



DATA AND EVIDENCE FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS (DEEP)

Mapping of Education Systems Diagnostics

July, 2023

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

ACER	Australian Council for Educational Research
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
GEPD	Global Education Policy Dashboard
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
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
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
SAM	Student Achievement Monitoring
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 the 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 the 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 the 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 as the tools listed in this document demonstrate.

This Mapping was originally completed in 2019. The mapping was updated in 2023 with data collected by the author and data collected separately by the [Building Evidence in Education \(BE²\) working group](#). The briefs included in the main body of this document reflect all information available as of the most recent update. Tools for which updated data were not available, may be found in Annex I.

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this document is to provide a reference that can inform discussion on existing and nascent approaches to education system assessments and diagnostics. This document contains twenty updated summary briefs of key characteristics of systems strengthening assessments and diagnostics, and five briefs of earlier tools for which updated data were not available. Each brief contains responses to fifteen questions, which cover the following broad characteristics: development/ implementation, objectives, boundary/scope, and nature of implementation. These assessments were all designed to:

- Better understanding of the state of the education sector and systems
- Diagnosing gaps and constraints that play a role in sub-optimal access and learning outcomes
- Identifying and prioritizing interventions to improve access and learning outcomes
- It is our hope that these summaries will serve as a useful reference during your discussion on systems assessments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WITHIN THE SYSTEM	1
CORRUPTION-RISK ASSESSMENT/ INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT	4
EDUCATION MICROPLANNING TOOLKIT	6
EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS (ESA) TOOL.....	8
GENERAL EDUCATION QUALITY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK (GEFAQ).....	11
GLOBAL EDUCATION POLICY DASHBOARD (GEPD).....	13
GUIDELINES TO STRENGTHEN THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION IN NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS.....	15
IIEP-UNESCO SCREENING TOOL.....	17
LABOR MARKET ASSESSMENT TOOL.....	20
LEARNING ASSESSMENT DATA SPEAKS.....	22
PEER	24
PISA CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK.....	26
PRE-PRIMARY SUBSECTOR ANALYSIS TOOL	28
PRIMER FOR ENGAGING EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS IN POLICY REVIEWS.....	30
RAPID EDUCATION AND RISK ANALYSIS (RERA) TOOL.....	31
SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR BETTER EDUCATION RESULTS (SABER).....	33
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT MONITORING (SAM) TOOL.....	36
SURVEYS OF ENACTED CURRICULUM TOOLKIT	38
SYSTEM DIAGNOSTICS FRAMEWORK (RISE) TOOL.....	40
USAID EDUCATION SYSTEM DIAGNOSTIC TOOL.....	42
ANNEX I	45
<i>DELIVERY LABS</i>	45
<i>GUJARAT SYSTEMS DIAGNOSTIC TOOL</i>	47
<i>IDENTIFYING BINDING CONSTRAINTS IN EDUCATION REPORT</i>	49
<i>PRIORITY SETTING AND DECISION PROTOCOL (PSDP)</i>	52
<i>USAID EDUCATION SECTOR ASSESSMENT TOOL</i>	54

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WITHIN THE SYSTEM

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Analysis of educational quality management practices within the system - Methodological guide
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO – IIEP Funding Agency: AFD
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/publication/analysis-educational-quality-management-practices-methodological-guide English: https://dakar.iiep.unesco.org/sites/default/files/2022-02/MGuide_ENG-VSR_10_02.pdf French: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375435/PDF/375435fre.pdf.multi Resources: https://dakar.iiep.unesco.org/en/programs/support-basic-education-quality-management
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	A first version was finalized in 2020. It is currently being reviewed to add additional elements coming from the implementation of the tool in 4 additional countries (Burundi, Cameroun, Cote d'Ivoire and Togo). The new version expected for September 2023.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The guide was piloted in Burkina Faso, Madagascar, Niger, and Senegal. The whole guide has been applied in: Burundi and Togo. Part of this Guide has been applied in: Cameroun and Cote d'Ivoire.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Method with data collection toolkits
What was the stated objective?	The objective of this methodological guide is to inspire countries wishing to undertake an analysis of education quality management practices in order to install a culture of questioning contributing to the sustainable strengthening of management capacities in the education sector.

