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**Day 1**

**I. First session (9.30-10.30)**

Welcome address, Head of the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA (Task Force) Secretariat, Mr. Edem Adubra

The presentation of the Head of the Task Force Secretariat first described the three main areas of focus of the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA:

- The policy gap: very often, no comprehensive teacher policy exists at national level;
- The capacity gap: relating to the capacity to devise and implement teacher policies;
- The financing gap: regarding teacher salaries and the ability of ministries to make a better use of available resources.

The outcome of this expert group meeting will feed into a report that will serve as a background document for a meeting in Namibia at the end of November, in preparation for the second phase of the Task Force starting in 2013.

Introduction, rationale and aims of the workshop, Head of Education Indicators and Data Analysis, UIS, Mr. Albert Motivans

The presentation discussed the rationale and objectives of the expert meeting, focusing first on the rationale for a global approach on teacher indicators. New demands and information needs on teachers highlight the relevance and timing of a discussion around teacher and teaching indicators. The current expert meeting builds on a similar meeting organized by the UIS in 2007, which took stock of teacher indicators.

Measurement and teacher indicators’ development rely on conceptual and statistical frameworks, which at the same time respond to policy frameworks, as in the example of the OECD work.

The presentation summarized seven cross-national initiatives aiming at developing teacher indicators, highlighting the key goals of each initiative and emphasizing the work done by the UIS on teacher data collection and indicator development. The UIS is developing regional and global modules, and is working on a proposal for global modules on teachers with the view of enhancing and improving the existing international database on teachers. Together, the initiatives that were presented point to different dimensions of a results chain for education policy: policy design/inputs, implementation/processes, and results/outcomes.

After the mapping of current initiatives, the objectives of the meeting were presented. The first goal is to critically review the UNESCO framework on teachers and teaching, and UIS
indicators which respond to this framework. UNESCO’s framework, the Global Education Quality Assessment Framework (GEQAF), provides a model for examining education quality more generally. The second goal of the expert meeting is to exchange information and learn from various existing cross-national studies of teachers and teaching and, its third goal is to consider a common global agenda.

The presentation ended with a description of the expert’s meeting agenda and how the meeting is organized to meet the objectives.

Opening remarks, Director of UNESCO Division for Teachers and Higher Education, Mr. David Atchoarena

The presentation highlighted the significance of the expert meeting within UNESCO’s work on quality. Education quality will be the focus of UNESCO’s Medium-Term Strategy, which is being finalized, and teachers are the most important priority of UNESCO’s programme.

UNESCO is launching a new strategy on teachers. The strategy centres on three key components: (1) bridging the teacher gap, particularly in UNESCO’s priority countries; (2) Improving teaching and learning, with an eye on new developments and research, and (3) Informing the global debate on teachers.

Having the strategy in mind, there are several areas where further information on teachers is needed:

- Teacher recruitment, in particular better understanding who those who join the teaching force are;
- Teacher allocation, particularly the challenge of equalizing learning opportunities;
- Contextualization of teaching, pointing to the need to differentiate teaching to cater for different student profiles;
- Teaching for different subject areas, particularly math and science, but also considering teachers’ use of ICTs;
- Quality and professional development, integrating learning within teachers’ service for example through peer learning;
- Teaching itself; and
- Financial issues, paying attention to teachers’ salaries as well as their salaries relative to other professions.

II. Second session (11.00-12.30)

Overview UNESCO General Education Quality Analysis/Diagnosis and Monitoring Framework (GEQAF) and teachers, Mr. Tekaligne Godana

The presenter first described the purpose of the GEQAF: it is to strengthen Ministries’ capacity to analyse, diagnose and monitor the quality of their general education systems by adopting a systemic approach and strengthening national leadership and ownership. The GEQAF approaches education quality from several angles: development goals, desired outcomes, core processes, core resources, and supporting mechanisms. It was developed in cooperation with UNESCO experts and Member States, and comments from the Member States and an International Reference Committee were integrated into the GEQAF. The GEQAF is now piloted in several countries and it will be refined and made available for wider use in 2013.
One section of the GEQAF relates to teachers and another one to teaching. The “teachers” section covers the issues of teacher attraction, selection, recruitment, deployment and retention, teacher training, working conditions, management and utilization, salaries and incentives, and retention. The “teaching” section covers the issues of teaching processes, equity and effectiveness, monitoring and support, and conditions for teaching.

It is hoped that these tools can support countries in their diagnosis of teacher and teaching issues.

**Questions and comments:** The holistic and cohesive approach to quality education in the GEQAF was highlighted. Questions were raised concerning the links with quantity - i.e. access to education, as well as the links with other levels of education and lifelong learning. The importance of using country examples and research results as illustrations was also highlighted. Furthermore, it was underlined that good data and information systems are a prerequisite for a good analysis of general education.

