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Executive Summary

For the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), countries’ assessment of the quality of teaching helps diagnose areas that need improvement and informs the Partnership around priorities for teaching practice, institutional support, or policy design. This study can inform teacher practice and policy development, contributing to improvement in teaching-learning interactions that help students’ learning. While this study is not measuring the quality of teaching in GPE partner countries per se (it examines whether countries are working to gather relevant data to inform their policy and work to improve teaching quality), it helps promote this agenda by establishing the baseline for indicator 7 (ii) in GPE’s 2025 results framework, “Proportion of countries where teaching quality is assessed”, in which countries are rated according to the extent of their systematic use of classroom observation (CO) tools. This research is the first known systematic attempt to compare the use of COs across 76 GPE Partner Countries.

To calculate these indicator values, the study reviewed existing quantitative and qualitative evidence made available through online sources. It collected, encoded, and analyzed data on the use of CO tools from 2017 to 2021. The main sources consulted included GPE Secretariat documentation, Ministry of Education reports, education sector analyses and plans, teaching quality assessment reports, evaluations, and analytical reports. Future research should seek to involve more country partners, including ministry officials, to uncover additional sources and add nuance to findings.

While this study’s methodology does not provide an exhaustive picture of how and whether countries assess the quality of teaching overall, data gathered shows that 52 of 76 GPE partner countries analyzed (68%) conducted COs to assess teaching quality between 2017 and 2021. Twenty-one countries (28% of our sample) can be classified as Advanced on their use of COs. In these countries, the criteria for being considered as Advanced include conducting observations that cover more than one grade in at least one level of education, assessing the quantity of teaching and at least one dimension of the quality of teaching practice, as well as conducting these observations in a representative manner, either nationally or sub-nationally, at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

Eighteen countries (24%) can be classified as Established and meet the same criteria, except only one of either teaching quality or quantity is assessed. Thirteen countries – 17% of our sample – can be classified as Emerging, meaning that COs cover at least one grade in one level of education, but may not meet the other criteria set out for the indicator. Finally, 24 countries (32%) are classified as Not Reported either because there is no documentation on whether COs are taking place or because COs have been recommended or planned but are not yet implemented.

Twenty-five countries out of 76 have used or are planning to systematically use ready-to-use CO tools promoted by international institutions. Twelve countries used TEACH; other tools that were used include Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA), Measuring Early Learning Environment (MELE), the System Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) Teachers tool, and the Stallings CO tool. In five countries (Cambodia, Guyana, Mozambique, Pakistan, and Tuvalu) sources mentioned the use of more than one CO tool. Most COs have been conducted at the primary level, followed by secondary, then pre-primary. COs used also mostly assess the quality of teaching, rather than aspects related to quantity of teaching or instructional time.

Overall, CO use is perceived as scarcely documented, with only 25 countries reporting on which tools were used. Where information on COs is available, documentation has often been drafted under the auspices of international organizations such as the World Bank. Furthermore, there is still a lack of information on how CO tools are used and how they contribute to improved teaching quality.

Future research should expand the indicator sample to partner countries that have since joined GPE and consult additional secondary sources. Country-level stakeholders should be consulted systematically to verify the extent to which CO use in practice reflects what is described in theory in secondary sources. Practitioners may wish to consider refining the indicator’s design for subsequent rounds of data collection by providing a more precise meaning of the representativeness sub-criteria. Future rounds of data collection will enrich the research and policy agenda on teaching quality by enabling longitudinal analysis of CO use and how it relates to educational investment more broadly.
1 Introduction

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is the largest global fund dedicated to supporting and accompanying lower-income countries in transforming their education systems to deliver quality and equitable education to all students, especially girls and those marginalized due to poverty, disability, or displacement. GPE developed its Strategic Plan for 2021 to 2025\(^1\) to support its partner countries\(^2\) in accelerating access to education, improving learning outcomes and gender equality and achieving inclusive and resilient education systems by improving educational outcomes of access, learning and equity. To achieve the above-mentioned goals, improving the quality of teaching is a priority as teachers’ effectiveness is a critical predictor of student learning. Furthermore, a large number of teachers lack the required knowledge or pedagogical skills to teach effectively, which ultimately affects children’s learning. The systematic assessment of the quality of teaching is fundamental because it provides evidence for policy dialogue around improving teaching quality and ways to improve learning outcomes, reduce the number of out-of-school children, and put students on the path to success.\(^3\) Results can prompt countries and international actors to implement targeted support in this area to ensure every child is able to learn from teachers who are motivated, qualified, and supported in their professional development.

The overall purpose of the report is to provide a diagnosis of the state of the use of classroom observation (CO) tools from 2017 to 2021 at the pre-primary, primary, and secondary levels of education across 76 of GPE’s partner countries. This is intended to provide the necessary information to establish the baseline for GPE’s indicator 7(ii) “Proportion of countries where teaching quality is assessed.” Assessment of teaching quality provides a diagnosis of the areas that need improvement to inform changes to teaching practice, institutional support, and policy design. The indicator measures the scope of partner countries who conduct such assessment.

This report is accompanied by a database of the data collected to support the indicator measurement. The database includes granularly coded evidence and documentation gathered on teaching quality assessment through COs. The database supports completeness, internal consistency, and external comparability, and allows users to search for aggregated and disaggregated data and compare trends across countries.

Section 2 of this report explains the methodology used for this study, including the data analysis approach and limitations of the study. Section 3 presents a narrative description of the findings and Section 4 provides lessons learned and recommended future research.

---

\(^1\) https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2025-strategic-plan
\(^2\) As of January 2022, 76 countries were members of GPE and included as the sample for this study.
\(^3\) https://www.globalpartnership.org/what-we-do/quality-teaching#:~:text=GPE%202025%20identifies%20quality%20teaching,can%20unleash%20children%20learning%20potential.
2 Methodology

To provide a baseline assessment of indicator 7ii, the consultancy conducted a desk review on quality teaching policy, programming, and practice sources available through web search. The consultancy took into consideration only secondary sources reporting data on COs conducted to assess quality teaching between 2017 and 2021 in 76 partner countries. The full list of 76 countries can be found in Annex 1.

Secondary sources were reviewed in this order:
1. GPE Secretariat documentation
2. Ministry of Education reports
3. Education sector analyses and plans
4. Teaching quality assessment reports, evaluations, analytical reports
5. Other documents available and accessible through web search.

The study generated data that enables the calculation of indicator 7(ii), as laid out in Annex 2 and the data collection rubric featured in Annex 3. Data gathered has been organized and systematized in a database that allows for disaggregated data analysis, beyond the level of detail required for the criteria and domains identified in Annex 3. The database is designed to guarantee full alignment of data collected with the indicator definitions. The database looks across multiple sources and analyses multiple tools for each country, seeking to identify those that better match GPE criteria.

The indicator, its criteria and sub-criteria were developed by the GPE Secretariat according to the following model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education:</td>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Domains:</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time teachers spend on teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Domains:</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of socioemotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness:</td>
<td>Nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federated states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency:</td>
<td>Once in the last five years:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement:</td>
<td>Endorsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not endorsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumed endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data was categorized according to the following Levels of Development (developed by GPE):

**Advanced**, where the assessment of teaching quality meets all four minimum criteria by:

i. covering more than one grade in at least one level of education: (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, and/or (c) secondary education.

ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; and one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.

iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.

iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

**Established**, where the assessment of teaching quality not considered as Advanced, meets all four minimum criteria by:

i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; or one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.

iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.

iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

**Emerging**, where the assessment of teaching quality, not considered as Advanced or Established, partially meets the four minimum indicator criteria by:

i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

ii. and fails to meet all three remaining criteria⁴ (criteria 2-4).

**Not Reported**, where data or information to evidence an assessment of teaching quality through a CO tool are not available.

Annex 4 provides a more detailed description of the development, completion, and compilation approach for the database.

### 2.1 Analytical Approach

Data collection and analysis covered 76 GPE partner countries.⁵

The main goal of the analysis is to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the heterogeneity of levels of development of COs, highlighting, whenever possible, best practices and weaknesses. The data gathered for the baseline does not allow for statistical inference nor for a deep quantitative analysis. The analysis is intended to:

- identify and collect valid and reliable data on COs in relevant reports.
- identify the most used CO tools and report their use across the 76 countries.
- explore what kind of documents provide information on COs.
- check whether certain local or international institutions are promoting the use of COs or foster the use of certain COs more than others.
- disaggregate the data by each criterion.
- triangulate the level of development of COs with other education indicators.

---

⁴ To the minimum as under the “Established” classification.

⁵ As of January 2022, 76 countries represented the totality of GPE partner countries. Other, new countries that have since partnered with GPE will be considered in future studies. The full list of 76 countries can be found in Annex 4.
2.2 Limitations

The study faced two types of limitations: practical, i.e., based on the process of data collection; and theoretical and methodological, which relates to the scope of the study and to what the study itself intends to achieve based on its pre-defined purpose. The main limitations are listed below.

**Practical limitations based on the process of data collection**

- Several Ministry of Education websites could not be consulted due to being inaccessible or under maintenance.
- In one case, (Nepal), it was not possible to translate national documents through translation software as documents were only available only as scanned images.