Who is expected to implement?	Any education actor who wants to analyze the efficacy of an education policy or intervention, with the following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Know why a policy/intervention have been adopted and what are the expected results • Know the relevance of the planned activities and their effective state of implementation • Assess the effect of the policy/intervention in order to develop with actors' improvement measures if necessary
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Education policy makers, education actors (including partners and funders) in charge of policy implementation. researchers, and education actors training institutions
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 the subsector and system levels.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	1-6 months are needed. The cost required depends on the type of policy or intervention analyzed and can range from approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 USD (including diagnostic, development and piloting of an intervention plan and proposition of a scaling up approach).
What will the end product look like?	Final report that provides a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of an education policy or intervention, along with an examination of the challenges faced by education stakeholders during its implementation. Additionally, the report formulates proposals specifically tailored to address these challenges within their respective contexts.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	This diagnostic tool allows us to get closer to the actors located at all levels of the education system (school and its community, decentralized units, central administration) to observe and describe their daily practices. It then questions with those actors to what extent these practices are relevant, coordinated between levels and among units of the same level, and to what extent these practices are aligned with the achievement of quality education. Based on the obstacles identified, the resources available and the specific context they are facing, actors are involved in the elaboration of concrete solutions that can help them improve their practices, so they become more effective. It is therefore a tool that fosters participation in identified obstacles to improved learning and develop solutions for a better policy implementation.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The tools do not make assumption on what should be done to improve education quality. The diagnostic is entirely conducted with education actors, in a participatory process. Solutions to identified obstacles are developed with actors primarily drawing from what they are already doing, and not from an external point of view. Solutions to identified obstacles are piloted and adjusted through field experimentation before being proposed for scaling up. The tool also provides insights into the organizational, sociocultural,

political, or other factors that tend to foster—or hamper—teamwork and cooperation at and across all levels.

Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?

Some expertise is required.

CORRUPTION-RISK ASSESSMENT/ INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Corruption-risk Assessment/ Integrity Assessment
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://etico.iiep.unesco.org/en/integrity-assessments
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Piloted by the OECD in partnership with IIEP UNESCO in Serbia The tool has been implemented in Ukraine, Kosovo, Guinea, and Georgia
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	To identify so called red flags and corruption risks in the education sector, reviewing different domains of educational planning and management.
Who is expected to implement?	A wide variety of actors can implement the tool provided public authorities agree to collaborate.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The primary target is Ministry of Education authorities (with a planning perspective).
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 tool can be used across the system, the education sector, or a subsector. It can focus on specific domains of educational planning and management, such as funding, staff management, procurement, or the organization of exams for instance.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	6-11 months are needed to implement. Time investment is quite high due to the wide variety of documents to be collected and analyzed, the diversity of people to be interviewed at several levels, etc. Reducing the scope of the work (for instance to 3 domains of planning/management) is more cost-effective approach.

What will the end product look like?	Final country reports, including a list of political and technical recommendations to improve transparency and accountability in the management of the education sector.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The tool collects and analyzes data on corruption risks and can provide information for local governments.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	It provides a general overview of the corruption risks prevailing in a given country per domain of educational planning and management. Other tools are required to collect more factual and in-depth information on each of those risks.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, a high level of expertise is required.