One key point made was that countries need to be supported in establishing priorities among the various components of the GEQAF based on quantitative and qualitative needs, expected impact and financial constraints. If such support to establishing priorities is not provided, then the GEQAF could fail in providing a meaningful diagnosis of general education and beyond.

Finally, participants were provided further information about the countries that participated in the design of the GEQAF and their implication in the pilot.

**Overview: UIS framework for comparative teacher indicators, Mr. Albert Motivans**

The presentation first placed teacher indicators within the policy cycle.


UIS is planning on extending and refining its current set of indicators for teachers to better cover the areas of teacher supply and demand, teacher characteristics, teacher training and capacity development, status and benefits, management and working conditions. More specifically, it proposes to look, in particular, into teachers’ ages by gender and level of education, teachers’ highest educational level, metadata regarding the minimum International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) level required to teaching, teacher salaries, working and teaching hours, and newly recruited teachers by gender and level of education. In addition, it will seek to improve the existing dataset e.g. by improving headcounts.

UIS is now seeking suggestions of modifications or additions to this dataset in order to best reflect the issues relevant for international comparisons.

**Questions and comments:** Comments were made with regard to the extension of datasets to include textbooks, learning outcomes, head teachers/inspectors/teacher support, pedagogy, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) related issues and non-formal education. The difference between information to manage the education system and information for effectiveness was also underlined – even studies such as Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) do not give information on what effective education is: additional research is needed to provide indications in this regard.
UIS explained that it does not seek to break new ground but rather to collect data that are needed and collectable. It has worked on further expanding teacher indicators by developing a teacher training taxonomy and by attempting to collect data on teacher status however this has proven very difficult due to the variability of education systems. For example, regarding teachers’ contractual status, it is relatively easy to collect data on civil servants, but the variety of categories of non-civil servant teachers makes it difficult to undertake international data comparison in this regard.

III. Third session. Show and tell: Lessons from new teacher data collections (14.00-16.00)

The World Bank, Mr. Halsey Rogers

The presentation focused on a World Bank project called Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER). It introduced SABER-Teachers as a part of the overall SABER. The goal of SABER is to make visible what is underwater. Most analysis had focused on inputs and some outcomes, but had left everything else out. SABER collects data on policies, institutions, implementation and the effects of the interventions. Other dimensions of SABER focus on classroom dynamics through observations and have also developed teacher observation instruments. Examining service delivery is important, and SABER is working at developing better school surveys, for example to measure teacher absenteeism.

SABER is part of a broader framework called Learning for All, which is the World Bank’s strategic objective presented in the Bank’s strategy. The framework considers inputs and outcomes (learning for all), but intends to focus on what’s inside the black box: policies and institutions, the focus of SABER, but also other processes.

SABER is an effort to collect, analyse and disseminate data on education policies. It covers about 12-13 domains or sub-systems that are believed to explain the variation in education results. Teachers are one of the policy domains analysed, but there are other less developed domains like Early Childhood Development. The role of SABER is to gather data, describe and evaluate it. Overall, SABER provides a comparative analysis that should inform policy decisions.

SABER covers 48 education systems in 38 countries. On teachers, it collects data on 10 teacher policy areas. Data are gathered by demand, and are analysed centrally at the World Bank. For each country, there is a Principal Investigator that focuses on the data collection, but the analysis is done by the World Bank staff.

An example of how the data are analysed appears in a recent World Bank paper “What matters for teacher policies”. The policy data analysed within SABER-Teachers has to be linked with policy implementation data, but just having the framework has been useful in the discussion with the ministries.

The presentation used the example of dimension 3 (Preparing teachers) to show how the data collection process is operationalized, from questions seen as policy levers, to the development of a classification rubric where different levels of policy design are considered for each policy lever: from latent, to emerging, to established. A list of the 8 teacher policy goals with their respective policy levers and questions was also presented.

SABER also includes data dissemination and the development of a knowledge database on teachers.
The data SABER-Teachers collects is proving to be very useful; the framework has been very appreciated by ministries and had very good resonance with colleagues and other government counterparts. Challenges were raised, and centered on getting good quantitative data. On teacher working conditions, for example, SABER-Teachers takes into account policies on working conditions but not on how they are implemented.

UIS, Mr. Mark Bernal

The presentation discussed a data collection initiative, the Regional Education Survey in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The regional survey is part of UIS’s mandate to collect education data. Before providing more details on the regional survey, the presentation described the context of UIS’s work in SSA. The UIS has advisors in the different continents and in SSA there are 8 advisors in different offices. The module is a success and one of the reasons for this is the deployment of regional advisors. Data collection is done through three instruments: questionnaire A, on enrolments; questionnaire B, on education finance; and questionnaire C on higher education.