**Theoretical and Methodological limitations of the scope of the study**

- The research methodology focused only on online secondary data collection. Consequently, it was out of this study scope to verify whether:
  - more recent reports on COs were available, but not online.
  - there were reasons or conditions as to why a Ministry of Education may have not published the results of COs conducted.
  - COs recommended in countries’ education sector plans or as part of the country’s action plans were already implemented, but not yet published.
- There are several tools and methodologies that can be used to assess teaching quality. This study takes into account only the use of COs, thus not providing a full comprehensive picture of the state of teaching quality assessment in sampled countries. To achieve this, further research on other existing tools and methodologies is required.
- The scope of the indicator is limited to assessing key domains regarding the quantity and quality of teaching. Data collection and analysis carried out for this study focused on the use of COs without further disaggregating aspects of teaching quality. Other aspects that can be considered in assessing teaching quality (e.g., foci, factors, policy areas) were not part of the purpose of this study.
- Many countries do not report on what type of CO tools they have adopted to assess teaching quality, nor do they report how they have adapted international tools, such as Teach or MELE, to their context, meaning that this consultancy was unable to explore trends on tools adaptation as part of this study.
- This study did not intend to explore the causal links between CO implementation and teaching quality improvement, as the scope of the indicator is limited to assessing key domains regarding the assessment of quantity and quality of teaching and this study collected data accordingly. Exploring the impact of COs on teaching quality would require further extensive research on whether and how the data generated by COs has been used to improve policy planning and development or to support teachers.
- The scope of this study was to assess if COs had been implemented, or recommended, or mentioned at least once in the past five years; more data collection would be required to do a systematic analysis of levels of institutionalization of COs over time in the 76 partner countries.
3 Findings

This section presents the results of the analysis of data gathered while constructing the baseline for the indicator. It provides details on CO implementation across 76 countries, exploring links between the level of development of COs and other factors such as region, CO tools used, and domains covered by COs.

3.1 Levels of Development of Classroom Observations

Over 50% of the 76 GPE partner countries analyzed have been conducting COs to assess teaching quality between 2017 and 2021.

Countries reviewed are not homogeneously distributed across world regions, with Sub-Saharan Africa over-represented and Europe under-represented. As a result, findings should not be generalized to other countries not covered by the review. In Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia and Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean more than half of sampled countries have reached the Established or Advanced levels. In Middle East and North Africa neither of the two countries reviewed has reached these levels. In Europe and Central Asia, only one out of six countries was classified as Established or Advanced.

There are no major differences in the level of development of COs by countries’ income level. However, amongst upper-middle income countries, the share of countries scoring Advanced is higher (42%) than among low (31%) and lower-middle income countries (21%).

The average government total expenditure on education (as % of GDP) amongst countries reviewed is 4.6%. Almost half of countries (46%) spend less than 4%. The average spending in countries classified as Advanced is 1.1% higher than in Not Reported countries. However, a clear relationship between COs implementation and expenditure on education cannot be inferred in this context.

Thirty-six out of 76 countries have high levels of institutional and social fragility or are affected by violent conflict (according to the GPE categorization of countries affected by fragility and conflict). There is no clear relationship between fragility/conflict and level of development of COs. Twelve fragile or conflict-affected countries (33%) have been classified as Not Reported, eight (25%) as Advanced, six as Emerging, and 10 as Established.

Out of the 76 GPE partner countries assessed, 39 (51%) rank as either Established (18 countries) or Advanced (21 countries). In these countries COs are endorsed by a relevant authority, cover at least one grade, are implemented in a representative sample of schools at sub-national or national level, assess either quality or quantity of teaching, and were conducted in the last five years. Thirteen are categorized as Emerging (17%), while 24 countries (32%) are classified as Not Reported either because there is no documentation reporting COs, or because COs are only recommended or planned, without indication or evidence of implementation.
Classroom Observation and Geographic Distribution

The distribution of the 76 GPE partner countries reviewed is not homogeneous across the globe. Thirty-nine are in Sub-Saharan Africa, 15 in East Asia and Pacific, six in South Asia, six in Europe and Central Asia, eight in Latin America and the Caribbean, and two in Middle East and North Africa. A comparative analysis across regions is therefore not feasible in this context. This section only describes the distribution of COs level of development across regions and does not intend to infer any generalization.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, 22 countries out of 39 (56%) score as having either Established or Advanced level of COs; in East Asia and Pacific eight out of 15 (53%); in Europe and Central Asia one out of six (17%); in Latin America and the Caribbean five out of eight (62.5%); and in South Asia three GPE countries out of six (50%) fall in the categories of Established or Advanced. In neither of the two countries in the Middle East and North Africa (Djibouti and Yemen) does the level of development meet these higher levels. Figure 2 below illustrates this graphically; Figure 3 displays it on a map.

Figure 1: Number of Countries by Level of Development of Classroom Observation

![Figure 1](image)

Source: Authors’ calculations.

Figure 2: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Region

![Figure 2](image)

Source: Authors’ calculations.
Figure 3: Map of Countries according to the Level of Development of Classroom Observation

Classroom Observation by Country Income Level Classification

Figure 4 displays the level of development of COs according to the income classification used by the World Bank. None of the countries reviewed is classified as high-income. There is a higher proportion of countries (5 out of 12, or 42%) classified as *Advanced* among upper-middle income countries than among low (8 out of 26, 31%) and lower-middle income countries (8 out of 38, 21%).

Figure 4: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Country Income Level Classification

Source: Authors’ calculations, using World Bank classifications
Classroom Observation and Government Expenditure in Education\textsuperscript{6}

The Education 2030 Framework for Action suggests that the minimum average expenditure in education should be between 4\% and 5\% of a country’s GDP. The average expenditure in education (as \% of GDP) among the 76 countries reviewed is 4.6\%. Countries classified as Advanced spend 5\% of their GDP in education on average. Established countries average 4.2\%, Emerging countries 5.5\%, and Not Reported countries 3.9\%. These differences in average expenditure among countries with different COs level of development is very small; on the other hand, Not Reported countries are only averaging less than the 4\% recommended minimum. This may suggest that there is a link between low expenditure in education and scarce implementation of COs.

Figure 5 aggregates countries in five groups according to their governments’ total expenditure on education (less than 4\%, between 4\% and 5\%, between 5\% and 6\%, higher than 6\%, and not available).

Thirty-five countries (46\%) spend less than 4\% of their GDP in education. Among these countries, 11 (31\%) are classified as Not Reported, six (17\%) as Emerging, 10 (29\%) as Established, and eight (23\%) as having an Advanced level of development of COs.

Twelve countries spend more than 6\% of their GDP in education. Five of them (42\%) are classified as Advanced, two (17\%) as Established, three (25\%) as Emerging, and two as Not Reported. Eight countries have not reported their expenditure on education since 2017.

\textbf{Figure 5: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Total Government Expenditure on Education (\% of GDP)}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5.png}
\caption{Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Total Government Expenditure on Education (\% of GDP)}
\end{figure}

Source: Authors’ calculations using data from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)

\textsuperscript{6} World Bank Data, \url{https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.XPD.TOTL.GD.ZS}
Classroom Observation in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Areas

Thirty-six of the 76 countries are classified by the GPE as having either high levels of institutional and social fragility or being affected by violent conflict. As shown in Figure 6, there is no clear relationship between conflicts and institutional and social fragility and use of COs: 12 of the 24 Not Reported countries (50%) are either affected by violent conflict or have high level of institutional and social fragility. By comparison, 8 out of 21 Advanced countries (38%) are either affected by violent conflict or have high level of institutional and social fragility. The share of Established and Advanced countries is similar across fragile and non-fragile countries (50% vs 52%).

Figure 6: Presence of Conflict, Institutional and Social Fragility by Levels of Development of Classroom Observations

Source: The GPE and authors’ calculations.

Classroom Observations in fragile contexts: the case of South Sudan

South Sudan is one of the youngest sovereign countries in the world, having gained independence in 2011. Since then, the country has not yet found stability; from 2013 to 2020 a civil war caused more than 300,000 deaths and displaced approximately two million people. In such a context, assessing the quality of teaching may not seem like a priority. However, with the coordinated effort of international agencies, an EMIS system in South Sudan has been developed and as a result the Ministry of Education is able to systematically collect data on schools, students’ enrollment, teachers’ professional development, and teaching quality.

With the support of the GPE, UNICEF, and USAID, the Ministry of Education publishes every year a report of schools’ performance for each county. These annual reports include results from a CO scoring tool that covers both quality and quantity of teaching. The South Sudan case illustrates that COs can still be implemented at an Advanced level in emergency contexts. The same holds for COs implementation in other seven fragile countries: the Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Niger, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste.

---

2 County reports can be found here: http://mogi.org/information-resources/
3 The classroom observation checklist can be found here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uJT1f29zRkZakHRDO0_p9wgrBiQdUuz/view
3.2 Classroom Observation Tools

Twenty-six countries out of 76 countries have used or are planning to use ready-to-use CO tools designed by international institutions or by national authorities. Among these countries, the Teach tool was the most used (12 countries, 48%). Partner countries have also conducted COs using MELE (five countries), EGRA (five countries), and SABER tools, the Danielson Framework, the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS™ tool (each in one country), and in six countries, national CO tools were developed. In five countries, more than one tool was used. The use of a specific tool does not translate automatically to an Advanced level of COs: in some countries, COs were planned or to be implemented and were classified as Not Reported.