EDUCATION MICROPLANNING TOOLKIT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Education Microplanning Toolkit
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/tools-planning-2759
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	The toolkit ready for use. UNESCO welcomes comments and feedback from users on the usefulness of the information provided as well as any suggestions for improving the toolkit, including having additional modules on pertinent topics of common interest, so that the next edition will provide information and tools that fully meet the needs of stakeholders. This is a living document and updates will be made.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The toolkit was piloted in Mongolia
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Guidelines
What was the stated objective?	The Education Microplanning Toolkit is designed to support education planning at the local level, emphasizing four main aspects of planning and change: increasing access, improving learning outcomes, enhancing community participation and supporting open and informed decision making.
Who is expected to implement?	Community members, local actors including appointed officials and administrators at the school and district levels, school leaders, teachers, community groups, students, who could play the change agent role to enhance the delivery of educational services and to improve learning outcomes.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Local actors, in particular appointed officials and administrators at the school and district levels. They can follow the toolkit in the sequence presented, which follows the microplanning cycle, or read and follow a particular module, which is self-explanatory for their interest in a particular aspect.
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 is bounded to the community-level.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	There is no cost associated with the use of the tool. However, for the planning exercise, which is the focus of the toolkit, some costs should be foreseen for organizing meetings, training the local stakeholders and data collection, the level of which really depends on the local context. The tool may take between 1 to 6 months to implement.
What will the end product look like?	The toolkit can be found online. It is a living document which can be adapted and enriched according to the context and needs.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	A set of guidelines which includes slides, notes, and a manual on the right to education which can be used as a complementary tool.

What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The approach facilitates the connection between broad national policy objectives and local contexts, in particular the social and cultural factors of the communities where the school is located, in addressing the local challenges with, rather than to the community.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Some expertise is required.

EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS (ESA) TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Education Sector Analysis (ESA)
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
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.unicef.org/reports/education-sector-analysis
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?	<p>A report</p>

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. 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 a high level of expertise 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.

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
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/activity/general-education-quality-analysis-framework-geqaf-initiative
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)?	Implementation costs >\$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 a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Medium expertise and high national ownership are required

GLOBAL EDUCATION POLICY DASHBOARD (GEPD)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Global Education Policy Dashboard (GEPD)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	World Bank
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.educationpolicydashboard.org/ Blogs: https://blogs.worldbank.org/education/better-data-boosting-student-learning ; https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/brief/global-education-policy-dashboard
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized. Data is available for four education systems and will soon be released for three additional ones.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool has been applied in Peru, Rwanda, Jordan, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Pakistan, and is ongoing in Jordan, Chad, Gabon.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	The purpose of GEPD is to collect and analyze data which offers a strong basis for identifying priorities for investment and policy reforms that are suited to each country context.
Who is expected to implement?	This process is mostly led by a survey firm, with some readily available inputs from the WBG.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The tool highlights gaps between what the evidence suggests is effective in promoting learning and what is happening in practice in each system and allows governments to track progress as they take action to close those gaps.
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?	Samples of schools and public officials are representative at the system-level but focused on primary education, with strata for sub-sector of interest.

What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	1-6 months is needed for implementation. The GEPD draws on existing instruments but streamlines them by using only the pieces that are most relevant for measuring key determinants of learning. This streamlining, combined with the unified fieldwork operation, substantially cuts the cost of data collection while providing a comprehensive view of the system. Schools are visited for 1 day; Public officials are interviewed for 45 minutes, and policies are assessed through a legislative review and discussions with a few key stakeholders.
What will the end product look like?	Final report
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The Global Education Policy Dashboard (GEPD) uses 3 light instruments (School Survey, Policy Survey, and a Survey of Public Officials) to report on 39 indicators that, operationalizing the World Development Report 2018 framework, provide a snapshot of how well the education system promotes learning. Results offer a strong basis for identifying priorities for investment and policy reforms that are suited to each country context. It does so by (1) highlighting gaps between what the evidence suggests is effective in promoting learning and what is happening in practice in each system; and (2) allowing governments to track progress as they take action to close those gaps. The tool covers the domains of practices (what is happening in the schools, including the level learning in grade 4 and grade 1), de facto policies (how policies are understood and applied by school level actors), de jure policies (what policies, strategies, framework are in place), and the characteristics of the bureaucracy.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The tool covers the domains of practices (what is happening in the schools, including the level learning in grade 4 and grade 1), de facto policies (how policies are understood and applied by school level actors), de jure policies (what policies, strategies, framework are in place), and the characteristics of the bureaucracy.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise apply (from the person implementing)?	The tool requires some expertise for implementation. Implementation of the GEPD requires a good understanding of the survey instruments and protocols, a firm or agency to collect the data, analytical skills to run the codes and produce indicators and presentation.

