints model in research and policy responses could be applied to any set of challenges in the education sector; i.e., it could be applied to sub-sectors beyond early grade literacy. As noted on pages 5-6, the research program's focus on literacy is based on current challenges and priorities in South Africa: "Irrespective of the subject, the South African curriculum assumes that children have learned how to read by the end of grade 3, an assumption that is not supported by the evidence. Most South African children are not acquiring the most basic reading skills (in any language). Consequently, the report makes a strong recommendation that the central focus of the South African educational administration should be the following goal: 'Every child must learn to read for meaning by the end of grade 3.'"</p>
The level of effort to implement (duration, \$\$ to implement)	The overall cost of the research project was approximately \$100,000 over 1-2 years.
What the end product looks like	Research report synthesizing multiple studies
Brief description of the approach/tool/method	<p>The binding constraints approach holds that some problems are so severe, they must be solved first. This stance is informed by one of the two foundational conceptual approaches of the research program, which is that prioritization is necessary given limited government resources.</p> <p>The binding constraints are identified by a comprehensive review of the literature and conducting new research on areas where literature was lacking. During initial stages of research, constraints are "candidate constraints", which are further differentiated into between binding constraints and other constraints. Other constraints are those with their roots in a binding constraint; scenario analysis can aid differentiation.</p>
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives	It is not a standalone tool, but rather a conceptual framework (the "binding constraints approach") and a synthesis report
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes – requires a team of academics to conduct initial research and subsequently to synthesize findings

EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS (ESA)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Education Sector Analysis
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Volume 1 (6 sector-wide and core chapters): UNESCO-IIEP, World Bank, UNICEF, GPE, Univ. of Burgundy Volume 2 (4 sub-sector chapters): UNESCO-IIEP, World Bank, UNICEF, GPE Volume 3 (4 thematic and 'system' chapters): UNESCO-IIEP, UNICEF, DfID, GPE
Who is the point of contact?	ESA: Beifith Kouak (b.kouak-tiyab@poledakar.iiep.unesco.org), Matt Brossard (mbrossard@unicef.org), Raphaelle Martinez (rmartinez3@globalpartnership.org) ESA – Risk Analysis chapter: Koffi Segniagbeto (k.segniagbeto@poledakar.iiep.unesco.org), Jean-Luc Yameogo (jlyameogo@unicef.org) ESA – Institutional Analysis chapter: Anton De Grauwe (a.de-grauwe@iiep.unesco.org) ESA – Stakeholder/Political Economy Analysis chapter: Joe Wales (J-Wales@dfid.gov.uk), Laura Savage (L-Savage@dfid.gov.uk)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Volume 1: Finalized and implemented in more than 70 countries since the early 2000s as part of efforts to support education sector plan (ESP) development Volume 2: Finalized and implemented in some countries (mainly in Africa) since the early 2010s. Chapters selected 'a la carte' depending on country context and priorities. Volume 3: Different chapters are in different stages (with inclusive education, risk and institutional analysis piloted and finalized and stakeholder/political economy analysis awaiting piloting); full volume 3 under copy editing/translation and translation by GPE)
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Volume 1 and 2 are implemented in many countries. Volume 3 components are being piloted: : (1) inclusive education is being piloted in Ghana;(2) risk analysis is being piloted as a specific chapter and a cross-cutting item in six countries (Chad, DRC, Cote d'Ivoire, Niger, Guinea Bissau, and South Sudan); (3) institutional capacity analysis was piloted in two countries and has been implemented in eight countries (Benin, Ethiopia, Vietnam, Tanzania Mainland, Zanzibar, Comoros, Chad, Madagascar, Haiti, and Guinea); (4) stakeholder mapping/political economy has not yet been piloted.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Each ESA chapter is a method accompanied by toolkits with methodological guidelines.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What was the stated objective?	<p>ESA's objective is two-fold: (1) to inform education system reform within the preparation of government-led education sector plans and their implementation, and (2) to strengthen governments' analytical capacity in the preparation of ESAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objective of the Volume 1 & 2 chapters is to analyze the education sector and sub-sectors and to provide quality-assured baseline data for policy dialogue • The objective of the Institutional Analysis Chapter is to assess the functioning and effectiveness of an educational administration with a focus on planning and management to develop a capacity strengthening program • The objective of the Political Economy Chapter is to analyze and address stakeholders' interests, accountability, and implementation gaps, and to serve as a bridge between ESA findings of other chapters and ESP formulation/implementation
Who is expected to implement?	<p>ESA chapters are generally designed to be implemented by government teams with technical support (when needed) from consultants, international organizations, or national research institutions/universities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutional Analysis Chapter has so far been implemented through a collaboration between a national team and a small team of international experts
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	<p>Government/Polymakers and their development partners (civil society) by using the findings for informing the development of ESPs and reform designs.</p>
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	<p>Volume 1: Sector-wide (across different levels of education; analysis of context, internal/external efficiency)</p> <p>Volume 2: Analysis of specific levels of education</p> <p>Volume 3: Thematic and 'system' chapters (institutional analysis, stakeholder analysis/political economy analysis, inclusive education for children with disabilities, risk/vulnerability analysis)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutional Analysis Chapter focuses on educational administration, which covers all ministries involved in education and all levels (from central to local but not the school level). It examines the relations between the education administration and its national/international partners.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	<p>Varies across countries and selected areas of analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of person-days required for each chapter ranges from 15–35 days • Note that GPE funding for supporting a country-specific ESA is usually \$250K • Note that the Institutional Analysis Chapter may take 4–8 months with a total cost of \$80–120K
What will the end product look like?	A report