According to the sources analyzed, 26 countries out of 76 have used or are planning to use ready-to-use CO tools. These tools include Teach, EGRA, MELE, the SABER Teaching tool, the Stallings CO tool, the CLASS™ tool, and the Danielson Framework for Teacher Observation and Evaluation. In five countries (Cambodia, Guyana, Mozambique, Pakistan, and Tuvalu) sources mention more than one CO tool. Table 1 provides the full list of tools used by each country, also displayed graphically in Figure 77. A brief description of each tool follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Countries using the tool</th>
<th>Education sub sector</th>
<th>Number of countries¹⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Cameroon, Guyana, Malawi, Maldives, Mozambique, Niger, Sao Tomé and Principe, Sierra Leone, Pakistan, Togo, Tuvalu</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELE</td>
<td>Cambodia, Mozambique, Lesotho, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Cambodia, Madagascar, Kiribati, Solomon Island, Tuvalu</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABER SD</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings classroom observation tool</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Assessment Scoring System™ (CLASS™)</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Classroom Observation Tool</td>
<td>Tonga (Classroom Observation Snapshot)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania (Decentralized Periodic Learning Assessment)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria (EdoBEST observation instrument)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua (National Pedagogical Observation and Support Instrument)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana (Early Childhood Development Program Delivery Evaluation Checklist)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire (bulletin/grille d’inspection de l’instituteur)</td>
<td>Pre-primary Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson Framework for Teacher Observation and Evaluation</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Primary Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁰ The sum is higher than 76 (number of countries reviewed) because in some countries more than one tool is mentioned.
The Teach Tool

The Teach tool is a suite of tools for different levels of education and free to use, publicly available CO tool developed and continuously updated by the World Bank. It is comprised of a toolkit for data collection, analysis, and the validation of scores. The tool holistically measures “what happens” in the classroom: it assesses both quantity and quality of teaching, focusing not only cognitive but also socioemotional skills. It has been applied in many contexts but there is not a systemic way of tracking its application and, in some contexts, the tool is not systematically used. Twelve GPE partner countries were identified as using the Teach tool or a tool adapted from it between 2017 and 2021. Of these, eight score as either Established or Advanced.

All countries used the tool at the primary level, except for Tuvalu that reported using Teach ECE (a Teach tool developed specifically for early childhood education). The CO level of development of countries using the Teach tool is set out in Figure 8 below.

---

The MELE Tool\textsuperscript{13}

The MELE (Measure of Early Learning Environments) tool is one of the two modules of the Measuring Early Learning Quality and Outcomes (MELQO) initiative and includes a CO tool together with interviews with teachers and supervisors and a short parent/caregiver survey, targeting children up to eight years old.\textsuperscript{14} The CO tool assesses both quantity and quality of teaching and codifies classroom environment and materials, pedagogical content of lessons, and interactions within the class (both teachers-students and students-students). The MELE module is mentioned in sources from five countries, three of which have either an Established or Advanced level of COs. In each of the five cases, the sources mentioned the tool as linked to World Bank or GPE funded programs. Figure 9 below sets out the distribution of countries using the MELE tool by Level of Development.

\textbf{Figure 8: Number of Countries using Teach, by Level of Development}
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\textit{Source: authors’ calculations}

\textbf{Figure 9: Number of Countries using MELE, by Level of Development}
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\textsuperscript{13} More information on the MELE module can be found at: \url{https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/melqo-measuring-early-learning-quality-outcomes.pdf}

One country, two Classroom Observation tools: the case of Mozambique

Mozambique has invested significantly in education over the last decades, making the sector a high priority in the policy agenda. Between 2008 and 2018, education spending in Mozambique averaged 19.1 percent of total government expenditure and 6.3 percent of GDP. Assessment of teaching quality has been recognized as crucial to improve the education system. In 2018 the government conducted a second round of the Service Delivery Indicators (SDI) Survey (the first was conducted in 2014). SDI measures the quality of service delivery of schools through a set of metrics that include teachers’ effort and ability, and inputs availability. The SDI included the Teach tool to conduct COs: it was used to observe grade 4 classes in 337 schools randomly sampled at the national level. Results from SDI informed the preparation of the Strategic Education Sector Plan.

The government also endorsed COs conducted to evaluate the Mozambique Early Childhood Development Project (DICIPÉ). The project constructed 350 escolinhas (pre-primary schools for three-to five-year-old children) in five provinces (Gaza, Tete, Cabo Delgado, Maputo Province, and Nampula) between 2014 and 2019. To assess children’s learning outcomes, classroom environment, and quality of teaching in these schools, MELQO modules were used. COs were conducted in 40 randomly sampled schools (eight per province) using the MELE module. This module is not limited to COs: it also includes oral interviews with caregivers, teacher, and community committees and, in this case, an assessment of the learning environment in new-built schools. The implementation of COs in both primary (with the Teach tool) and pre-primary schools (through the MELE tool) led to the Advanced country classification.

The EGRA Classroom Observation Toolkit

USAID developed the EGRA CO toolkit as part of the Results in Education for All Children (REACH) World Bank program. The program funds results-based financing projects and provides technical support and advice on results-based financing in education to other World Bank teams and development partners, including USAID. The main purpose of the EGRA tool is to provide a resource for assessing early grade reading teaching practices and to support teachers’ development at the primary level. The tool helps to codify teaching practices, classroom management and environment, students’ participation, and teachers’ assessment methods. The EGRA tool was used in five countries, four of which have an Established or Advanced level of COs. Figure 10 sets out the number of countries using EGRA by Level of Development.

![Figure 10: Number of Countries using EGRA, by Level of Development](image)

Source: authors’ calculations

---


17 More information on this tool can be found at: [https://www.globalreadingnetwork.net/sites/default/files/media/file/Classroom%200bs%20Toolkit%20FINAL_Nov%202019.pdf](https://www.globalreadingnetwork.net/sites/default/files/media/file/Classroom%200bs%20Toolkit%20FINAL_Nov%202019.pdf)
Other Classroom Observation Tools

In four countries, we found evidence of the implementation of COs through other international ready-to-use tools or through nationally developed tools.

Other international tools include the Stallings tool\(^{18}\), the SABER SD tool\(^{19}\), the Danielson Framework for teacher observation and evaluation\(^{20}\), and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System\(^{TM}\) (CLASS\(^{TM}\))\(^{21}\). The Stallings tool was developed in the 1970s by Stanford professor Jane Stallings and initially used in the United States and then adapted to low- and middle- countries contexts. It generates data on teachers’ use of time, teachers’ use of different learning activities, and teachers’ ability to keep students engaged.

The SABER SD tool was developed by the World Bank with the aim of easing the monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goal of achieving universal primary education. It measures teacher practices and classroom behaviors through the use of an open-source tool designed to measure the quantity (i.e., time-on-task) and quality of instruction (i.e., quality of teacher feedback, ability to convey knowledge to students, behavior management).

The Danielson Framework, developed for high-income or lower middle-income countries settings, is a set of 22 components of instruction that measure teacher effectiveness under four domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System\(^{TM}\) (CLASS\(^{TM}\)) is an observational instrument developed by the School Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning of the University of Virginia to assess classroom quality in PK-12 classrooms. It describes multiple dimensions of teaching quality linked to student achievement and development and has been validated in over 2,000 classrooms.

Finally, in six countries (Tonga, Nigeria, Tanzania, Nicaragua, Guyana, and Côte d’Ivoire), we found evidence of the use of a national observation tool. In all cases the tool was in place (Guyana, Côte d’Ivoire, Tonga, Tanzania, and Nicaragua) or planned (Nigeria). In five countries the tool was developed with the support of the World Bank (in Tanzania the tool was developed with USAID). Sources do not indicate whether these nationally developed tools were created by adapting an already-existing international ready-to-use tool.

When Classroom Observations are Established but not Advanced: the case of Tanzania

The education system in Tanzania is highly fragmented with donors working in different regions. Moreover, the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar has its own Ministry of Education. This division makes it difficult to implement homogeneous programs at the national level. Consequently, the classification of COs level of development is more difficult than in other countries, as the plethora of documentation relates to different education programs.

The most complete source used for the classification was the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation for the USAID-funded “Tusome Pamoja” project.\(^{22}\) The project lasted 5 years (2016-2021) and was implemented in 5 regions. As a result of the program, approximately 1 million decodable readers were distributed and around 12,000 teachers in more than 3,000 primary schools received training on evidence-based early grade reading instruction, improving their knowledge and skills as educators. A 12-item CO checklist was developed to help head teachers oversee teaching and learning, control the use of teaching materials and the quality of instructions. However, the tool does not cover the quantity of teaching domain, and for this reason, the country has been classified as Established rather than as Advanced.

Although the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of the Tusome Pamoja project was the main source of information on the status of CO implementation, a large amount of other documentation exists and references complete CO tools. However, the documents were not used for the classification as they do

---


\(^{19}\) More information on the SABER SD tool can be found at: http://wbgfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdr/ed/saber/supporting_doc/in_actions/SABER_in_Action_Service_Delivery.pdf


\(^{21}\) More information on the tool can be found here: https://education.virginia.edu/classroom-assessment-scoring-system

\(^{22}\) https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PAA007GR7.pdf
not contain evidence of actual implementation of COs or because COs were conducted in an unrepresentative sample of schools.

Another example, a World Bank Policy Research Working Paper titled “Identifying Effective Teachers: Lessons from Four Classroom Observation Tools”\textsuperscript{23}, describes results from four different COs tools (SDI, Stallings, CLASS, and Teach) used in around 100 schools in Tanzania. While the paper is very informative on COs, the sample size of schools is not large enough to consider the paper as a useful source for the indicator.

Finally, the 2017-2021 Education Sector Development Plan\textsuperscript{24} identified COs as a necessary tool to improve head teachers’ and school committees’ skills related to school supervision and teaching quality assessment.

### 3.3 Classroom Observation Sources

Documents related to GPE or World Bank projects hold the most detailed information on COs, suggesting that these institutions have consistently prioritized promoting COs to assess teaching quality.

The database was populated by consulting a diverse range of sources, including documentation from World Bank and GPE projects, Ministry of Education reports, Education sector plans and analyses, action plans, teaching quality assessments and evaluation reports.