The regional modules are part of a new initiative. In SSA, it is linked to the African Union Strategy. The UIS committed to providing data to the African Union database, but the aim is also more generally to collect new data. The database is managed by Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), which is developing outlooks of education performance. In Latin America and the Caribbean the content of the regional module was decided in agreement with regional organizations and it focuses on adult education.

The regional SSA questionnaire was launched in 2011. The questionnaires were sent out in February and in September most of the data was available. The decision was to start small but be realistic and not burden the country with too much data request.

The regional questionnaire has 6 items. The presentation lists the meta-data, and the findings are available in the website.

The presenter showed examples of the data collected for each of the 6 items. He discussed the relevance of the items and showed the indicators that were calculated. Item 3, for example, measures graduates from pre-service teacher training program, or the capacity of countries to produce trained teachers. Regarding item 6, schools census response rates, it was highlighted that countries have issues with their master list of schools.

The survey was implemented in 36 countries with a very high response rate, of 80%. An example of the questionnaire was shown, and key findings highlighted.

OECD, Ms. Kristen Weatherby


One of the OECD mid-term objectives is to raise teaching and learning effectiveness, although teacher issues are integrated into a broader approach to education.

After providing an overview of TALIS 2008, some findings were presented. A majority of teachers claim to believe in the constructivist nature of teaching and learning. However, when asked about their actual teaching practices most teachers in the countries surveyed say they used structured teaching practices. The presentation also showed the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and self-efficacy, and that the classroom disciplinary climate correlates with the percentage of lesson time spent on teaching and learning. In fact,
TALIS found that new teachers spend more time on class management and less time on teaching. TALIS 2010 will ask about time teachers spend planning, dealing with parents and on leadership roles and activities.

Teachers also expressed the wish to participate more in professional development activities. New teachers emphasize the need for professional development activities related to classroom management, whereas teachers overall also highlight ICT training and activities related to special education. Finally, findings on the impact of evaluation on teaching were also presented.

After the overview of TALIS 2008 findings, the presentation provided a summary of the activities for TALIS 2013. 34 countries will participate in the second TALIS, 9 of which are non-member countries. For countries in the Southern Cone, TALIS will start in November 2012, and next year for those in the Northern Cone. TALIS 2013 will have the same overall policy focus, with some new indicators for 8 countries.

The structure of the teacher and school leader questionnaires was showed. TALIS 2013 will include questions on the costs of continuing professional development, as one finding that came out of TALIS 2008 was that teachers who paid for participating in professional development activities actually took more hours of professional development, contrary to what was expected. In partnership with the European commission, TALIS 2013 will also ask questions about teacher mobility and teachers’ opportunity to work in other countries. The school leader questionnaire puts more emphasis on distributed leadership than the previous questionnaire.

The benefits of linking TALIS with PISA were highlighted, although the connection can only be done at the school level and not the individual level.

The field trial of TALIS 2013 highlighted several challenges. In 2008, the questionnaire asked about formal and informal evaluation feedback, but most respondents were confused with the two questions. The two questions were separated in the 2013 trial, and the questionnaire will actual focus only on formal formative evaluation of teachers. It will also ask the principals about formal appraisal of teachers. Response bias was another challenge; and the 2013 TALIS uses a social desirability scale to deal with this bias. This is only added for those countries that choose to incorporate this item.

The presentation highlighted areas where there are still information gaps as well as areas of research and analysis currently being undertaken by Centre for Education Research and Innovation (CERI).

The OECD is considering possible future developments, particularly in relation to measuring effective teaching practices through possible videos or a teacher questionnaire in PISA.

UNICEF Geneva, Ms. Erin Tanner

UNICEF’s presentation started with a summary of the three common teacher challenges in the Central and Eastern Europe Commonwealth of Independent States (CEECIS) region: an inappropriate environment, inadequate qualifications and many unqualified teachers, and teacher shortages. Teacher shortages issues are not evident from national statistics, although they show up at the school level. Schools are good at coping with absent teachers, for example by assigning teachers that do not have the required training.
UNICEF discussed 10 studies on teachers and their methodology. At the school level, UNICEF conducted interviews and used human resource data, in addition to policy documents and other statistics.

After presenting a list of indicators of teacher shortage at the school level, the presentation used a picture of a school’s teaching staff to show the research findings. When indirect measures of teacher shortages are examined at the school level, the finding is that schools face serious teacher shortages that are not evident on national statistics.