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	<p>Each ESA chapter includes a conceptual analytical framework with research questions, methodologies for the analysis (including common data sources), and country examples in applying the methodology and interpreting the findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutional Analysis Chapter focuses on four categories of factors (institutional, organizational, individual, and relational) with four sets of questions (official rules, actual practices, causes of differences between official rules and actual practices, and stakeholder perceptions). • The Political Economy/Stakeholder Analysis Chapter has four phases: (1) defining priority problems, (2) identifying immediate causes, (3) analyzing causal chains, and (4) applying stakeholder analysis. Tools used include the 5Ys process, stakeholder mapping (roles, incentives, accountability relationships), and coalition mapping.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	<p>ESA focuses on ministries' analytical capacity strengthening using a 'learning by doing' approach. The government leads the process with support as needed by an external support team.</p> <p>ESA triangulates data from different sources and provides quality-assured data to be used as baseline data in a financial simulation model, which is then used to support discussions on budgetary trade-offs for the ESP.</p> <p>The ESA Institutional Analysis Chapter and ESA Political Economy/Stakeholder Analysis Chapter build on the sectoral and sub-sectoral findings of other ESA chapters and focus on system-level issues (including political and technical actors).</p> <p>As part of the new GPE funding model, preparation of a sound ESA within the preceding 3 years is a requirement for eligibility to funding.</p>
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	<p>Varies across chapters. Guideline chapters provide step-by-step instructions, but external support may be needed where government capacity is lower or where the chapter requires more technical analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Analysis Chapter: Analytical framework is fairly straightforward, but data collection requires a mastery of qualitative research methods • Political Economy/Stakeholder Analysis Chapter: Data collection requires a mastery of qualitative research methods and data analysis requires a thorough understanding of the country context

RESEARCH ON IMPROVING SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION (RISE) FRAMEWORK

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	System Diagnostics Framework
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creator: Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE) Funder: DfID
Who is the point of contact?	Lant Pritchett (lant.hks@gmail.com)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	An original analytical framework was developed and diagnostic exercises were carried out in several countries (not an official piloting). A new system diagnostics framework based on this original version is currently being developed.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Based on the original analytical framework, a diagnostic exercise was carried out in Ethiopia, Tanzania, Vietnam, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	RISE's original system diagnostics is an analytical framework capturing actors and the nature of accountability relationships across these actors. It builds on an existing descriptive toolkit (SABER) and introduces systemic and diagnostic dimensions into the analysis.
What was the stated objective?	RISE's diagnostics framework contributes to the achievement of some RISE Programme aims, including (1) describing and understanding how education systems function and (2) generating explanations for why reforms succeed or fail.
Who is expected to implement?	To be determined (as it is still under development), but it is likely to be researchers/experts given that the original framework was designed and implemented by researchers.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	To be determined (as it is still under development), but it is likely to be donors and external development partners.
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The original diagnostic framework addresses the entire system but with a focus on basic education (with actors ranging from parents/children to state/politicians) but it could be applied to other parts of the education system also (such as ECE or TVET).