As set out in Figure 11 below, documentation related to World Bank or GPE projects\textsuperscript{25} was the main source of information on COs for 31 countries out of 76. Twenty of these 31 countries (64.5\%) are classified as either Established (11) or Advanced (9). Most of these documents refer to specific GPE or World Bank projects or programs that involve COs as data collection instrument. In 19 of these 31 countries, a specific tool was used: in nine of them, the tool used was the Teach and in 5 of these the level of development of COs was either Established or Advanced.

This finding may simply suggest that GPE and World Bank are more likely to prioritize and support COs than other institutions. When documents from Ministries of Education (e.g., Education Sector Plans, Reports, Guidelines) were used as primary sources (25 countries), only in nine cases countries reached an Established or Advanced level of COs. In these cases, reports and plans from Ministries of Education often do not or only briefly mention COs and do not display results from implementation nor detailed descriptions of tools used (only two out of nine documents of this type report the tool used).

Other sources analyzed are documents from other international agencies. These include reports from USAID, Agence Française de Développement, and Innovations for Poverty Action. The contribution of USAID is particularly relevant: four countries have been classified relying on its documentation. The agency also contributed to the realization of the EGRA Classroom Observation toolkit. Finally, in five countries, no documents mentioning COs were found.

---


\textsuperscript{25} WB project appraisal documents, implementation reports, research paper, and any official documents related to GPE or WB funded projects.
The “Education and Institutional Strengthening Project 2” and the “Improving Quality and Equity of Basic Education Project”: the case of Togo

Togo can be regarded as a success story of the implementation of COs. In 2015, GPE provided US$27.8 million in funding for the “Education and Institutional Strengthening Project 2”, whose first objective was to improve the quality of pre-primary and primary education by training teachers, designing new curricula, and improving classroom material and equipment. The project explicitly foresaw that COs should be the main instrument to assess teaching quality and measure the impact of the training on teacher practices. COs were conducted four times in the period between 2017 and 2019 and involved 745 teachers in grades 1-3 across six regions. COs were also used to develop a new teacher training policy. The impact of the project was significant: more than 30,000 teachers were trained, teacher practices improved substantially (100% of teachers observed used the new curriculum at the endline), and students’ repetition rate plummeted.

The Ministry of Education has maintained its commitment to continue assessing teaching quality and to strengthen its monitoring system even after the end of the project in 2019. While the project was in its final phase, the Togo government obtained around US$60 million in additional funding from the World Bank to implement the “Improving Quality and Equity of Basic Education” Project. The project began in 2020 although its implementation has been limited by the COVID-19 pandemic. The project will support the use of an adaptation of the Teach tool to track curriculum implementation and will represent a standard teachers’ assessment by the Ministry of Education.

A secondary part of the analysis regarded purposes and audiences of documents mentioning COs. Not all documents clearly state their objectives and target audience. As a result, the identification of objectives and audience was highly subjective and did not follow a precise pattern. Sources were coded in line with five possible objectives: diagnose challenges and opportunities in the education system, inform policy, measure progress, support improvement, and measure impact of an intervention. If a document did not have any of these objectives, it was classified as having “other” purposes. Two potential audiences were identified for each source: policymakers and education practitioners. If no specific audience was identified for a source, it was classified as not having a specific target. Most documents had more than one objective and some had both policymakers and education practitioners as target audiences.

In 5 countries no sources mentioning COs were found. All of them are classified as Not Reported.

Figure 12 shows the number of countries divided by the objective of the sources used for classification. The most common objective is to support improvement (43 countries), followed by inform policy (38 countries), diagnostic of the education system (32 countries), measure impact of an intervention (25 countries), and measure progress (23 countries). In 15 countries, sources used for the classification have other or not specified purposes.

Figure 12: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Objectives of the Sources Used for Classification

Looking at audiences targeted by sources utilized, in 38 countries documents were targeted to policymakers, and in 17 countries to education practitioners. In 13 countries the audience was not specified, or it was the general public.

Figure 13 reports the number of countries by target audience of source used.

Figure 13: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by Target Audiences of Sources Used for Classification
3.4 Features of Classroom Observations

Looking at domains covered by COs, the analysis sheds light on which aspects of teaching are most likely to be observed within the classroom.

In most countries COs are mentioned in relation to the primary level of education (59 out of 76, 77%), followed by secondary (19 countries, 25%), and pre-primary (16 countries, 21%). Only in six countries are COs mentioned for all levels of education.

COs tended to assess the quality of teaching rather than the quantity of teaching. In 31 countries (41%) COs cover both domains, in 18 countries only quality, and in one country only quantity of teaching. COs were more likely to assess time teachers spend on teaching than teachers’ attendance. The most assessed sub-criteria for quality of education was how teachers give instructions (in 44 countries), followed by classroom environment (in 40 countries).

The data also revealed how COs adoption slowed during pandemic-related school closures: in 2020 and 2021, COs were implemented in only nine countries while all countries classified as Advanced implemented COs before 2020.

This section provides a detailed analysis of the criteria used for the baseline calculation of the indicator:

- level of education where the COs took place (pre-primary, primary, or secondary school)
- domain covered by the COs (quantity and quality of teaching and respective subdomains)
- representativeness of sample of schools where COs are implemented
- endorsement of COs by a relevant authority in the country
- frequency of COs
- certainty of COs (if they are implemented, recommended, or to be implemented).

Level of education and domains covered by COs are the only two criteria that allow to differentiate between Not Reported and Emerging countries and between Established and Advanced. Representativeness, frequency, and endorsement criteria were used to classify countries as at least Established, and the certainty criteria was used to classify them as at least Emerging.

Level of Education

Sixty-four of the countries analyzed are low- or lower-middle income countries, where expenditure in education is mainly allocated towards primary education. Excluding countries where the level of education is not specified (14 out of 76, 18%), in most cases COs are implemented in only one level of education (36 out of 62 countries, 58%), with a large predominance of primary school grades (33 out of 36, 92%). Primary is also mentioned in all cases where more than one level of education is mentioned. In the 20 countries where COs are mentioned for two levels of education, eight mentions pre-primary and primary, 12 mention primary and secondary education, while in six countries COs are mentioned for all levels of education.

COs at the primary level are the most common in each classification of COs level of development. Out of 24 Not Reported countries, in 11 (46%) the level of education is not specified, in seven (29%) COs are mentioned only for primary schools, and in one (4%) for pre-primary schools. In five Not Reported countries (21%) COs are mentioned for more than one level, including primary. These countries were still classified with the lowest level of development of COs because the COs were only recommended or had yet to be implemented.

Among 13 countries classified as Emerging, in six (46%) the sources report COs only for primary schools and in four countries (31%) are mentioned for more than one level of education (including primary); in 12 of the 19 countries (63%) with an Established level, COs are mentioned as taking place only in primary schools (in other six countries COs are mentioned for more than one level, including primary); in and eight of the 21 Advanced countries (38%) COs are reported to be in place

---

28 UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)
29 See section 3.5 for details on Not Reported level of development.
only in primary schools, and in other 12 countries (57%), COs take place in more than one level, including primary.

Figure 14 reports the number of countries analyzed by school level and Level of Development.

![Figure 14: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by School Level](image)

**Figure 14: Level of Development of Classroom Observations by School Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level Combination</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Primary &amp; Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; Secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Primary, Primary, and Secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ calculations

**Quantity and Quality of Teaching**

To gain a deeper understanding of how COs are implemented, this section explores where COs assess quality and quantity of teaching. We considered the quantity of teaching criterion as met by the COs if at least one between teachers’ attendance and time teachers spend on teaching were addressed by COs (per the indicator methodology). Quality of teaching was divided into four sub-criteria: teachers’ instructional practices, teachers’ knowledge of pedagogical content, classroom environment, and teachers’ use of socio-emotional skills. If any of these sub-criteria were addressed by COs, we considered the quality of teaching as covered (per the indicator methodology).

In 31 out of 76 countries (41%), COs covered both quality and quantity of teaching. Twenty-one of them were classified as Advanced, five as Established, and five as Not Reported. Among countries covering only one of these domains, 18 covered quality of teaching and only one covered quantity. In 26 countries (34%) none of the criteria were met: 16 of them have been classified as Not Reported, and 10 as Emerging. Figure 15 reports how many countries reported COs covering quality and quality of teaching for each level of COs.
Figure 15: Number of Countries covering Key Domains by Classroom Observations Level of Development

Looking at each sub-criterion (attendance and time teachers spend on teaching for the quantity domain, teachers' instructional practices, teachers' knowledge of pedagogical content, classroom environment, and teachers' use of socio-emotional skills for the quality domain) can provide insight on the focus areas of COs and, by extension, the information these tools provide to guide reform efforts.

Among the 32 countries where COs cover the quantity of teaching, eight address the sub-criteria of time teachers spend on teaching. In only four countries, teachers' attendance is addressed, and in 20 are both addressed.

COs cover at least one sub-criteria of quality of teaching in 49 countries out of 76 (64%). COs cover all four sub-criteria of quality of teaching in 26 countries out of 76; in 10 countries they cover only three sub-criteria; in seven countries, only two sub-criteria are addressed, in six countries, COs cover only one sub-criterion.

Figure 16 shows how each sub-criteria of the domain quality of teaching is covered by COs in Not reported, Emerging, Established, and Advanced countries, respectively.
Among the 49 countries covering the quality of teaching domain, the most covered sub-criterion is how the teacher gives instructions (44 countries, 90%), followed by classroom environment (40 countries, 82%), teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (38 countries, 78%), and use of socio-emotional skills (32 countries, 65%).

It is important to note that there are fewer Emerging countries covering quality sub-domains than Not Reported countries. This may seem counterintuitive; however, as already mentioned, there are cases of Not Reported countries where sources describe CO in detail and as covering many domains, but without evidence of actual implementation.