GUIDELINES TO STRENGTHEN THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION IN NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Guidelines to Strengthen the Right to Education in National Frameworks
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO
Where can more information be found?	Guidelines: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375352 Blog: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidelines-strengthen-right-education-national-frameworks
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool has been used in Nepal, Haiti, Senegal, Mauritania, Tunisia, Niger, Palestine, Bahamas, Mozambique, Madagascar, Chile, Rep. of Congo, Burundi, Cameroon, and Mali.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Guidelines
What was the stated objective?	Through a hands-on approach, the Guidelines aim to assist countries and stakeholders wishing to assess the compatibility of national education legal and policy frameworks with international standard-setting instruments and SDG 4 commitments and further develop them to advance the right to education for all and leave no one behind.
Who is expected to implement?	These Guidelines may be used by all relevant actors, such as local education groups, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations, although they are primarily intended for ministries of education.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	National-level education stakeholders
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 guidelines are cross-sectoral
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	The cost is unclear; however, this may take between 1 month and 6 months to implement.
What will the end product look like?	Unknown
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	A set of guidelines which includes slides, notes, and a manual on the right to education which can be used as a complementary tool.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	These Guidelines aim to assist in the review of national education legal and policy frameworks in view of:

-
1. Developing practical knowledge on the right to education based on the [Right to education handbook](#) and supporting capacity development;
 2. Providing operational tools to assess the status of the right to education at country level and its compatibility with international and regional human rights obligations and international commitments (SDG 4);
 3. Identifying legal and policy gaps in education at country level and resulting challenges;
 4. Making recommendations for the full alignment of national constitutions, legislations and policies with international standards and provisions;
 5. Providing insights on how to implement the recommendations in view of necessary reforms.
-

Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)? Yes, a high level of expertise is required.

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)
Where can more information be found?	This tool is still under development. Public information is not yet published.
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"> • A tool: 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. • A toolkit: 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. • An approach: 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 a high level of expertise 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>

LABOR MARKET ASSESSMENT TOOL

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)?	Youth Power – FHI 360 is the implementer and USAID the funder
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.youthpower.org/key-approaches-labor-market-assessment-interactive-guide
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
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
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 a high level of expertise 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.
--	--

LEARNING ASSESSMENT DATA SPEAKS

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Learning Assessment Data Speaks
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.unesco.org/en/learning-assessments Dashboards: https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/unesco.assessments/viz/Learning_Assessment_Dashboard/DCover
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized, however the dashboards will require updates to data
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	There was no pilot. The tool was not designed to track country(ies) where it has been applied. The data dashboards are shared through the data visualization platform so any one/country can access, watch and download them.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	The tool is intended to make relevant knowledge and available evidence accessible and easy to use for policy makers and practitioners everywhere. Data visuals are free for download by the public.
Who is expected to implement?	UNESCO or data users
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Education stakeholders including learners, families, teachers, school administrators, service providers, local communities, policy makers. Depending on the needs, they can watch, review, customize or download the data visuals for use as is, or do a more tailor-made analysis with or without contextual data and information.
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 tool holds system-level data
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	Cost and time needed depend on context and needs
What will the end product look like?	Online data visualization platform (Tableau)
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The tool provides user-friendly and intuitive data visualization dashboards to support comparative understanding of country efforts in collecting and using large scale learning assessment data to monitor and improve all aspects of student learning. It also provides customizable visualized insights and evidence for designing and prioritizing interventions - as well as peer learning across education systems -

	to tackle systemic issues and challenges affecting teaching and learning, especially those regarding the curricula, pedagogical approaches, educational resources and assessment.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The tool provides ready-made, interactive visuals based on the analysis of learning assessment and other related data serving busy, non-technical decision makers in their search for evidence for designing and prioritizing interventions to improve student learning.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	End users of data visuals require no expertise; researcher and analyst users require some level of data analysis expertise.