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	To be determined (as it is still under development) but it is likely to vary across countries and composition of the research team
What will the end product look like?	To be determined (as it is still under development) but the end product of the original diagnostic framework was a report
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The original diagnostic framework captures actors in the systems of basic education and the nature of the accountability relationships across these actors. The framework is based on a principal-agent model and identifies four design elements vis-a-vis accountability relationships: (1) Delegation, (2) Finance, (3) Information, and (4) Motivation. The principal-agent relationships captured in the framework are (1) Politics (from citizens to state/politicians), (2) Compact (from state to organizations), (3) Management (from organizations to front-line providers), and (4) Voice (from service recipients to organizations/front-Line Providers).
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	RISE's original diagnostic framework diverges notably from sectoral frameworks informed by policies and inputs. Instead, it marries principal-agent theory with political economy of education with a focus on accountability relations. The hypothesis underlying the framework is that systems of education work well when (1) there is an adequate flow of accountability in the system and (2) this flow is not characterized by debilitating incoherence.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	To be determined (as it is still under development) but the original diagnostic framework requires a solid understanding of the accountability relationships in a given country and an ability to analyze data with a relatively complex analytical framework.

PRIORITY SETTING AND DECISION PROTOCOL (PSDP)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Priority-Setting and Decision Protocol (PsDP)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creator: The World Bank Funding Agency: DfID and Gates Foundation
Who is the point of contact?	Joao Pedro Wagner de Azevedo (jazevedo@worldbank.com)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Piloting ongoing
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Piloting ongoing
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	PsDP is an approach
What was the stated objective?	PsDP's objective is to identify the most binding constraints in the education system and possible impactful solutions.
Who is expected to implement?	The approach is designed “for those who are trying to strengthen education systems, whether they are government officials, operational staff from the World Bank and development partners, and other education stakeholders.” The piloting of the protocol has so far been carried out by World Bank experts.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Policy makers, task teams from the World Bank Group, and other development partners are expected to use the resulting information in identifying impactful solutions to binding constraints in the education system.
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The PsDP approach focuses on the education sector (including political, capacity, technical dimensions) but the methodology could potentially be adapted to different levels (from sub-system to entire-system).

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	A few weeks
What will the end product look like?	Main end product: A short note and a presentation of diagnostic research and insights Other products: An exploration report on the general challenges; collection of interactive dashboards
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The approach is rooted in systems and design thinking, combining three features: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Behavioral compact mapping that accounts for the divergent goals, incentives, behaviors, and relationships between actors, and the system feedback loops these generate 2. Feasibility analysis of political feasibility and management capability 3. Pragmatism so the output lays out a clear prioritization of issues and links them to possible solutions and milestones of progress PsDP involves three steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diagnosis – Identify factors more likely to operate as binding constraints in expert clinics 2. What Works – Map potential policy actions that could unlock these constraints and the political, behavioral, and capability requirements to effectively act on these policy actions in expert clinics 3. Analysis and Prioritization – Decide on a list of priority policies in expert clinics and flesh out their implementation to elicit and sustain behavioral change and alignment of stakeholders
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	PsDP is explicitly rooted in systems and design thinking and is defined by pragmatism and feasibility. It bridges the path from data and indicators → diagnosis → priorities and policy decisions
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes. It requires a team of experts to organize background materials for and facilitate the expert clinics. It also requires experts to attend and actively participate in the clinics.

SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR BETTER EDUCATION RESULTS (SABER) & SABER 2.0

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) and SABER 2.0
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creator: The World Bank Funding Agency: The World Bank and its development partners
Who is the point of contact?	N/A
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	SABER has a focus on policy and institutional frameworks and was launched in 2011. (Note that SABER is designed with a “phased development approach” and so continues expanding with new policy domains added and existing ones regularly updated.) SABER 2.0 has a focus on policy implementation and service delivery. Different components have been under development, review, and piloting since 2017. (Note that SABER 2.0 includes additional diagnostic tools on service delivery [SABER SD], on teacher practices in the classroom [TEACH], on teacher development programs [ITTSI], as well as an Education System Snapshot to understand the core drivers of education system performance. SABER SD and TEACH have been finalized.)
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	More than 200 country reports in specific policy domains have been produced in more than 130 countries since SABER’s launch in 2011. SABER SD has been piloted in the Punjab province of Pakistan, Laos, and Afghanistan in 2017. TEACH has been piloted in the Punjab province of Pakistan, the Philippines, Uruguay, China, Tanzania, Afghanistan, and Vietnam.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	SABER is an approach to analyzing education policy domains with detailed data collection and analysis tools. SABER 2.0 is an approach to analyzing policy implementation and service delivery with detailed data collection tools.
What was the stated objective?	SABER’s aim is “to give all parties with a stake in educational results a detailed, objective, up-to-date, easy-to-understand snapshot of how well their country’s education system is oriented toward delivering learning, based on measures that can be easily compared across education systems around the world.”
Who is expected to implement?	The approach is designed “for those who are trying to strengthen education systems, whether they are government officials, operational staff from the World Bank and development partners, and other education stakeholders.” The country reports written using SABER have been predominantly prepared by experts from the World Bank Group.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Primary users: The World Bank, governments Secondary users: Development partners, civil society, researchers
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	SABER covers a range of education policy domains that span the breadth of the education system at all stages of education (early childhood development, primary and secondary, workforce development, tertiary). SABER focuses on quality of policies and institutions, and not on quality of policy implementation or the education services delivered. SABER 2.0 builds on SABER and focuses on policy implementation and service delivery.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	The total time required to undertake data collection and analysis will vary by country and policy domain as well as the preferred data collection approach (interviews vs. workshop). More generally, SABER is designed to be carried out relatively quickly. Similarly, it is designed to be cost-effective. With a focus on the policy and institutional framework, and with the fixed costs of developing the framework and instruments already financed, conducting SABER in a given country requires only the marginal cost of gathering and analyzing the data and preparing the report. These costs vary by country and domain, yet it is suggested that the cost is typically much less than that of a typical sector study by the World Bank. Countries choose to participate in SABER and choose the specific policy domains; the study is typically financed out of the funds from the country programs of the World Bank or other partners (i.e., AusAid, CIFF, JICA, DfID, UNICEF).
What will the end product look like?	Country report and the underlying data (both of which are publicly available)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	<p>SABER's policy domains include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Resources (finance, teachers, school health, and school feeding) 5. Governance (school autonomy and accountability, engaging the private sector) 6. Information (assessment, education management systems) 7. Complementary Inputs and Cross-Cutting Themes (information and communication technologies, equity and inclusion, resilience) <p>The typical model for data collection and analysis for a selected policy domain follows these steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Writing of a “What Matters” paper that identifies the elements of the policy and institutional framework that matter most for improving education outcomes 9. Identification of indicators of policy and institutional development, and data sources for each indicator to prepare a rubric on ratings of the country’s progress in each policy domain 10. Developing a data collection instrument for the indicators identified 11. Collecting policy information and data to fill out the data-collection instrument 12. Analyzing the data to assess how developed a country’s education policies and institutions are 13. Validating and discussing the analyses with government officials 14. Publishing the analysis and the underlying data <p>For SABER 2.0:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SABER SD collects data at the school level using six modules (school information, teacher and principal roster, governance-management-finance, classroom observation, student assessment, teacher assessment). 2. TEACH is an open source classroom observation tool intended to track and improve teaching quality. 3. ITTSI (under development) will document the design and implementation details of in-service teacher training programs. 4. Education System Snapshot Tool (being finalized) is a tool for holistically assessing the health of education systems across the following clusters: standards/norms, resources/expertise, delivery of services/instructions and management relationships, information/evidence/feedback, accountability/quality assurance, and governance/leadership.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	It allows for cross-country comparison—SABER’s evaluation of specific policy domains of an education system allows for a comparison with education systems in other countries. SABER uses a 4-point scale to this end (latent, emerging, established, advanced). SABER provides detailed generic rubrics and questionnaires to facilitate country-level evaluations.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes. SABER methodology indicates that the expert teams for each policy domain are to be “led by an experienced senior expert in the field from the World Bank Group, working with a dedicated team of colleagues.”