Representativeness

To classify a country as at least Established, COs need to be implemented in a representative number of schools. The criterion does not require representativeness at the national level, but at least at a sub-national level (federated state, region, province, or municipality). In 40 countries out of 76 (53%) COs are in place or to be implemented at the national level. Of these, nine countries have been classified as Not Reported as COs are yet to be implemented. Sixteen of these 40 countries (40%) have been classified as Advanced, 11 as Established (27.5%), and four (10%) as Emerging. In 19 countries COs are either not implemented in a representative sample of schools, or no mention of representativeness has been found. Fourteen have been classified as Not Reported and five as Emerging.

Amongst the remaining countries (17), in nine COs are implemented only in a municipality, in a county, or in a province, and in eight at the regional or federal state level.

Figure 17 shows the number of countries for each level of representativeness and for each level of development of COs.
When Classroom Observations are used in a small sample of schools: the case of Djibouti

The Djibouti Early Grade Reading Activity (DEGRA), funded by USAID, is a five-year (2019-2024), $11,386,528 project to improve reading outcomes for more than 55,000 children in grades 1–5. In 2021 USAID published a mid-evaluation report, showing that COs were one of the tools used to measure the progress of the project. For the evaluation, 100 observations in grades 1 and 2 were conducted in 50 schools. The CO tool is described in detail and covers both quality and quantity of teaching. Despite the project being endorsed by the Ministry of Education, there is no evidence that COs are implemented in a systematic way across the country as 50 schools is not a representative sample. For this reason, Djibouti has been classified as Emerging.

Frequency

The implementation of COs in the period 2017-2021 has not been homogeneous. The COVID-19 pandemic has hindered CO implementation in the period 2020-21, when we found evidence of implementation only in nine countries (five in 2020 and four in 2021) out of 76 (12%). None of them have been classified as Advanced. In 26 countries (34%), we did not find any evidence of implementation in selected years: 24 of them have been classified as Not Reported, and two as Emerging. In these two countries we have found evidence that COs have been implemented, but without any reference to a temporal period. Among the 24 Not Reported countries, we did not find any evidence of implementation in five countries, while in 18 countries COs are either recommended or to be implemented. Zambia was classified as Not Reported as there were only references to implementation prior to 2017.

Figure 18 reports the number of countries which have implemented COs in the period 2017-2021, disaggregated by year and score level.

---

30 More information on the project can be found here: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00Z8H1.pdf
The Impact of School Closures on the implementation of Classroom Observations: the case of Somalia

The breakout of the COVID-19 pandemic forced almost every GPE country to close schools. Interruptions in education have made the implementation of COs difficult or even unfeasible in many cases. In Somalia, schools closed for 19 weeks. Before the pandemic broke out, the Somalian Ministry of Education received $17.9 million for an Education Sector Program Implementation grant (ESPIG) with the following objectives:

- increase access to quality education for out-of-school children
- enhance the quality of primary education
- improve the capacity of the Ministry of Education to regulate and manage the education sector.

Program activities included the development of a CO tool and its implementation in 616 schools. Although 79% of the grant had been disbursed by the end of October 2021, COs were implemented in only 77 schools (13%) out of a planned 616 schools.

Despite these limitations, Somalia was classified as Established because COs were implemented and covered more than one grade. On the other hand, it is not Advanced because COs only cover quality of teaching and not quantity.

## Endorsement

The endorsement of a relevant authority in the country is a minimum requirement to classify a country’s CO level as at least Established. Out of the 76 countries reviewed, we found evidence of non-endorsement in only seven countries (9%) (in five of which there was no mention of COs at all).

Among the 69 countries where evidence of endorsement was found, in 66 (96%) COs were endorsed by the government (either by the Ministry of Education or by the Ministry of Finance) and in three (4%) by an intergovernmental organization (the cases of Dominica, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines are highlighted in the dedicated box below). In 17 of the 66 countries COs were endorsed.

---

31 UNESCO Institute for Statistics

32 More information on the program can be found here: https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/document/file/2022-02-progress-report-espig-somalia.pdf?VersionId=TMGubjibek3NKw_bRqom3KfQU.JRO5aDN
by the government but there was no evidence that they were in place: they were either recommended or to be implemented, and for this reason those countries were classified as Not Reported.

Figure 19 reports the number of countries for each type of endorsement and for each level of development of COs.

The role of inter-governmental organizations in the implementation of Classroom Observations: The Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and COs in Dominica, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Amongst the GPE partner countries analyzed in this work are small island state members of inter-governmental organizations. Among them, Dominica, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines represent a notable example of how coordinated action can ensure stronger EMIS systems and improve the quality of teaching assessment. These countries are all members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) that in 2018 commissioned a review of teacher performance appraisal systems in member states. The review document was used as the main source for the calculation of the scores in all three countries: it describes in detail how COs are implemented. The OECS has developed its own guidelines for COs which covers both Quality and Quantity of teaching criteria. The review reports that the tool is used in all three countries: for this reason, they are classified as Advanced.

3.5 Countries with Low Levels of Development of Classroom Observations

Twenty-four countries were classified as Not Reported, the lowest level of classification, as we were unable to find evidence that COs had taken place in the last five years or of follow through on their plans to implement COs. Amongst the 12 countries classified as Emerging, ten countries had no information as to whether COs assessed the quantity or quality of teaching.

Countries Classified as 'Not Reported'

Countries have been assigned the lowest score of COs (Not Reported) where there was no evidence that COs had taken place in the last five years.

The following cases were considered as lacking evidence of implementation:

1. There is no mention of COs in any document reviewed from:
   a. GPE
   b. National Ministry of Education
c. UNESCO Planipolis documentation
d. World Bank data

for the 2017-2022 period. This is the case of Bhutan, Georgia, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

2. COs are only mentioned but there is no detailed description of the CO tool nor evidence that they were implemented: either they are recommended, or they are planned. This is the case for 12 countries: Bangladesh, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Grenada, Haiti, Mali, Myanmar, Sudan, Honduras, and Yemen.

3. COs are described in detail so would meet all criteria, but there is no evidence of their implementation. This is the case for Cameroon, Haiti, Nigeria, São Tomé and Príncipe, Tuvalu, and Uzbekistan. Four of these countries (Cameroon, Malawi, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Tuvalu), the Teach tool was mentioned but there was no additional information on the implementation of COs.

Figure 20 below sets out the number of countries in each of the above categories.

**Figure 20: Number of Countries with a ‘Not Reported’ Rating by CO Status**

![Bar chart showing number of countries in different categories](chart)

Source: authors’ calculations

**Countries Classified as ‘Emerging’**

A country is classified as Emerging if there is evidence of COs in at least one grade, but all other criteria are not met. This means that documents reviewed for that country do not specify the sample of schools where COs were implemented, nor what domains they cover.

The analysis found 13 countries classified as Emerging (17%). Among these countries, in 10 there is no evidence that COs assess quantity or quality of teaching. In the remaining three, COs assess at least one domain, but the sample of schools was not significant (see for instance the case of Djibouti).

Amongst Emerging countries, COs were mainly conducted in primary school grades (in 9 countries). In four countries COs covered more than one level: in one country (Burkina Faso), all three levels, (pre-primary, primary, and secondary); in one, pre-primary and primary (Rwanda); and in the last two (Moldova and Marshall Islands), primary and secondary. In three countries we found evidence of COs, but the level of education was not specified.

Figure 21 shows education levels covered by COs in Emerging countries.
Figure 21: Levels of education covered by COs: Emerging Countries

Source: authors’ calculations
4 Lessons Learned and Opportunities for Further Research

This report has attempted to provide a systematic analysis and comparison of the use of COs across 76 GPE partner countries. In this section, we summarize reflections from the research process and lessons generated from the findings, as well as reflections for future research.

Reflections from the research process lessons and future research

- **Indicator 7 (ii) is a first iteration.** Future rounds of data collection may wish to adjust criteria and sub-criteria parameters in light of the findings. In particular, the representativeness sub-criterion defined in the rubric for teaching quality assessment checklist (Annex 3) does not currently specify what is to be considered representative and what is not. The frequency sub-criterion also warrants further consideration because as currently stated in the checklist it is a binary criterion assessing whether countries have conducted COs in the past year or not. In the future, it might be applied on scale assessing how many times observations have been conducted.

- **Research carried out for this study relied solely on secondary sources,** meaning it was not possible to verify how COs are conducted in practice. Future research, including forthcoming rounds of data collection for indicator 7 (ii), should also include primary sources. While it is likely unfeasible to observe COs across all countries systematically, researchers may want to consider speaking to relevant government ministries, perhaps within the context of broader GPE data collection and capacity development exercises.

- **The research team’s choice of attributing a Not Reported rating to countries that had not documented implementation of otherwise comprehensive or Advanced COs was decisive in 12 cases.** This suggests that in these cases, the classification could be updated if data could be collected by following up on implementing these plans or if countries documented the implementation process more thoroughly.

- **Overall, CO use is scarcely documented.** Only 25 countries reported on which tools were used, generally when documents consulted were drafted under the auspices of international organizations such as the World Bank. Future research including forthcoming rounds of data collection for indicator 7 (ii) should explore how CO tools are designed, adapted, and used.

- **Sources consulted rarely described how CO tools contribute to improving teaching quality.** Future research could examine whether there are correlations between data on teaching quality in GPE partner countries and indicator 7 (ii) results. The indicator serves to use the status of COs in partner countries as proxy of teaching quality. However, other factors and elements should be accounted to report comprehensively on teaching quality.

Lessons from the findings and future research

- **There were no discernible patterns in terms of the income levels, regions, and fragility status of countries with higher CO levels.** This should be monitored in future research, particularly to verify whether patterns emerge as the indicator’s composition is revised in future.