PEER

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Profiles Enhancing Policy Reviews (PEER)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report, which has multiple funders.
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://education-profiles.org/ Video: https://youtu.be/9t0-nzZBm80
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	PEER was launched in 2020 and is in full operation.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Country profiles are summarized in indicators and reported in GEM Report publications. For instance: - 2020 GEM Report : 68% of countries define inclusive education in laws and policies, only 57% of those definitions cover multiple marginalized groups. - 2021/2 GEM Report : Private school regulations are least likely to focus on equity: 67% of countries regulate fee setting, 55% prevent selective student admissions in non-state schools, 27% ban profit making. - 2022 brochure : 39% of countries have a law, policy and strategy focused on climate change education.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	A resource
What was the stated objective?	Provide information on national laws and policies to (i) feed into the GEM Report theme and other outputs to map global trends on key education policy issues and (ii) foster policy dialogue and peer learning.
Who is expected to implement?	GEM Report team with consultant support occasionally for Arabic- and Russian-speaking countries.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Anyone can use the information for comparative education analysis of selected laws and policies.
How is the tool/method/approach bounded? Does it address the entire system, only the education sector, only	PEER contains information on specific topics and themes within the education sector including: Global coverage: inclusion (2020), private sector regulation (2021), technology (2023 - forthcoming), school leadership (2024 - forthcoming)

part of the education system, or can it be adapted to any of the above?	Selected county coverage: equity in financing (2021), climate change education and communication (2021-23), comprehensive sexuality education (2023), national education monitoring (2024 - forthcoming)
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	It depends on the coverage of the theme. A theme for the global report takes a team of 4 people about 9 months to prepare profiles for all education systems.
What will the end product look like?	The end product is country profiles of about 1,500 words, following a common structure, which feature at the www.education-profiles.org website.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	PEER (www.education-profiles.org) provides descriptions of national laws and policies on the theme of the Global Education Monitoring Report: inclusion (2020), private sector regulation (2021/2), technology (2023 - forthcoming), school leadership (2024 - forthcoming). Key trends are summarized in the main text of the GEM Report. PEER also covers selected other policy topics: equity and financing, climate change education (2021) and communication (2022-) and comprehensive sexuality education (2023 - forthcoming); in these cases, country coverage is not global but profiles tend to be more detailed.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The global coverage of the topics covered.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	No, anyone can use the website

PISA CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	PISA capacity needs assessment framework
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	OECD
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.oecd.org/pisa/ Reports on assessments: https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisa-participants.htm or https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-for-development/pisa-for-development-documentation.htm
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	The tool is finalized and mainstreamed as part of each round of PISA, starting with PISA 2018 and including PISA 2022 and, currently, PISA 2025.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	PISA for Development was a pilot project and the tool was developed and implemented as part of this in the following countries: Cambodia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Framework
What was the stated objective?	The purpose of the framework is to assess a country's capacity to implement PISA.
Who is expected to implement?	The OECD and its international contractor, currently ACER, together with participating countries.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The OECD and its international contractor, currently ACER, together with participating countries are the principal users. It is used to guide capacity building plans aimed at ensuring the country's successful implementation of PISA and other large-scale assessments and the effective use of the resulting data.
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 is a system-level framework

What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	1-6 months of time is needed to implement. The approximate cost of the assessment <i>and</i> the implementing capacity building plan is \$215,000. The key factors that drive the costs are international costs of OECD and its international contractor.
What will the end product look like?	Final report, available on the OECD's PISA and PISA for Development webpages
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	This tool is specific to PISA: the purpose being to assess a country's capacity to implement PISA (the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment). The framework is structured according to three dimensions: 1) Enabling context, 2) Organisation, and 3) Individual. Data and information are collected on more than 120 capacities in these three dimensions and ratings for each of these are agreed with the participating country. For each capacity one of three possible ratings is given: (1) Latent - there is little or no capacity [in this indicator area] -- significant capacity building required; (2) Emerging - there is some capacity [in this indicator area] -- capacity building required; and (3) Established - there is sufficient capacity [in this indicator area] -- capacity building not required. This tool is part of a suite of tools including the PISA capacity building plan (CBP) and the PISA programme implementation plan (PIP). The CBP is built upon the results of the capacity needs analysis for the participating country and is designed to address the areas of capacity identified for strengthening in the report of the capacity needs assessment. The PIP is a management tool for PISA participating countries that sets out the financial and human resources required to implement PISA successfully.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	This is a unique tool. No other international large-scale assessment carries out an assessment of a country's capacity to implement and make use of the data and builds a capacity building and implementation support plan on the basis of this.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	The tool requires some level of expertise to use, in particular to form a judgement on capacity levels based on the evidence collected.