DELIVERY LABS

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Delivery Labs
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Performance Management and Delivery Unit (PEMANDU)
Who is the point of contact?	Robin Todd (Robin.Todd@camb-ed.com)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized. It was first used in 2009 in Malaysia and then rolled out in Tanzania (2013). Variants were also used in some South African provinces (2014), Ethiopia (2018), and St Lucia (2018).
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	It was not piloted
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	The purpose of Delivery Labs is to analyze the current delivery situation and root causes of issues within a priority sector or sub-sector, develop solutions and ideas, and produce a detailed implementation plan to achieve results.
Who is expected to implement?	Governments, in collaboration with a breadth of stakeholders and with the assistance of PEMANDU.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The resulting implementation plan will be used by governments and other stakeholders to deliver desired education results.
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	It addresses particular priorities within the education sector (or any sector as desired).
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	4–6 weeks to implement, likely with a high degree of resources

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What will the end product look like?	Final report, including analysis of the current delivery situations, sector or sub-sector priorities, and a detailed implementation plan.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	Delivery Labs brings together different participants from various agencies in a delivery system to work together in an intense and collaborative 6-week planning process to develop a detailed plan for implementing desired results.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	What sets Delivery Labs apart from other implementation planning methods is the intensity, duration, breadth, and seniority of stakeholder engagement in a meticulous and detailed planning process.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes—Delivery Labs needs to be facilitated by someone who has prior experience using it or similar participatory techniques.

GUJARAT SYSTEMS DIAGNOSTIC TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Gujarat Systems Diagnostic
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Central Square Foundation
Who is the point of contact?	Rahul Ahluwalia (rahul.a@centralsquarefoundation.org)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Review
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Applied in Gujarat State, India (not an official piloting; results not yet public)
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	The Gujarat Systems Diagnostic used a series of data collection tools tailored to this study and the Gujarat context.
What was the stated objective?	The objective of this systems diagnostic is to answer the research question, “Why is the Gujarat Education System delivering low levels of foundational learning?”
Who is expected to implement?	Central Square Foundation (an Indian non-profit organization focused on improving educational quality)
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Gujarat State Government, Department of Education
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The tools and research question are focused on the foundational level (grades 1–3), but broader questions within the tool and the diagnostic framework could be applied to other levels of the education system. The framework and tools address the entire system (with actors, including parents, teachers, schools, and administrative levels). A parallel initiative evaluated state-prescribed pedagogy in grades 1–2 and provided additional data for the overall diagnostic.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	For base diagnostic: Four team members for 3 months (including 6 weeks in field and 4 weeks for data analysis) For parallel evaluation of state-prescribed pedagogy in grades 1–2: Four months, including a survey agency for data collection and analysis. Unknown

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What will the end product look like?	Report/Presentation of findings
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	<p>The systems diagnostic was informed by several diagnostic frameworks, including the USAID 5Rs, <i>Doing Reform Differently</i> (Crouch and DeStefano 2017), the RISE principal-agent model, and the systems analysis framework presented in <i>Building State Capability</i> (Pritchett, Andrews, and Woolcock 2017). The preliminary results present a diagnostic framework derived from <i>Doing Reform Differently</i> to assist in interpreting results.</p> <p>Data collection tools reflected a range of methods, including interviews, observations (both document review and classroom observation), and learner assessments. Interview tools included open-ended qualitative questions intended to allow system actors to lead the direction of the diagnostic, as well as closed-ended questions to collect quantitative data related to educational inputs (teacher training, time on task, student attendance, etc.); the parallel assessment of state-prescribed pedagogy in grades 1–2 used a closed-ended (quantitative) teacher survey. Some qualitative tools were administered in focus group settings, while classroom observation included both structured and open-ended items. Learner assessments were based on modified versions of EGRA and EGMA using a census-based approach.</p>
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The tools reflect a hybrid of many widely-used approaches that are tailored to the Gujarat context, reflecting the needs of the system’s decision-makers.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Because this approach does not provide a “ready-made” toolkit, it requires the study team to possess skills in the following three areas: (1) an extensive background understanding of education systems and existing diagnostic frameworks and scholarship to draw on in tailoring the approach to the study’s focus; (2) strong facilitation skills to understand and guide various stakeholders through the diagnostic process; and (3) familiarity with standard research/evaluation methods in order to develop the data collection tools.