**ILO, Mr. Oliver Liang**

The ILO representative briefly discussed ILO’s activities in relation to teachers. Emphasis was put on the 1966 ILO/UNESCO recommendation concerning the status of teachers and on the Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendation concerning Teachers (CEART) working group that the ILO continues to coordinate.

The CEART puts an emphasis on teaching as a profession, not just a job. In addition to the issues discussed in the meeting that are also relevant for the ILO (for example, the issue of effective teachers and the need to link this to student achievement), the ILO puts an emphasis on issues of voice, collective bargaining and freedom of association. In fact, most teacher complaints directed to the ILO are related to these issues, more so than to teacher evaluation or working conditions.

**IV. Fourth session. Emerging teacher issues from a regional perspective: Expert panel (16.30-17.30)**

**Asia, UNESCO Bangkok, Mr. Gwang-Chol Chang**

The presenter first described the trends that are emerging in the Asia Pacific region then underlined the issues that arise in this changing context.

In the Asia Pacific region an emerging trend is the increased regionalization and harmonization, particularly within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) community. There is also a paradigm shift with changing learning needs and changing learner competencies in response to a changing world. In addition, with technology, the way students are learning is changing. Learners are increasingly becoming lifelong learners.

Another key trend in the Asia Pacific region is the brain drain which takes place across but also within countries e.g. between urban and rural regions.

In this changing context, a number of issues arise – a reflection of the three main issues underlined by the UN Secretary General’s “Education First” initiative. There is a need to increase access to education, which involves making trade-offs e.g. between access and class size or teaching hours. In order to improve the quality of learning, there is a need for an increased focus on teacher qualifications as well as in-service training. There is also a need to reflect on the drivers of quality learning, as well as to consider cognitive and non-cognitive skills. Private tutoring is a particular issue in the region. The third aspect of the “Education First” initiative relates to global citizenship. In relation to that, there is a need to consider teacher support, reward for performance, and teacher ethics. Finally, it was highlighted that it is also important to consider inclusion in education.

**Latin America and the Caribbean, UNESCO Santiago, Mrs. Paz Portales**
The presenter described the Regional Strategy on Teachers in Latin America and the Caribbean, which seeks to contribute to fill knowledge gaps with regard to teacher policies. A technical secretariat working with international experts and national stakeholders (Ministries of Education, Teacher Unions, and academics) has looked into teacher policies in eight countries of the region. The main areas of focus were pre- and in-service teacher training, teacher career, and institutions and processes related to teacher policies. Gaps were identified and recommendations made, leading to actions to foster teacher policy improvement in the region.

Issues identified with regard to pre-service teacher training include the preparation of entrants to teacher training and training programmes that are insufficiently regulated, of weak quality, and with no specific preparation to working in under-privileged sectors. Emerging action therefore seeks to create guidelines, standards, and accreditation systems, increase the entry requirements for acceptance into teacher training, and provide, inter alia, specific training on bilingual intercultural education.

In-service teacher training is marked by lack of regulation, relevance and impact, as well as lack of awareness among teachers and inadequate consideration of collaborative learning. Emerging action seeks to set in place national plans, responsible public agencies and alliances between governments and universities, establishing specific requirements. It also seeks to increase support to beginning teachers and experiences of collaborative learning in schools. It finally seeks accreditation of post-graduate programmes.

Issues identified with regard to teachers’ career relate to attraction and retention, lack of consideration of teachers’ life stages, disconnect with professional development, issues of remuneration, and disagreement with regard to performance evaluation. Emerging action to address these include horizontal promotion, teacher incentives, salary policies and national teacher evaluation systems.

The development of policies itself also faces a number of fundamental issues with regard to prioritization, coordination, coherence, capacity, level of investment, and lack of projections. Emerging actions include: better dialogue / creation of fora with social actors on teacher policy, coordination mechanisms, creation of dedicated organizations responsible for teacher policies, and data and information production.

In order to improve policymaking, data needs have been identified. These relate to teachers with teaching degrees and their distribution; teacher salary disaggregated by grade, location and gender, and linkages with working hours; economic incentives; teachers’ ages; (Pupil Teacher Ration) PTR and class size; teachers’ deployment (particularly in urban vs. rural areas); teaching and working hours; and teacher attrition.

Arab States, UNESCO Beirut, Mr. Said Belkachla

The presenter described priority data needs in the Arab region. These relate to two main areas: improving existing indicators (mainly PTR and percentages of trained teachers), and gathering new information.