PRE-PRIMARY SUBSECTOR ANALYSIS TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Pre-primary Subsector Analysis Tool
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNICEF
Where can more information be found?	Tool: https://www.ece-accelerator.org/toolkit/section-2/tool-2-2
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool has been implemented in Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Liberia, and the South Pacific.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	The Pre-primary Subsector Analysis Tool operationalizes the Build to Last conceptual framework and aims to support national stakeholders to assess the strengths and weaknesses of all aspects of their pre-primary subsector, including equity, inclusion, gender, and crisis considerations.
Who is expected to implement?	Unknown
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	The resulting analysis helps local stakeholders to identify strengths, gaps, underlying challenges, and emerging opportunities in the ECE subsector.
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 the early childhood education subsector.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	Less than one month is needed.

What will the end product look like?	An analysis report and consultative workshop, however countries have adapted the tool to produce various products in their own countries.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	The tool will enable stakeholders to: 1) conduct an in-depth examination of the ECE subsector through a systems approach; and 2) use the analysis to identify strengths, gaps, underlying challenges, and emerging opportunities. It is part of a suite of tools found in the ECE Accelerator Toolkit which supports the inclusion and strengthening of ECE in the context of education sector planning processes.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The tool is specific to pre-primary analysis unlike others which engage the entire system. It can be easily implemented with limited expertise in a short period of time and easily adapted for country context.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	No

PRIMER FOR ENGAGING EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS IN POLICY REVIEWS

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	A Primer for Engaging Education Stakeholders in Policy Reviews
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	UNESCO
Where can more information be found?	Primer: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374010
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Pilot information is not available. The primer has been used in Malaysia, Thailand, Albania, Sudan, Mongolia, Zambia, Mozambique, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and other locations.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Resource
What was the stated objective?	This primer is designed to provide UNESCO staff and education stakeholders with an introduction to the methodology of UNESCO policy review in the wider context of SDG 4- Education 2030 and how it could be designed as a tool for capacity development leading to improved policymaking and planning in education.
Who is expected to implement?	A national team, UNESCO and contracted experts
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Ministries in charge 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 guidelines are cross-sectoral.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	The cost varies across countries; however, the primer will require 6-11 months for implementation.
What will the end product look like?	Final report
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	An education policy review (EPR) aims to provide an overall appraisal of the education system and the way in which development policies, regulations, structures and education-specific policies, plans, programmes and practices could be reformed to improve education in the country. Notes and a primer are included.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	The primer supports conducting an EPR which aims to provide an overall appraisal of the education system in a way in which policies, plans, programs, and practices could be reformed to improve education.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, a high level of expertise is required.

RAPID EDUCATION AND RISK ANALYSIS (RERA) TOOL

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)
Where can more information be found?	Toolkit: https://www.edu-links.org/resources/rapid-education-and-risk-analysis-rera-toolkit-1
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 a high level of expertise 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.

SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR BETTER EDUCATION RESULTS (SABER)

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creator: The World Bank Funding Agency: The World Bank and its development partners
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/brief/systems-approach-for-better-education-results-saber
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.”

QUESTION	RESPONSE
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.
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"> 1. Resources (finance, teachers, school health, and school feeding) 2. Governance (school autonomy and accountability, engaging the private sector) 3. Information (assessment, education management systems) 4. 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"> 1. Writing of a “What Matters” paper that identifies the elements of the policy and institutional framework that matter most for improving education outcomes 2. 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 3. Developing a data collection instrument for the indicators identified 4. Collecting policy information and data to fill out the data-collection instrument 5. Analyzing the data to assess how developed a country’s education policies and institutions are 6. Validating and discussing the analyses with government officials 7. 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 a high level of expertise 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.”