IIEP-UNESCO SCREENING TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Screening Tool
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
Who is the point of contact?	Hugues Moussy (h.moussy@iiep.unesco.org)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	The tool is still partly under development. It will be composed of a number of decision trees. So far, two trees have been completed and piloted: completion tree and learning tree. A third tree regarding equity is being finalized (due June 2019). Other trees might be developed in the future based on demand and needs.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool was piloted in Guyana in January 2019 during a 5-day policy dialogue workshop, which convened (1) national officers from various central level directorates of the Ministry of Education (MoE), (2) regional officers of the MoE, and (3) international organizations and civil society organizations. Two decision trees were used: 'low level of completion' and 'low level of learning outcomes'. IIEP staff led the work on the first tree, and the deputy director of the planning unit led the work on the second tree. The pilot demonstrated that the tool had achieved its main objective to be a didactic approach to articulate the findings of an education sector analysis (ESA) with the initial steps of policy formulation and education sector plan (ESP) development.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	<p>It can be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A tool</u>: The pre-filled decision trees are intended to orient education professionals and stakeholders through a range of possible explanatory factors of the challenges that have been identified in their education system on three major dimensions: equity, learning, and completion. • <u>A toolkit</u>: The decision trees are complemented by a number of short monographies on specific types of policies and interventions. These 'policy boxes' are accessible online and could be used separately from the trees themselves. • <u>An approach</u>: The overall objective of the tool is to engage and channel policy dialogue among various education stakeholders.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What was the stated objective?	<p>The general objective is to engage policy dialogue among a group of education professionals and stakeholders based on the results and findings of an ESA. It can be understood as a didactic approach, which articulates an ESA and the development process of an ESP. Specific objectives are threefold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channel the policy dialogue through a logical and rational causal chain that leads from challenges identified in an ESA to root causes that have to be addressed through specific strategies, policies, and interventions Base the policy dialogue on a set of evidence Help prioritize a limited number of potential interventions that will structure an ESP
Who is expected to implement?	<p>The screening tool is used in different working sessions, typically facilitated by UNESCO-IIEP staff. Officers from various subsectors concerned by the ESA and the future ESP design participate, as well as stakeholders selected by the national education administration. However, with appropriate and basic training, national officers are expected to use the tool, (1) as a technical exercise within a small working group (planners), and/or (2) as facilitators in broader sessions composed of various education stakeholders.</p>
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	<p>The resulting information is (1) disseminated and shared with all national officers and education stakeholders who participate in the policy dialogue to develop an ESP; and (2) used more specifically by planners in charge of developing the ESP, to shape strategies and engage in the formulation of potential policies and interventions.</p>
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	<p>In its current form, the tool is focused on basic education within the formal education sector. However, the plasticity of the approach makes it possible to develop more trees and policy boxes fitted for other levels of education.</p>
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	<p>According to country requests and needs, the level of effort to implement can be variable. However, the tool has been initially designed to be used during a short period of time (typically 3–5 days of working sessions) and with limited intervention from IIEP-UNESCO staff (USD 3,000–5,000).</p>

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What will the end product look like?	<p>The end product is a country memo, which documents the outputs of the working sessions, combining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pathways that have been identified as explaining the main policy issues to be addressed—these causal pathways can be converted into results chains for a potential results framework • The summary of the discussions and decisions taken during the working sessions, including key data points and rationale behind every point discussed • Different policy options to be researched further during the plan design phase, including bibliographical references for future research
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	<p>The screening tool is an offline PowerPoint application that allows a group of policymakers, planners, and managers to engage in a constructive dialogue around policy challenges, prioritizing issues to be dealt with as well as providing potential policy options for reflection in the ESP design phase. It focuses on specific thematic areas (trees): (1) completion and access, (2) learning outcomes, (3) equity (under finalization).</p>
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	<p>The screening tool is different in three ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is intended to be used at a specific and strategic stage of the policy/planning cycle, namely between the ESA and the ESP development phase • It also offers an approach (didactic) and a set of tools in a user-friendly way • It has been designed for a wide range of professionals/partners/stakeholders with different backgrounds (qualitative/quantitative, policy/research, planners/implementers) in the spirit of supporting and facilitating the policy dialogue around an easily accessible and comprehensible mapping of issues, factors, and constraints in which all actors can recognize their part
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	<p>The tool has been designed to be easy to handle and user-friendly, for example, by using a common software (PowerPoint). Technically, it requires a seasoned education specialist and/or senior planning official able to (1) engage in policy dialogue with various stakeholders, (2) make good use of results and findings from an ESA and channel a discussion based on evidence, (3) guide a range of education professionals toward agreeing on a limited number of initial priorities.</p>