- **Fifty-two of 76 GPE partner countries analyzed (68%) conducted COs to assess teaching quality between 2017 and 2021.** Thirty-nine countries (51%) rank as either Advanced or Established. Given the low-income and frequently fragile nature of these countries, these figures could be considered relatively high. Future research could investigate the extent to which COs have been prioritized as a policy priority. Moreover, tools adopted by these countries were frequently those promoted by international organizations. This suggests scope to study the role of aid programs as an opportunity to promote the use of COs.

- **Countries classified as Advanced spend on average more of their GDP in education.** Advanced countries spend on average 5% of their GDP on education, as compared to 4.9% average across Established countries, 4.6% amongst Emerging countries, and 3.9% amongst Not Reported countries. Future rounds of data collection should explore whether this pattern holds true over time and whether there is a relationship between government expenditure in education and the use of COs in the promotion of improved teaching quality.
Other opportunities for future research

- **Comparative analysis with other metrics.** Researchers may wish to compare indicator 7 (ii) scores with indicators of factors that might be influencing the conduction of COs. Examples include markers of policy framework, educational governance, and educational investment. As indicator 7 (ii) grows into a longitudinal database, it may also be possible to study potential associations with variables potentially affected using COs such as teacher characteristics, teaching quality, teaching practices, and learning outcomes.

- **Comparative analyses on the use of COs in partner countries versus non-partner countries.** This research focused on a subset of GPE partner countries. This database should be expanded to include all GPE partner countries in future studies. Further research might apply the indicator 7 (ii) methodology to rank countries outside of GPE’s remit and potentially compare results.

- **Reflection on the frequency of future data collection.** Results serve as the baseline for this indicator. Longitudinal analysis of CO trends will become possible as this indicator is reviewed over time. Researchers will have to decide how frequently to update the indicator. On the one hand, the timing of indicator data collection should mirror protocols for other indicators in GPE’s results framework. On the other hand, our research found partner countries had generally conducted CO only once over the five-year period in question, suggesting that increasing the frequency of indicator data collection may not necessarily improve the robustness of longitudinal analysis.

- **GPE may wish to construct indicators measuring the use of COs for other purposes.** Indicator 7 (ii) only looks at the use of COs in support of improving teaching quality. Future indicators may wish to apply a similar methodology to measure the use of COs for other purposes such as promoting teacher accountability. This could feasibly be accomplished through the same data collection exercise as that carried out for indicator 7 (ii).
### Annex 1. List of 76 Partner Countries included in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>FS Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Democratic Republic of</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Republic of</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Methodology sheet for Indicator 7 (ii) of the GPE 2025 results framework (Annex 1 of ToR)

INDICATOR 7_ii
Proportion of countries where teaching quality is assessed.

Purpose: To measure the percentage of countries that have an assessment, as a measurement, of teaching quality at the pre-primary, primary, and/or secondary level of schooling based on a classroom observation tool that captures key domains of the teaching-learning interaction that help students learn (see Definition).

Teachers play a key role in determining the quality of education provided in classrooms. Assessing teaching quality helps diagnose areas that need improvement and inform change to teaching practice, institutional supports, or policy design. A teaching quality assessment can help understand strengths and weaknesses in teacher knowledge and practice and identify teachers' attitudes and beliefs about learning and teaching. Such assessments can thus be useful for informing teacher practice and policy development. While measuring teacher quality through classroom observation does not necessarily ensure that findings are leveraged to improve teaching or policy, they are a useful step.

Definition: Percentage of countries where a teaching quality assessment has taken place at the pre-primary, primary, or secondary level of schooling within the last five years. Recognizing the complexities in measuring teaching quality and the different foci, factors, and policy areas that can be considered in such a measure, the scope of this indicator is limited to assessing key domains regarding the quantity and quality of teaching. While these factors, in part, cannot give a comprehensive picture of teaching quality on their own, they serve as a proxy for teaching quality in this indicator.

This indicator is based on classroom observation tools to assess teaching quality at the teacher level. A rubric to determine the quality of the teaching quality assessment considers four minimum criteria listed below:

i. Level of education: Focus on grades at (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

ii. The classroom observation tool through teaching-learning interaction assesses the following key domains:
   a. Quantity of teaching or instructional time: (a) time teachers spend on teaching and helping students learn, (b) teachers' attendance in their classes
   b. Quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom: the quality of teaching practice can be broken down to include one or more of the following areas: (a) teacher instruction, (b) pedagogical content knowledge, (c) classroom environment (whether it supports learning), (d) use of socioemotional skills in the classroom.

iii. Representativeness: The assessment is representative nationally or at least at federated state/region/province/its equivalent.

iv. Frequency of data collection with relevant endorsement: Assessment has been carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

Unit of measurement: Percentage

Calculation method: At the country level, the assessment of teaching quality can be classified into one of four levels of development or rigor as follows.

Advanced, where the assessment of teaching quality meets all four minimum criteria by:

i. covering more than one grade in at least one level of education: (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, and/or (c) secondary education.
ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; and one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.

iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.

iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

Established, where the assessment of teaching quality, not considered as Advanced, meets all four minimum criteria by:

i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; or one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.

iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.

iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.

Emerging, where the assessment of teaching quality, not considered as Advanced or Established, partially meets the four minimum indicator criteria by:

i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

And fails to meet all remaining three criteria\(^{33}\) (criteria 2-4).

Not Reported, where data or information to evidence an assessment of teaching quality through a classroom observation tool are not available.

At the aggregate level, take the sum of the number of countries which have had an assessment of teaching quality classified as Established or Advanced divided by the total number of GPE partner countries.

Formula:

**Country level**

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{adjusted}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment that meets all four minimum criteria as Advanced (see calculation section above),} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{established}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment that meets all four minimum criteria as Established (see calculation section above),} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{emerging}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment that partially meets the four minimum criteria as emerging (see calculation section above),} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{not\ reported}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if country } j \text{ does not report on a teaching quality assessment or no data are available (see calculation section above),} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

for \( j = 1, \ldots, n \).

**Aggregate level**

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{established}_j + Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{advanced}_j}{n} \]

Where:

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{advanced}_j \quad \text{Dummy representing if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment at the Advanced level} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{established}_j \quad \text{Dummy representing if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment at the Established level} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{emerging}_j \quad \text{Dummy representing if country } j \text{ has a teaching quality assessment at the Emerging level} \]

\[ Teaching\ quality\ assessment\_\text{not\ reported}_j \quad \text{Dummy representing if country } j \text{ does not report on a teaching quality assessment or no data are available} \]

\(^{33}\) To the minimum as “Established” classification
*Teaching quality assessment\_established\_j* Dummy representing if country \( j \) has a teaching quality assessment at the *Established* level

*Teaching quality assessment* Proportion of partner countries with a teaching quality assessment *Established or Advanced*

\( n \) Number of partner countries.

**Reporting timeframe:** At least twice during GPE 2025 Results Framework.

**Data required:** Teaching quality assessments following the defined rubric (see Definition)

**Data source:** GPE Secretariat (Documentation with relevant teaching quality information.)

**Types of disaggregation:** By PCFC.

**Interpretation:** The indicator will provide information on the extent to which assessments of teaching quality, through classroom observation tools, are being carried out throughout the GPE 2025 Strategy. A high value indicates that a larger number of partner countries assess quality of teaching in the classroom and are classified as *Established or Advanced*.

**Quality standards:** Assessment of teaching quality based on a classroom observation tool in a country with the aim to capture one or more aspects of the teaching-learning interaction. Generally, classroom observation tools differ in whether they are low and/or high inference, inter-rater reliability, and ability to predict student outcomes. Qualitative notes will accompany the teaching quality assessment describing the purpose intended\(^{34}\), targeted audience\(^{35}\), sources, and potential limitations.

**Limitations:** The indicator at the country level conveys information on teaching quality broadly through the assessment of the quantity of teaching and quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom. The comparability of teaching quality assessment results across countries will be limited. This is because the quality and content of classroom teaching delivery differ across countries and classroom contexts and because how quality teaching manifests in different settings may vary. The data collection is extended to five years, given that teaching assessments are unlikely to be conducted yearly or even regularly, similar to learning assessments.

---

\(^{34}\) Purpose or intended use: Intended use is one or more of the following: (a) for diagnostic purposes (b) to inform teacher policies, (c) to measure progress over time, (d) to support improvement (e) to measure impact of an intervention.