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT MONITORING (SAM) TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Student Achievement Monitoring (SAM)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Center for International Cooperation in Education Development
Where can more information be found?	Website: http://www.ciced.org/students-achievement-monitoring-tool/
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	At the current stage the team is: a) developing shorter version of the tool (the time of testing is only 40 minutes instead of 90) and finalizing principals of the adaptive testing; b) developing tool to diagnose teaching practices that will be used in combination with the SAM tool; c) working on formats to represent the results of testing that will be the most convenient for usage by teachers.
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool was piloted in Russian Federation and CIS countries. SAM has been administered to over 30,000 students in the USA, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Armenia, Belarus, Russia.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Tool
What was the stated objective?	SAM can be applied to assess knowledge acquisition of different school subjects at different school levels.
Who is expected to implement?	It is intended to be used by teachers, methodologists and education management authorities in schools that apply the system of the developing education and formative assessment in Russian Federation and CIS countries as well as schools that use these methodologies in some classes.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Teachers and education management authorities use the resulting information to improve the organization and quality of the learning process in schools. Information can also be used by various education 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?	SAM can be used across the entire system, the education sector, or a subset of the sector.

What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	1-6 months are needed. The cost of implementation is low-to-moderate and depends on whether pen-and-paper or computer-based testing is used and on the size of the sample (it starts with just one class).
What will the end product look like?	Final report
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	SAM is an assessment tool that measures subject competencies of schoolchildren. Theoretical framework of SAM relies upon the teaching/learning process concept based on the theory of cognitive growth. SAM is noted for the embedded diagnostic mechanism that provides information on the quality of knowledge acquisition. SAM can be applied to assess knowledge acquisition of different school subjects at different school levels. SAM is designed for the organization and quality improvement of the learning process in schools. It is intended to be used by teachers, methodologists and education management authorities.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	It has a predictive potential. We can use this tool to predict the level of educational achievements of the students with a prospect of some years.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Some expertise is needed for implementation

SURVEYS OF ENACTED CURRICULUM TOOLKIT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	Surveys of Enacted Curriculum
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Funded by FCDO, tool development led by RISE
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://riseprogramme.org/tools/surveys-enacted-curriculum Complete toolkit: https://riseprogramme.org/publications/conducting-surveys-enacted-curriculum-studies-low-and-middle-income-countries-toolkit
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool has been piloted in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda and used in Nigeria and Nepal.
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	Toolkit that encompasses approaches and tools
What was the stated objective?	The Surveys of Enacted Curriculum quantifies academic content that is embedded in different system components (e.g., curriculum, instruction, exams, textbooks, etc.) and reports on their alignment with each other and with learning.
Who is expected to implement?	A think tank or civil society organization leads implementation coordination but works closely with education authorities, universities, colleges, schools and teachers.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Governments use the information for policy reform and teachers use it in their classrooms.
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 is intended for use in basic education
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	6-11 months are needed. The cost ranges from \$80,000 - \$100,000 with the key factor impacting cost being the survey of teachers.
What will the end product look like?	SEC reporting follows the results interpretation. The structure of the report will be determined primarily by the main goals of the study, which could be alignment analysis, curriculum articulation and sequence analysis, education policy reform, teacher development and school improvement, and so on. Results of SEC analyses are descriptive depictions of current emphasis, providing an objective basis for discussion by relevant authorities.
What is the approach/tool/method (brief description)?	A guide and set of tools to complete the 10-step process of conducting an SEC study. The steps include [1] working with partners to identify study objectives, [2] creating a research plan, [3] developing tools, [4] convening an expert panel to review academic content, [5] surveying teachers

	on content coverage, [6] conducting data entry, processing data, and reporting, [7] collecting item-level student performance data, [8] collecting participant feedback, [9] analyzing, interpreting, and reporting results, and [10] disseminating study findings.
What makes it different from other efforts with similar objectives?	Unlike other tools, the SEC includes teacher insight on content delivered in the classroom and maps the different system components onto a common framework.
Does the tool require a high level or expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, you will need a team of evaluators and an expert panel to complete the study.