GENERAL EDUCATION QUALITY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK (GEFAQ)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	General Education Quality Analysis Framework (GEQAF)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Developed by the UNESCO Secretariat in close cooperation and consultation with Ministries of Education, UNESCO Delegations and National Commissions of the People's Republic of China, Finland, Norway, the Republic of South Africa, and the United Arab Emirates
Who is the point of contact?	Mmantetsa Marope (m.marope@unesco.org)
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	To date, the GEQAF initiative has been undertaken by 12 UNESCO Member States
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Framework
What was the stated objective?	The project seeks to strengthen the capacity of Member States' education systems to equitably and sustainably provide quality education and effective learning opportunities by using the General Education Quality Analysis/Diagnosis Framework tools to identify systemic constraints and by designing and implementing responsive interventions. It seeks to facilitate national policy dialogue to analyze/diagnose and identify critical impediments that prevent Member States' general education systems to equitably and sustainably provide high-quality education and effective learning experiences to all learners.
Who is expected to implement?	Senior national policymakers, education planners, and practitioners who wish to improve the quality and equity of their general education system, facilitated by UNESCO IBE
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	It will be used by national policymakers, education planners, and practitioners to set priorities and use evidence to align education systems with development priorities. They will use the tool to strengthen both the qualitative and quantitative knowledge base required to effectively guide the design and implementation of responsive, targeted, and timely general education system quality improvement interventions.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	The national education system, structured around 15 elements
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	>\$100,000, cost and duration will depend on the type of intervention
What will the end product look like?	Nationally-produced priorities and plans
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The GEQAF is a set of diagnostic/analytical tools to guide Member States to undertake comprehensive analyses and diagnoses of their general education systems, identify critical impediments to equitable provision of quality education and learning effectiveness, and develop and implement interventions to redress the identified challenges.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The framework's main intended audience is UNESCO Member States. It speaks to in-country audiences specifically, mobilizing policy makers and system managers to undertake systemic analysis of impediments to equitable provision of quality education and learning effectiveness, and to develop and implement interventions that enhance education quality and learning effectiveness.
Does the tool require high capability to apply (from the person implementing)?	Medium capability and high national ownership required

CONCLUSION

The following observations can be taken from the above briefs:

- 1) Some assessments have been around for several years and have been piloted, codified, implemented in many countries, and expanded to cover more policy areas or system components through the years. Other tools/frameworks are new; they are currently being developed, piloted or finalized.
- 2) The assessments vary as to the extent to which they are descriptive (answering the question, “what is the state of education policies and outcomes?”), diagnostic (answering the question, “why do we see sub-optimal outcomes?”), and prescriptive (answering the question, “what can be done to improve outcomes?”). While some tools are purely descriptive, diagnostic or prescriptive, most tools have some combined elements of descriptive, diagnostic, and/or prescriptive. Several diagnostic and prescriptive tools/frameworks use and build upon existing descriptive tools/frameworks.
- 3) The assessments also vary with respect to their scope. Some tools/frameworks focus on sub-sectoral components or policy areas. Others try to look at the entire sector, while some others look beyond the sector to the wider political/economic/social contexts with their various actors, relationships, interests, values. Tools cover a range of sectors, from Basic Education, Early Childhood Development (ECD), Secondary, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), and Tertiary Education.
- 4) The current developers/users of the assessments include researchers, technical staff of international organizations, technical staff of national agencies, and national policymakers. The assessments also vary in terms of the temporal, human, and financial resources required for their implementation.

Together these assessments provide a wealth of experience and perspectives, and potential opportunities for learning from each other to identify areas of collaboration.