\(^{35}\) Target audience: Target audience includes one or more of the following: (a) policymakers, or (b) education practitioners, including schools’ principals, administrators, including those in charge of monitoring school quality, development partners, and civil society.
### Annex 3. Rubric for teaching quality assessment check of minimum criteria (Annex 2 of ToR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Check - Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of country/territory:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of criteria met:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Reported/ Emergent/ Established/ Advanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of tool:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Check - Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Level of education</strong></td>
<td>Select the respective grades and level(s) of education that apply:</td>
<td>[add details] ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Pre-primary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ more than one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ more than one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ more than one grade, specify _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No focus on any level of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Key domains</strong></td>
<td>Select the key domain(s) assessed that apply:</td>
<td>[add details] ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity of teaching or instructional time (one or more of the following areas)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ a. Time teachers spend on teaching and helping students learn,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ b. Teachers’ attendance in their classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of teaching (one or more of the following areas)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ a. Teacher instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ b. Pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ c. Classroom environment (whether it supports learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ d. Use of social-emotional skills in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No focus on any of the core domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Representativeness</strong></td>
<td>Select the representativeness level(s) that apply:</td>
<td>[add details] ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ one federated state/ region/ province/ it is equivalent, specify __________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ more than one federated state/ region/ province/ it is equivalent, specify __________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ nationally represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Not representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frequency of data collection and relevant endorsement</td>
<td>☐ Carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country</td>
<td>[add details] _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Not frequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose or intended use</th>
<th>Select the purpose(s) or intended use(s) that apply:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ a. Diagnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ b. Inform policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ c. Measure progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ d. Support improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ e. Measure impact of an intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ f. Other, specify ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No purpose or intended use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>[add details] _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential limitations:</td>
<td>[add details] _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Select the target audience(s) that apply:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ a. Policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ b. Education practitioners (schools' principals, administrators including those in charge of monitoring school quality, development partners, civil society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ c. Other, specify ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No target audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on the source and potential limitations</th>
<th>Source: _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential limitations: _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on the source and potential limitations</th>
<th>[add details] _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[add details] _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4. Database Development

The database is an MS Excel file composed of 76 worksheets, one for each of the partner countries analyzed, plus a master one that presents aggregate data and scores by country. The aggregated information provides a global picture and allows comparison between countries. Each country spreadsheet encodes the criteria and sub-criteria of indicator 7 (ii) and the Rubric (Annex 3) for monitoring the quality of education of the minimum criteria. The worksheet for each country also contains aggregated scores for each criterion. Throughout the database, whenever possible, information has been coded using drop-down lists. This approach both minimized manual data entry errors and allowed for easy adjustment of scores during the analysis.

The final format of the database was discussed with and validated by the GPE Secretariat during the inception phase. For each source (rows), the database specifies what type of information it contains on the topic of quality assessment in education, according to the criteria specified in Annex 2 (columns). The four minimum criteria are subdivided into sub-criteria and completed by background information (purpose or intended use and target audience) and an additional column (“Certainty”) specifying the extent to which classroom observation tools are applied in practice and not only foreseen by policy objectives.

Each country spreadsheet also contains a hyperlinked bibliography of the sources utilized to populate the database (title, author, year of publication). The consultancy has completed a further bibliography as well with all the sources consulted, but that contains no mention of COs (Annex 5).

For each criterion and sub-criterion, the following information is available:

- Page (of the source document containing data on COs)
- Data point (actual info on classroom observation)
- Specifications needed to determine the data point
- Details
- Notes
- Code (0, 1 or 2).

Finally, the Master spreadsheet presents the Level of Development of all the 76 GPE partner countries, defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced, where the assessment of teaching quality meets all four minimum criteria by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. covering more than one grade in at least one level of education: (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, and/or (c) secondary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; and one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established, where the assessment of teaching quality, not considered as Advanced, meets all four minimum criteria by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. assessing at least one area of (i) quantity of teaching or instructional time; or one area of (ii) quality of teaching practice delivered in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. representative nationally or at least at federated state/ region/ province/ its equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. being carried out at least once in the last five years and with the endorsement of the relevant authorities in the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging, where the assessment of teaching quality, not considered as Advanced or Established, partially meets the four minimum indicator criteria by:

i. covering at least one grade in one level of education, (a) pre-primary, (b) primary, or (c) secondary education.

ii. And fails to meet all remaining three criteria\(^{36}\) (criteria 2-4).

Not Reported, where data or information to evidence an assessment of teaching quality through a classroom observation tool are not available.

### 3.1 Database Completion

In order to populate the database, the study reviewed both quantitative and qualitative evidence available through existing online sources. It collected, encoded, and analyzed data on the level of use of classroom observation tools from 2017 to 2021 at the pre-primary, primary, and secondary levels of education in each of the 76 GPE partner countries.

Data collection relied on secondary sources and conceptualized teaching quality assessment as use of classroom observation tools. Classroom observations conducted as part of appraisals and/or evaluations were not included in this study.

Data on COs was gathered through an extensive literature review on quality teaching policy, programming, and practice sources available through web search. The desk review followed a ‘snowball’ approach, whereby useful further sources were identified in the first reviewed documents.

The main types of sources consulted and analyzed were:

I. GPE Secretariat documentation

II. Ministry of Education reports

III. Education sector analyses and plans

IV. Teaching quality assessment reports and analytical reports

V. Other relevant documents available and accessible through web search

To ensure data consistency, for each of the 76 partner countries analyzed, the consultants researched and analyzed up to five sources from amongst the different types. When one source met all GPE’s criteria\(^{37}\), no further source was researched. When the five sources consulted did not yield enough information to respond to all criteria, the consults consulted up to an additional five sources, expanding the data collection to academic papers, market research and NGO reports.

Data gathered from the abovementioned sources was organized and systematized in a database. The database matches domain criteria and relevant sub-criteria identified by GPE; and allows the analysis of the disaggregated data.

---

\(^{36}\) To the minimum as “Established” classification

\(^{37}\) Level of Education; Key Domains; Representativeness; Frequency; Endorsement; Background information; Certainty.
3.2 Database Compilation Approach

This section shows how the database was compiled in each section and according to each of the GPE criterion. It shows the level of details achieved to comprehensively report complex data and make them accessible and easy-to-consult.

Level of Education

The “Level of Education” criterion and its sub-criteria specify at which educational level and grade the classroom observation are taking place. The Level of Education criterion has a code of 0 or 1 or 2. This is because there are three level of analysis to categorize the country as Advanced or Established (school level, one grade and more than one grade).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>SUB CRITERIA</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>Free text: page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Dropdown menu: One Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dropdown menu: Grades 1 to 15 (listed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Empty for this criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No known focus on any</td>
<td>Free text: Any useful comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific level of education</td>
<td>Dropdown menu: 0 or 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not applicable

N/S = non-specified

The Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary sub-criteria are disaggregated fields, each with its own row and dropdown menus for analysis. When the same source refers to multiple-level classroom observations, the domains will be populated for every level which applies.

The analysis will identify whether one grade, more than one or a non-specified (N/S) number of grades is covered within the level of education.

The grade covered will also be specified. Given the different national classification of school levels in each analyzed country, the consultancy will assign each grade to “primary” or “secondary” depending on how each national school system classifies school grade levels.

The code will be assigned according to these definitions:

- 2: the classroom observation covers more than one grade in at least one level of education;
- 1: the classroom observation covers at least one grade in one level of education;
- 0: the classroom observation does not explicitly cover any specific grade level.

Key Domains

The Key Domains identified by GPE in the Annex 3 relate to quantity and quality of teaching and aim at verifying whether the classroom observation is measuring teaching time, attendance, instruction, pedagogical knowledge, environment, and skill-based teaching. For the Key Domains criterion, the code to each sub-criterion (Quality and Quantity) is 0 or 1. However, the aggregate score will be 0 or 1 or 2 because there are three level of analysis (Quality or Quantity or both together).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SUB CRITERIA</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Time teachers spend on teaching</td>
<td>Free text: page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ attendance</td>
<td>Drop down menu: Yes No N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Teacher instruction</td>
<td>Empty for this Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of socioemotional skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No focus on any of the core domains</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultancy will establish whether the classroom observation tool measures each sub domain by assigning a yes, no, or non-specified value. Where findings on the quality of teaching are available, the consultancy will add them to a dedicated section of the database.

The code for each sub-criterion will be assigned according to these definitions:

- 1: the classroom observation matches the sub-criterion.
- 0: the classroom observation does not match the sub-criterion.

The aggregate score for each country in the Key Domains criterion will be computed based on this scoring of sub-criteria as follows:

- 2: the classroom observation incorporates at least one sub-criterion for each criterion (one for both Quantity AND Quality),
- 1: the classroom observation incorporates at least one sub-criterion for at least one criterion (one for either Quantity OR Quality),
- 0: the classroom observation does not incorporate the criteria of Quantity and Quality.

Classroom observations analyzed may define Key Domain criteria and sub-criteria using different language to that employed by GPE classification. The Instructions section of the final database will clarify how we match these. Where the observations analyzed are not directly equivalent to the GPE classification, the ‘best fit’ will be used and the rationale for this entered in the Details field of the Database.

**Representativeness**

Representativeness details where in a country the classroom observations are taking place and demands an analysis of governance levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not represented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on Representativeness is disaggregated by the administrative units the classroom observations are taking place in (e.g.) Federated State, Region, Province, or equivalent level, and whether one or more than one sub-national unit or the country as a whole is covered if different sources on the same country offer complementary data at the disaggregated level, the presence of further details about geographical coverage enables a complete overview of the actual level of Representativeness. It may also be useful for future World Bank / GPE research.

The code will be assigned according to these definitions:

- 1: the classroom observation matches the criterion.
- 0: the classroom observation does not match the criterion.

**Frequency of data collection with relevant endorsement**

The frequency and relevant endorsement criterion highlights when the classroom observations took place and what governmental/multilateral agency endorsed it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of data collection and relevant endorsement</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GPE Secretariat has established that the preferred timeframe for this research is 2017-2022. We will primarily collect sources falling into that range.

Assessments will be classified as “frequent” if:

- sources fall within this time range;
- the tools reported in the sources have been used within this timeframe, and;
- the teaching quality assessment has been endorsed by a relevant authority in the country.

If any of these criteria are not met the tool will be not included in the database, unless it is the only available source or there are fewer than five sources overall on a given country that do not offer the necessary information. In this case, the assessment will be rated as “not frequent.”

The code will be assigned according to these definitions:

- 1: the classroom observation matches the criterion.
- 0: the classroom observation does not match the criterion.

**Background Information**

Background information provides further details on the sources: their intended audience and purpose, as well as any other note or potential limitation that are relevant to the scoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>SUB CRITERIA</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose or intended use</td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>Free Text: page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure impact of an intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No purpose or intended use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target audience</td>
<td>Policymakers</td>
<td>Free Text: page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education practitioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No target focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes and potential limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since a sole source may have more than one purpose or target audience, the database allows for flags in these domains. Free text explanations of ‘other’ will be entered in the ‘specifications’ domain.