SYSTEM DIAGNOSTICS FRAMEWORK (RISE) TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	System Diagnostics Framework
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Funded by FCDO, tool development led by RISE
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://riseprogramme.org/tools/rise-education-systems-diagnostic Complete toolkit: https://riseprogramme.org/publications/rise-education-systems-diagnostic-toolkit Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bkSFILgy9qE
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Finalized
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	The tool was piloted in Ghana. Six additional field-based studies were conducted across Africa, Asia, Latin America, including Ecuador, Balochistan Pakistan, South Africa, North India, and Uganda
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?	The framework can be used by a think tank, government advisory organization, civil society organization, consultancy, or a university.
Who will be using the resulting information and how?	Governments and ministries can use resulting information to guide system reform efforts.

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 framework addresses the sub-sector, sector, and system.
What level of effort is required to implement (duration, approximate \$\$ to implement)?	6-11 months are needed to complete the tool. The cost range is between \$80,000 and \$100,000. The key factor impacting costs is whether implementers conduct key stakeholder workshops and interviews.
What will the end product look like?	Final 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?	The tool facilitates consensus building among key system actors around the diagnosis and prioritization of critical areas for reform intervention.
Does the tool require a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Some expertise is required.

USAID EDUCATION SYSTEM DIAGNOSTIC TOOL

QUESTION	RESPONSE
What is the name of the tool/approach/method?	USAID Education System Diagnostic (under revision)
Who is the creator and funding agency (if different)?	Creators: University of Notre Dame, under Supporting Holistic and Actionable Research in Education (SHARE) program Funding agency: USAID
Where can more information be found?	This tool is still under development. Public information is not yet published.
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	In piloting
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Piloted in DRC (education of marginalized learners), Uzbekistan (learners with disability), and Rwanda (general basic education)
Is it a tool, a toolkit, a method, an approach, or something else?	An approach with a toolkit in development
What was the stated objective?	A systems diagnostics approach maps key actors and factors at each level of a system, their linkages with one another, and their relationship to a pre-identified core problem, in addition to achieving a level of validation that the identified problem itself is viewed as a problem by a broad group of stakeholders. The approach seeks to identify key leverage points at which to engage with a problem at its root causes and key actors needed to achieve buy-in and enable an activity to make sustainable improvements. Systems diagnostics is a participatory process with key stakeholders, either in mixed groups or separate groups, depending on the group dynamics necessary to ensure candid open participation, to foster a deeper understanding of the problem and the potential actions to make improvements.
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); implementing partners. 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
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, with 1-9 months to implement

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 a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, high level of expertise is 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.

ANNEX I

The tools included in this annex are no longer active or their status is unknown.

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)
Where can more information be found?	Website: https://pemandu.org
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.

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?	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
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 a high level of expertise 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
Where can more information be found?	The tool is not available online.
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.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
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
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 a high level of expertise 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.

IDENTIFYING BINDING CONSTRAINTS IN EDUCATION REPORT

QUESTION	RESPONSE
Name of the tool/approach/method	Report title: <i>Identifying Binding Constraints in Education</i>
Creator and the funding agency (if different)	<p>Authors: Servaas van der Berg, Nicholas Spaull, Gabrielle Wills, Martin Gustafsson, and Janeli Kotzé</p> <p>Author affiliation: Research on Socio-Economic Policy (RESEP), Department of Economics, University of Stellenbosch</p> <p>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)</p>
Where can more information be found?	Report: https://resep.sun.ac.za/identifying-binding-constraints-in-education/sample-post/
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.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
Who is expected to implement	N/A
Who will be using the resulting information and how	N/A
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, approximate \$\$ 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

QUESTION	RESPONSE
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 a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, it requires a team of academics to conduct initial research and subsequently to synthesize findings

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
Where can more information be found?	The approach is not available online.
What is the current stage of development (in development, review, finalized)?	Piloting ongoing (last updated 2019)
If piloted, where (links to pilot reports/summary of findings)?	Piloting ongoing (last updated 2019)
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 à diagnosis à priorities and policy decisions
Does the tool require a high level of expertise 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.

USAID EDUCATION SECTOR ASSESSMENT TOOL

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
Where can more information be found?	The tool is not available online.
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 a high level of expertise to apply (from the person implementing)?	Yes, relatively high level of expertise required