



Policy Linking Toolkit Review

Presentation at GAML

November 2022

Identification of changes

The changes to the policy linking toolkit (PLT) were identified from the following sources:

- UIS contract for services 4500467710
- PL feedback session notes
- Summary of recommendations from NFER's evaluation of PL (under contract to Gates Foundation)
- Cito PL workshop reports for Cambodia, India, Lesotho, Nepal and Zambia (under contract to UIS)
- Evaluation of the draft PLT by Cito

MAIN CHANGES

Update to stages of policy linking



Due to changes in the remit of the SDG 4.1.1 review panel, the new PLT will have six stages:

- Stage 1 – Initial engagement
- Stage 2 – Self-assessment of appropriateness of assessment for PL
- Stage 3 – Preparation for the PL workshop
- Stage 4 – Implementation of PL workshop
- Stage 5 – Self-assessment of PL workshop outcomes
- Stage 6 – Reporting results for SDG 4.1.1

Self-assessment (stage 2)

Criteria	Question
1	Is the assessment sufficiently aligned to the GPF?
2	Is there evidence that the items in the assessment have been reviewed qualitatively and quantitatively to determine their suitability for inclusion in the assessment?
3	Is the sample of learners that took the assessment representative of the population against which the results will be reporting?
4	Is there evidence that the assessment was administered in a standardized way?
5	Are the outcomes of the assessment sufficiently reliable?

Answer to each question needs to be 'Yes'

GPF Alignment – mathematics

Level of alignment	Category	Grade 1-3 criteria	Grade 4-9 criteria
Minimally aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs	
	Depth	N (≥10)	
	Breadth	≥50% of grade-relevant N subconstructs	
Additionally aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs	
	Depth	N (≥10) + M&G (≥5)	
	Breadth	≥50% of grade-relevant N, M & G subconstructs	
Strongly aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs	
	Depth	N (≥10) + M&G (≥5) + S&P&A (≥2)	N (≥10) + M&G (≥5) + S&P&A (≥5)
	Breadth	≥50% of all grade-relevant subconstructs	

N – Number | M – Measurement | G – Geometry | S&P – Statistics & Probability | A – Algebra

GPF Alignment – reading

Level of alignment	Category	Grade 1-2 criteria	Grade 3-6 criteria	Grade 7-9 criteria
Minimally aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs		
	Depth	D (≥10) + C(≥5)	R (≥10)	R(≥20)
	Breadth	≥50% D&C s/c	≥50% grade-relevant R subconstructs	
Additionally aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs		
	Depth	D (≥10) + R(≥5)	N/A	B1(≥5)+B2(≥5)
	Breadth	≥50% D&R s/c	N/A	≥50% R s/c
Strongly aligned	Length	≥20 score-points for 1 MPL / ≥45 score-points for 3 MPLs		
	Depth	R(≥10)	B1(≥5)+B2(≥5)	B1(≥5)+B2(≥5)+B3(≥5)
	Breadth	≥50% R s/c	≥50% R s/c	≥50% R s/c

D – Decoding | C – Comprehension (Spoken/signed) | R – Reading Comprehension
 B1 – Retrieve information | B2 – Interpret information | B3 – Reflect on information

Selecting items



If not all items are to be used in PL workshop, selection should be made based on:

- Content coverage
- MPL alignment
- Item functioning
- Items classified as 'no fit' during alignment exercise
- Item difficulty (only applicable where IRT is used)

Self-assessment (stage 5)

Criteria	Question
1	Did all panellists meet the requirements for participation?
2	Were the group of panellists sufficiently representative?
3	Were all outliers removed before calculating the final benchmarks?
4	Were benchmarks only set when there were no floor/ceiling effects?
5	Is the inter-rater consistency statistic greater than or equal to 0.7?
6	Is the intra-rater consistency statistic greater than or equal to 0.7?
7	Has the SE for each benchmark been reviewed to be determined as appropriate?
8	Has the CI for each benchmark been reviewed to be determined as appropriate?
9	Was the minimum score for each section of the evaluation ≥ 4 ?
10	Was the mean average score for the overall evaluation ≥ 3 ?

Answer to each question needs to be 'Yes'

Other changes



There are other changes related to:

- Trying to make the document easier to navigate
- Understanding the advantages/disadvantages and requirements of different types of workshop (in-person, remote and hybrid)
- Providing translating documents and presentations to support successful workshops
- Providing additional support to set up the workshop

Timeline



- The final draft of the proposed changes are currently with UIS for approval
- Following approval, a set of slides with more details of the changes will be developed
- These are due to be signed off by 21 December 2022
- The updated toolkit and presentation will be released in the new year for immediate use