**Certainty**

Assessing the level of Certainty allows the Consultancy to provide encoded information on how we formulated our assessment for each criterion. This field summarizes our overall assessment of a given criterion considering uncertainties such as: to whether the practice of classroom observations is
foreseen by a national or sub-national Policy; to what extent these policies are implemented; and to what extent the existing tools are implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>SUB CRITERIA</th>
<th>CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Dropdown menu:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dropdown menu (for each):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programs in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Consultancy added the disaggregation of data at tool implementation level to provide additional evidence of context where a policy may be existing and partially implemented, but existing tools are not consistently used.
Annex 5. Bibliography of Consulted Sources with no mention of Classroom Observations

This bibliography has been prepared by Learn More, a member of Triple Line's consortium for delivering monitoring and evaluation services to the GPE Secretariat.

Afghanistan


Albania


Bangladesh


Benin


Bhutan

Burkina Faso

  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/2019-02-gpe-synthesis-report-country-level-evaluations_0.pdf?VersionId=Dhsd0xXjz_ip6pgTToeMY.GO9OGEe2b

Burundi

  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/2022-04-Burundi-UNICEF-rapport-progr%C3%A8s.pdf?VersionId=9iNk_Ufdak1TcTlOICXsz7sppCGNu0o

  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/plan_transitoire_education_du_burundi.pdf?VersionId=23CHC06LLfFMyq77pSEBaCzYEBilk

  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/rapport_evaluation_baastel_pte_burundi.pdf?VersionId=yvHqIKgk1fTRWfkWBzIUi1KQGMzU


Cabo Verde


  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/plano_estrategico_da_educacao_cvfinal.pdf?VersionId=AZujj9rREGrtNPC4R5kMVh2oSDEr_cw

  No mention of classroom observations, but there is a mention of general school observations.

  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/b-cp-esp_appraisal_report_por.pdf?VersionId=mc_sv2yn.uZ0Xddd6kCbudyDeHcqmWt


- Ministry of Education website is not accessible.

Cambodia


  The Education, Youth and Sport Performance in the Academic Year 2017-2018 and Goals for the
A Study on Assessments of Teaching Quality in GPE Partner Countries: Final Report

Academic Year 2018-2019

Cameroon


Central African Republic

- Classroom observation mentioned happened in 2015 and before.

Chad


Comoros


Congo, Democratic Republic of


• Ministry of Education website is not accessible.

Congo, Republic of


• Ministry of Education website is not accessible.

Côte D’Ivoire


Djibouti


Dominica


Eritrea


A Study on Assessments of Teaching Quality in GPE Partner Countries: Final Report 46
A Study on Assessments of Teaching Quality in GPE Partner Countries: Final Report

- The Ministry of Education website is not available.

Ethiopia


Gambia


Georgia

- It is reported that “A whole process of classroom observation is being piloted. Teacher professional development scheme within the classroom observation process piloted in March 2016. Classroom observation process will be fully launched in 2016-2017 academic year and will be an important component for the teacher’s professional and career development. There are
several stages for the process: The information obtained on how different countries analyse and evaluate the process, the participation of teachers in the classroom observation over the basic principles and the evaluation criteria and using the information to create workshops across the country. Teachers with the status of head teachers will need to undergo the process."

However, no documents have been found by the team. Documents in local language may be available.

Ghana

- Ministry of Education. School Establishment and Inspection Policy (SEaIP). 2020


  Vol 2

- Ministry of Education. Education Sector Analysis 2018. 2018

  2018

- Ministry of Education. Education sector plan implementation report. 2019

- National Teaching Council. Guidelines And Procedures for The Licensure Examination for Teachers. 2021

Grenada

- Ministry of Education. Education sector plan. OECS. 2012 – 2021
  https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/2012-2021-oecs-education-sector-strategy_0.pdf?VersionId=fRL26RXrQLuDYbjaiO5z2.yPbXjb_vku

- Ministry of Education site inaccessible

Guinea

  https://www.globalpartnership.org/fr/content/plan-sectoriel-de-education-2020-2029-guinee

  https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/summative-evaluation-gpes-support-guinea

  https://www.globalpartnership.org/fr/content/rapport-de-mise-en-oeuvre-du-plan-sectoriel-de-education-guinee-2019

https://www.globalpartnership.org/fr/content/analyse-du-secteur-de-education-et-de-la-formation-republique-de-guinee-2019


Guinea Bissau


Guyana


Haiti


Honduras


Kenya


Kiribati


Kyrgyz Republic


• Kyrgyz Republic and UNICEF. *Education Sector Analysis Strategic Choices for the Government to...*
Liberia
- Universalia. *Summative evaluation of GPE’s country-level support to education*. 2018 https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/summative-evaluation-gpes-country-level-support-education-liberia

Lesotho
- Kingdom of Lesotho. *Application for an education sector program implementation grant to Lesotho*. 2021 https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/application-education-sector-program-implementation-grant-lesotho-2021

Lao PDR


**Lao PDR**

Global Partnership for Education. National Learning Assessment Policy. 2021

Global Partnership for Education. National learning assessment framework. 2021


Madagascar


Malawi

https://www.unicef.org/malawi/media/4581/file/Malawi%20Education%20Sector%20Analysis.pdf

https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/malawi_esip_ii.pdf?VersionId=19JDyu0aIFWFOl2.qAK85938q9WNxe.

Maldives

https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/document/file/2020-8-%20Maldives-Program%20Document.pdf?VersionId=WEGEYGpuruho0B460876gVtaSb_fQa

World Bank. Implementation Completion and Results Report Republic of The Maldives for an Enhancing Education Development Project. 2018

World Bank. Maldives Learning and Measurement Advancement Project. 2019


The World Bank. Implementation Completion and Results Report Republic of The Maldives for an Enhancing Education Development Project. 2018


Mali


• UNICEF. Analyse du secteur de l’éducation pour la relance d’un enseignement fondamental de qualité pour tous et le développement d’une formation adaptée aux besoins. 2017 https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/document/file/2020-8-Mali-ESP-Analysis.pdf?VersionId=m0aBTrTlcB14HJ.crXjzw8qjkw0gCJoD


Marshall Islands

• Pacific Community. The Status of Pacific Education 2020 Educational Quality and Assessment


### Mauritania


FS Micronesia


Moldova


Mongolia


• The Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Sports; Asian Development Bank. Preschool Education Sector Study Report, Supporting the Development of Education Sector Master Plan of
Mongolia. 2020 https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/mongolias-preschool-education-sector-study-report


Mozambique


Myanmar


Nepal


la-formation-2020-2022-niger


Nigeria

- Results for Development, Universalia, Itad, Prospective evaluation of GPE’s country-level support to education Final Report – Year 2, 2020. https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/document/file/2020-04-country-level-prospective-evaluation-year-2%E2%80%93nigeria.pdf?VersionId=mGMX0w0OPTMReWZ1LdrUw7uFaBllKNu


Papua New Guinea


- Ministry of Education. Education Sector Analysis. 2018 https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/papua-new-guinea-education-sector-analysis-2018


Pakistan

- Global Partnership for Education. *Summative evaluation of GPE’s country-level support to education*. 2018 https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/summative-evaluation-gpes-country-level-support-education-pakistan


Rwanda


- Global Partnership for Education. *KIX ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22 Mobilizing innovation to strengthen teacher professional development. 2022* https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-knowledge-and-innovation-exchange-annual-report-2021-2022

Saint Lucia


Saint Vincent and the Grenadine


Samoa


São Tomé and Príncipe


Senegal


Sierra Leone


Solomon Islands


Somalia


• Republic of Somaliland, Ministry of Education & Science. National Teacher Education Policy. 2018. https://moe.govsomaliland.org/site/downloadfile/file/MjAyMi8wMS8yMDIyLTAxLTAzLTA5LTAwLTAxLTAxOTU1MTY0MjA2MDgwMS5wZGY%3D/view/1

• Republic of Somaliland, Ministry of Education & Science. Education Statistic Yearbook 2018/19. 2019. https://moe.govsomaliland.org/site/downloadfile/file/MjAyMS8wMS8yMDIzLTAxLTAzLTA3LTAxLTAxLTE2LTAzMTQtMTYxMDI5ODQzNiwW5wZGY%3D/view/1


South Sudan


• Ministry of General Education and Instruction. Training of Trainers Teaching Guide. 2018. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qJTl3f29izRk2akHRO0_p9wgrBiOduuz/view

Sudan


Tajikistan


**Tanzania**


**Timor-Leste**


**Togo**


Tonga


Tuvalu


Uganda


Uzbekistan


Vanuatu


- UNICEF. *Education and Training Sector Analysis*. 2018


Vietnam

  [https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/education-sector-analysis-vietnam-2017](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/education-sector-analysis-vietnam-2017)

- Global Partnership for Education. *Analysis of national learning assessment systems Vietnam country report*. 2019

- Ministry of Planning and Investment. *Viet Nam’s Voluntary National Review on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals*. 2018


- Ministry of Education website inaccessible

Yemen

- Appraisal of Transitional Education Plan 2019-2021 for Yemen: [link](#)

- Project Information Document (PID): Restoring Education and Learning Project: [link](#)

- Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG): [link](#)

  [https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099535005062217420/pdf/P1750361a640423613e2e14d38196611c0cca7c7091e.pdf](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099535005062217420/pdf/P1750361a640423613e2e14d38196611c0cca7c7091e.pdf)
Zambia


Zimbabwe