Existing indicators often give unusual values such as a PTR of 8 in Kuwait or a percentage of trained teachers of 12% to 14% in Lebanon, while Lebanon is the second country in the region in terms of Mathematics achievement results. These values, however, do not adequately account for the high percentage of non-classroom teachers or of private enrolment and private school teachers, hence are somewhat misleading.
Additional, relevant data is also not captured. In a 2011 Regional Conference, it was underlined that regional issues included attraction, training, deployment, career and incentives for teachers, as well school principals’ autonomy and support. It is therefore suggested that further information should be gathered with regard to teacher training, motivation, support, deployment and utilization, as well as absenteeism.
Global Monitoring Report, Ms. Nicole Bella

The presenter first reminded the audience of what the EFA Global Monitoring Report (GMR) does. It is a global report to monitor progress towards the six Education for All (EFA) goals. Every year, the Report focuses on a specific theme: in 2012, the Report focuses on “Youth and Skills - Putting Education to Work”, in 2013, the theme of the Report will be “teaching and learning for sustainable development”.

This Report will relate to EFA goal 6 (improve the quality of education), but will also discuss the extent to which teacher issues are relevant to other goals, in particular Early Childhood Care and Education or gender parity. Issues of teacher working conditions will be important in the 2013 GMR when it revisits the 2005 Report on the quality of education. The 2013 GMR will have to cover issues such as teacher deployment, teacher numbers, teacher qualifications and training.

The EFA GMR will face a number of challenges, particularly data gaps. While some data exists, it is not necessarily available at the global level or in a cross-comparable manner, hence the relevance of this meeting.

UNRWA, Ms. Gabrielle Bonnet

UNRWA is the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East. It works in five Fields of operation (Jordan, Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, West Bank) and approximately half a million students are enrolled in its schools throughout the region.

UNRWA was set up as a temporary Agency which has influenced the way in which it works (with, often, an “emergency” mode of working rather than a “development” mode of working). There are also issues with data: data on students are stored separately from data on teachers and in a format that makes it difficult for both datasets to be analysed together. Traditionally, the main teacher indicator collected was pupil-teacher ratios, in line with a de facto Teacher Policy of class size decrease; and teacher deployment, training, motivation and behaviours were not monitored.

The vision of UNRWA education is however changing. Class size decrease is both the most expensive and least efficient Teacher Policy. To improve the quality of education, and in a context of financial constraints, building an evidence-based and affordable Teacher Policy is key, and the Agency is now moving towards a coherent Teacher Policy which considers issues of recruitment, repetition, school-based training and professional development, teacher support, performance evaluation, and career paths for teachers. Better deployment is also being promoted, as it is essential for equity and it is also more cost efficient. In line with this policy change, data collection, monitoring and analysis are also changing, with pupil-teacher ratios, but also deployment, teacher training, and teaching practices now being tracked. Furthermore, one of the key strands of the Agency’s Education Reform is the assessment of the evolution of students’ learning outcomes.

As tools toward this change, financial simulations and analyses of teacher deployment and the use of working hours (for direct teaching or other duties) has been undertaken. A new data system linking teacher and student information for systematized monitoring is being developed, and research is being undertaken to “look into the black box” of teaching practices.
Day 2

I. Introduction to group work: policy mapping and prioritization activity

The organizers presented the modality for the two working groups: one focusing on teachers and another group focusing on teaching for quality education. The working groups aimed at identifying and prioritizing new indicators to be collected, and the following questions were proposed to guide the discussions.

- What are the key policy challenges and issues to be addressed?
- How can these issues be addressed in the data/indicators approach? What kind of new teacher/teaching data should be collected and which existing indicators should be redefined and refined in order to improve the quality of education?
- Which of these indicators should be considered as part of a broader global data collection and what can be possible challenges and obstacles?
- What collective actions can be undertaken among all relevant stakeholders to have quality teacher/teaching data, particularly with regard to indicators proposed by the group?

The goals of the working groups were to produce a set of recommendations on producing indicators (new indicators to be collected, existing indicators to be refined) along with proposed collective actions based on these two important dimensions of quality education outlined in the framework.

The outcomes of the discussions were put together in a short presentation of the recommendations.

II. Teachers working group

The group discussed teacher indicators, and its recommendations are summarized below.

Recommendations with regards to teachers relate to 6 main areas:

1. It is necessary to broaden our focus on teachers to include all EFA goals and levels of education, e.g. Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE), Literacy, Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET), or higher education.
2. There is a need to know more about national standards and policies of teacher and teaching issues.
3. It is important to capture more of what is in the “black box”, i.e. attitudes and beliefs, as these may have more impact on the quality of education than teacher profiles.
4. It is recommended to capture more disaggregated information about existing indicators, including sub-national data.
5. It is recommended to modify some traditional teacher indicators to make them more relevant, responsive to the policy needs, and add a number of other indicators.
6. It is important, in developing and analysing teacher indicators, to link these to information on teaching as well as learning outcomes.

1. Include other EFA goals

Most international attention is focused on primary education teachers. Other levels of education relating to other EFA goals, particularly early childhood and higher education, and less formal education provision such as literacy programmes tend to be forgotten. The recommendations in this regard therefore relate to (i) improving “traditional” sources of data...
(e.g. UIS) to better cover these other EFA goals and levels of education (ii) draw upon / improve other sources of data (iii) strengthen data analysis.

More specifically, it was first suggested that a grid could be developed where all indicators available with regard to teachers at primary education level are included, and their availability for other levels of education or other types of programmes (e.g. literacy) is assessed. This could help Institutes such as UIS identify additional indicators they could gather. Some of the indicators may be impossible to gather by UIS (e.g. number and profile of literacy facilitators where the State has no oversight of this provision), but in this case, non-traditional sources of data should be considered. It was suggested that, as International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA) already collects some data, it could improve the reliability of its data collection and move toward more robust data and ultimately a global framework on literacy facilitators’ data. Another source of information on non-primary teachers is the SABER for ECCE. Finally, it was suggested to expand the analysis of teacher data, for example teacher gap computations, to include other EFA goals.

**Recommendations:**

1. UIS to map existing teacher data for primary education teachers and expand, as feasible, its data collection to other EFA goals and levels of education.
2. CONFINTEA to strengthen data collection towards reliable information and, ultimately, a global framework on literacy facilitators.
3. SABER ECCE data collection to be expanded.
4. All partners working on teacher data analysis to broaden their analysis beyond primary education, in particular with regard to the Teacher Gap.

2. Collect data on standards and policies

Discussions around existing and possible teacher indicators underlined the need to improve our knowledge of national standards and policies. For example, current teacher indicators include the percentage of “trained teachers”, which does not make sense unless national standards for teacher training are known. Furthermore, teacher policies such as induction, mentoring programmes, feedback mechanisms for teachers at school level, or modalities of teacher assessment can be crucial for teacher quality and would be best captured through data collection on policies such as the one undertaken through SABER.

**Recommendations:**

5. UIS to collect and include metadata on standards (e.g. national standards regarding what is considered as a “trained teacher”) where feasible.
6. SABER, World Education Indicators (WEI), and other systems collecting data on teacher policies to be expanded to cover more countries and modified to include issues such as induction and mentoring programmes for teachers, feedback mechanisms for teachers at school level, and issues of teacher assessment.

3. Look into the "black box" of teachers’ attitudes and motivation

The discussion underlined that issues such as motivation, reasons behind the choice of a teaching career and context (such as school violence) are also important. Such variables, however, can only be captured through instruments such as surveys or observations, which is more difficult that capturing national data on teachers’ profiles e.g. training status. Despite this difficulty, it remains important to consider such variables.
**Recommendations:**

7. Consider “looking into the black box” for teachers’ motivations (reasons to become a teacher, degree of motivation to teach) and certain aspects of the teaching context (such as school violence).

4. **Dig deeper into existing indicators**

It was underlined that many of the existing indicators could be much more useful if they were better disaggregated. One of the elements that are currently missing is sub-national data, which could provide further information on teacher deployment issues.

Furthermore, it was recommended to improve the way UIS captures teacher training. Ideally, teacher training indicators would shed light on teachers’ academic, pedagogical, and practical training, and would distinguish between pre- and in-service training. It was also recommended to capture teacher status information. UIS has actually already developed a teacher training taxonomy but it has proven difficult, given the multiplicity of training systems within and between countries to have comparable data. UIS has also attempted to gather data on teacher status, but while it appears possible to divide teachers into two broad categories: civil servant and non-civil servant teachers, it has proven far more difficult to distinguish between the many different categories of non-civil servant teachers.

**Recommendations:**

8. Disaggregate teacher indicators further e.g. by including information on teachers per subject areas as well as on geographical disparities of indicators such as pupil per teacher ratio (or pupil per trained teacher ratio). Information on disparities per income level, or teachers from marginalized groups would also be useful.

9. UIS to continue working on the teacher training taxonomy to try and better capture different types and durations of training.

10. UIS to continue looking into ways of capturing information regarding contractual teachers.

5. **Develop additional teacher indicators**

A number of key additional policy issues were highlighted. These are not yet appropriately reflected in the indicators that UIS has already developed or in those that will soon be collected. They relate to attracting and recruiting teachers, wages and incentives, school principals' transfer of teachers from school to school, teacher flows, workload of teachers and class size.

**Recommendations:**

UIS to develop the following additional indicators:

11. Indicators reflecting the attractiveness of teacher training, completion rates of teacher training programmes, and actual entry of graduates into teaching. One possible indicator would be the transition rate of Teacher Training Institution graduates into teaching.

12. Hourly wages: while teacher salary will be collected by UIS, collecting hourly wages would improve comparability with other professions.

13. Types of incentives (e.g. through questions regarding the prevalence of teacher housing, as already done in the WEI).

14. Characteristics of school principals: this would not be worldwide but a pilot may start in the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

15. Teacher transfer rate from school to school (and particularly from rural to urban areas).
6. **Link teacher indicators with teaching and learning outcomes**

Qualifications to teach are different from competencies; hence data on teacher characteristics only provide a partial picture of teaching. It is therefore essential to also gather information on teaching and learning outcomes, and to link information on teachers to information on teaching and learning.

**Possible sources of teacher information / data**

A number of possible sources of data and information on teachers were highlighted. These include:

1. UIS for many teacher indicators, including, possibly, in the future, metadata regarding national teacher related standards (e.g. teacher training standards).
2. SABER, WEI, TALIS, ILO and UNICEF for teacher policy-related information and further qualitative and quantitative data.
3. National data systems (e.g. Education Management Information System-EMIS, TMIS) which, if further exploited, could provide school level information regarding, for example, teacher deployment.
4. Ministries of Labour, Trade Unions, and other associations of professionals (e.g. of literacy facilitators), that have additional information that is not always sufficiently tapped into.
5. The dedicated institutions that report on the Convention on Indigenous People: these could provide information for example on teachers from marginalized groups.
6. Specific research studies e.g. surveys concerning teacher motivation, or observations regarding school violence.

### III. Teaching working group

The discussion centred on three of the four suggested questions: (1) What are the key policy challenges and issues to be addressed? (2) How can these issues be addressed in the data/indicators approach? What kind of new teacher/teaching data should be collected? and (3) Challenges and obstacles of a global data collection exercise.

**Preliminary discussion**

Before addressing the proposed questions, the discussion focused on the difference between teacher and teaching indicators. It was agreed that teacher indicators are those related to getting the right people to the profession, whereas indicators on teaching would focus on what teachers do once they are in class and the teaching processes. Most of the group agreed that teaching cannot be conceived in isolation from learning; therefore a discussion on indicators should highlight aspects of teaching that relate to learning.

It was also agreed that, while teaching processes are essential, other dimensions that accompany the teaching are also very relevant for teaching to take place and are not necessarily captured by a discussion on teacher indicators.

There was also some conversation around ways to approach the discussion. Some participants suggested first discussing themes/issues relevant to teaching, and then discussing who would measure them and at what level (cross-national, country or even...
school level). On the other hand, other participants felt that one should first start with a discussion around who is going to collect the data and at what level, and then focus on those issues/themes that can realistically be measured.

Recommendations

The group discussed several issues or themes that a data collection exercise should aim at measuring. Overall, they relate to the dimensions highlighted in the concept note, and they can be summarized as:

- Teaching activity, processes, quality teaching, and effective teaching. Challenges to link teaching to learning;
- Learners' background, for example socio-economic status but also other features they bring to the classroom;
- Content knowledge/pedagogical knowledge (this might appear in a discussion on teachers per se, but here they were highlighted as they relate not to the person but to the actual teaching process);
- Teacher absenteeism;
- Teacher supervision, support, feedback system/evaluation, peer support;
- Working conditions or teaching/learning environment (instructional facilities, classroom support, textbooks, etc.);
- Class time management: classroom management, teaching, discipline, etc.;
- Teacher motivation/satisfaction, reward system;
- Different learners: primary vs. secondary, emphasis on cognitive development vs. disciplinary content; multi-grade teaching;
- Second language instruction;
- Parental involvement or support;
- Teaching and teacher training;
- In school learning time/after school time (private tutoring); double-shifting;
- Lesson planning;
- Standards taught (school and teacher training standards).

In addition to these themes, the group discussed broader issues, for example the role of teachers and how they compared with the role of doctors. In some countries, teachers are key actors in nation-building. A participant suggested teachers to be seen as the first truly global profession, as they are preparing children for a global society.

As regards ideas for the data collection exercise, several possibilities were suggested and discussed. Previous examples of videos to examine variations in teaching practices across several countries were mentioned. The US National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) uses videos in the process of certifying accomplished teachers, although they are most useful when they are accompanied by teachers' reports and notes about what they were trying to achieve in the lesson recorded in the videos.

Examples of teacher questionnaires were also provided, particularly the survey of teacher practices and beliefs used by TALIS. It was agreed that these types of surveys are very useful, although they give information about teachers' beliefs and intentions but not necessarily their actual practices.

Student surveys are one more tool to assess teacher effectiveness. These surveys are being used by the Gates Foundation and they are proving to be very promising.
observations are also being used by the World Bank, and they are normally done by trained observers. The data coming out from the observations can also be quantified.

Other sources of information are teacher statutes or country legislation. Data collected by the UNESCO-IBE, for example, can be examined to shed light on the country regulations for teaching conditions and the teaching environment. Similar to SABER-Teachers, this information will only speak about the available country regulations, but not necessarily about actual practices or implementation.

Finally, the group discussed challenges to be considered in any data collection initiative:

- Data on teaching are not necessarily collected at the country level (EMIS). Other instruments and data collection efforts should be conceived;
- Some of data appear to be available, although they are still very difficult to collect and interpret. One example is data on textbooks collected by UIS, or data on teacher absenteeism;
- A key challenge is to link effective teaching and other suggested dimensions to student learning: this is very difficult to measure, particularly when improvements in learning or learning gains are taken in consideration;
- Reliability: this is particularly an issue with surveys: because many questions are actually about beliefs or intentions, different respondents might have different views of what is going on in the school;
- Lack of standards makes it difficult to analyse the data: e.g. learning materials, how many books would be desirable for effective teaching and learning to take place?
- Another challenge is that data will provide a picture of the problem but not necessarily what is going on or an explanation of the causes. For example, teacher absenteeism might be prevalent in a particular country or region, but without any clear view of the reasons behind it the data will give little clues for policy makers. However, other participants believed that it is sufficient if the data just alert decision makers regarding key problems, as countries could then look deeper into the phenomenon;
- Finally, another challenge for any data collection exercise is not wanting to hold teachers accountable. When attempting to measure teacher effectiveness it is difficult not the get into discussions around teacher evaluation issues.

IV. Conclusions and next steps, Mr. Albert Motivans

This meeting enabled participants to share experiences and lessons from new initiatives around the world. It also provided feedback on conceptual and measurement frameworks. It finally helps set a global agenda around teachers and teaching.

As part of the way forward, global events should be leveraged, in particular: the Global Campaign for Education’s Global Action Week (in March 2013), the 2013 EFA Global Monitoring Report on teaching and learning, the EFA assessment process (SSA event: 17-18 October, Johannesburg), the International Summit on the Teaching Profession of 2013, and the Regional Conference in Latin America (6-8 November), The Policy Dialogue Forum of the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA (28-29 November, Namibia), the IIEP Buenos Aires office online forum on teacher policies in March, and the meeting of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teachers (CEART). Participants are invited to share further events that they have knowledge of.
As for UNESCO and UIS activities, these will include the strengthening of existing conceptual frameworks, work on the teacher training taxonomy, as well as on issues of supply and demand in secondary education. The regional modules on teachers for the Latin America and the Caribbean and East Asia and the Pacific regions will also be implemented (design and development being planned for 2013 and implementation on 2014). With regard to global modules, consultation should take place in early 2013, design in late 2013, and launch in January 2014. With regard to teaching, development activities will be initiated.

Partnerships should be created or reinforced between the various partners, including the World Bank, OECD, ILO, UNICEF, UNESCO (HQ and Field Offices) and the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA.

Regarding member states, it is crucial to enable them to provide data of their countries. Therefore, appropriate standard setting of the indicators which are compatible and appropriate to both national and international level are required. On the basis of these, strengthening and reinforcing in-country data collection system along with relevant national capacity are also needed.

V. Closing Remarks, Mr. Edem Adubra

A few observations and suggestions were raised by the Head of Task Force Secretariat. First of all, as the international community recognizes the 2015 EFA goals are not likely to be completely reached and new goals for post-2015 are being discussed, it is important that participants also think about teachers’ role in the post-2015 era while preparing for new programmes and studies.

It is also important to ensure that the ‘data’ collected has real impact on the ground level. This experts meeting has provided a perfect environment for the ‘poly-logue’ between two groups of people: experts working on data and statistics, and experts with policy background. This ‘poly-logue’ is important as it can provide a more holistic picture of the linkage between the ‘teacher/teaching indicators’ and reality. In the same vein, the ‘real users’ of the data, namely the ministers, policymakers, government officials, should be empowered to use the data when planning teaching and learning policies. Providing capacity building for these users should be the next step, in order to fill the current gap between the data and the application of them in countries.

Finally, the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA is a platform for partners and experts to exchange experiences and network. Participants were encouraged to inform the Task Force of their programmes/projects so they can be further disseminated. Experts were also invited to participate in the Task Force 5th Policy Dialogue Forum to be held in late November in Windhoek, Namibia, which will be attended by ministers and policymakers, to exchange ideas, and thus to enable real impacts in improving teaching and learning in the world.