

Democratic Republic of the Congo



STUDENT ASSESSMENT

SABER Country
Report
2014

Key Policy Areas for Student Assessment

1. Classroom Assessment

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), classroom assessment practices by teachers are perceived as being of 'moderate' quality. Resources available to support teachers' classroom assessment activities include textbooks and rubrics for grading students' work. Several formal mechanisms, such as pre- and in-service teacher training, also are in place to ensure that all teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment. At the same time, there is no national document that provides overall guidelines for classroom assessment practice, and there are limited mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of these practices across the education system.

Status

Established



2. Examinations

The Examen d'Etat has been administered in its current form to all students in grade 12 for over 20 years. A formal policy authorizes the examination and provides its framework. Results are used to certify secondary school completion and make decisions about student selection to tertiary education or for technical jobs. Regular funding is provided by the government and through student fees. Technical commissions and teams involved in different aspects of the examination process implement the formal mechanisms that ensure its quality, such as training all administrators according to a standard protocol. At the same time, there are few opportunities available to key stakeholders (e.g., examination staff, educators, other assessment specialists) to learn more about the examination. Another issue is that students' results are not confidential.

Established



3. National Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)

Since 2010, the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) has been implemented every two years for the purposes of monitoring education quality at the country level and supporting schools and teachers. EGRA is administered to a regionally representative random sample of students in grades 2, 4, and 6. A formal policy document authorizes the assessment. Results have influenced the reading curriculum at the primary level and supported the introduction of an in-service teacher training module focused on reading. However, to date, funding for EGRA has solely been provided by external donors. In addition, there are limited opportunities available to key stakeholders in the country to learn more about EGRA, including its results.

Emerging



4. International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)

The DRC completed its participation in PASEC in 2010, led by a team in the Ministry of Education's Directorate for Planning. There is no country-level policy document addressing the country's participation in PASEC or other ILSAs, and funds for the country's involvement in PASEC have primarily been provided by external donors. The country also offers minimal opportunities to learn about ILSAs. PASEC results and information have been disseminated using a limited number of communication strategies, specifically, through providing copies of the country-level and international reports to key stakeholders in the country.

Emerging



Introduction

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) has focused on increasing student learning outcomes by improving the quality of education in the country. An effective student assessment system is an important component to improving education quality and learning outcomes as it provides the necessary information to meet stakeholders' decision-making needs. In order to gain a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of its existing assessment system, DRC decided to benchmark this system using standardized tools developed under The World Bank's Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) program. SABER is an evidence-based program to help countries systematically examine and strengthen the performance of different aspects of their education systems.

What is SABER-Student Assessment?

SABER-Student Assessment is a component of the SABER program that focuses specifically on benchmarking student assessment policies and systems. The goal of SABER-Student Assessment is to promote stronger assessment systems that contribute to improved education quality and learning for all.

National governments and international agencies are increasingly recognizing the key role that assessment of student learning plays in an effective education system. The importance of assessment is linked to its role in:

- (i) providing information on levels of student learning and achievement in the system;
- (ii) monitoring trends in education quality over time;
- (iii) supporting educators and students with real-time information to improve teaching and learning; and
- (iv) holding stakeholders accountable for results.

SABER-Student Assessment methodology

The SABER-Student Assessment framework is built on the available evidence base for what an effective assessment system looks like. The framework provides guidance on how countries can build more effective student assessment systems. The framework is structured around two main dimensions of assessment systems: the types/purposes of assessment activities and the quality of those activities.

Assessment types and purposes

Assessment systems tend to be comprised of three main types of assessment activities, each of which serves a different purpose and addresses different information needs. These three main types are: classroom assessment, examinations, and large-scale, system level assessments.

Classroom assessment provides real-time information to support ongoing teaching and learning in individual classrooms. Classroom assessments use a variety of formats, including observation, questioning, and paper-and-pencil tests, to evaluate student learning, generally on a daily basis.

Examinations provide a basis for selecting or certifying students as they move from one level of the education system to the next (or into the workforce). All eligible students are tested on an annual basis (or more often if the system allows for repeat testing). Examinations cover the main subject areas in the curriculum and usually involve essays and multiple-choice questions.

Large-scale, system-level assessments provide feedback on the overall performance of the education system at particular grades or age levels. These assessments typically cover a few subjects on a regular basis (such as every 3 to 5 years), are often sample based, and use multiple-choice and short-answer formats. They may be national or international in scope.

Appendix 1 summarizes the key features of these main types of assessment activities.

Quality drivers of an assessment system

The key considerations when evaluating a student assessment system are the individual and combined quality of assessment activities in terms of the adequacy of the information generated to support decision making. There are three main drivers of information quality in an assessment system: enabling context, system alignment, and assessment quality.

Enabling context refers to the broader context in which the assessment activity takes place and the extent to which that context is conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment. It covers such issues as the legislative or policy framework for assessment activities; institutional and organizational structures for designing, carrying out, or using results from the assessment; the availability of sufficient and stable sources of funding; and the presence of trained assessment staff.

System alignment refers to the extent to which the assessment is aligned with the rest of the education system. This includes the degree of congruence between assessment activities and system learning goals, standards, curriculum, and pre- and in-service teacher training.

Assessment quality refers to the psychometric quality of the instruments, processes, and procedures for the assessment activity. It covers such issues as design and implementation of assessment activities, analysis and interpretation of student responses to those activities, and the appropriateness of how assessment results are reported and used.

Crossing the quality drivers with the different assessment types/purposes provides the framework and broad indicator areas shown in Table 1. This framework is a starting point for identifying indicators that can be used to review assessment systems and plan for their improvement.

Table 1: Framework for building an effective assessment system, with indicator areas

| | Assessment types/purposes | | |
|--------------------|--|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Classroom assessment | Examinations | Large-scale, system-level assessment |
| Enabling context | Policies Leadership and public engagement Funding Institutional arrangements Human resources | | |
| System alignment | Learning/quality goals Curriculum Pre- and in-service teacher training opportunities | | |
| Assessment quality | Ensuring quality (design, administration, analysis) Ensuring effective uses | | |

Source: World Bank.

The indicators are identified based on a combination of criteria, including:

- professional standards for assessment;
- empirical research on the characteristics of effective assessment systems, including analysis of the characteristics that differentiate between the assessment systems of low- versus high-performing nations; and
- theory — that is, general consensus among experts that it contributes to effective assessment.

Levels of development

The World Bank has developed a set of standardized questionnaires and rubrics for collecting and evaluating data on the three assessment types and related quality drivers.

The questionnaires are used to collect data on the characteristics of the assessment system in a particular country. The information from the questionnaires is then applied to the rubrics in order to judge the development level of the country’s assessment system in different areas.

The basic structure of the rubrics for evaluating data collected using the standardized questionnaires is summarized in Appendix 2. The goal of the rubrics is to provide a country with some sense of the development level of its assessment activities compared to best or

recommended practice in each area. For each indicator, the rubric displays four development levels—*Latent*, *Emerging*, *Established*, and *Advanced*. These levels are artificially constructed categories chosen to represent key stages on the underlying continuum for each indicator. Each level is accompanied by a description of what performance on the indicator looks like at that level.

- *Latent* is the lowest level of performance; it represents absence of, or deviation from, the desired attribute.
- *Emerging* is the next level; it represents partial presence of the attribute.
- *Established* represents the acceptable minimum standard.
- *Advanced* represents the ideal or current best practice.

A summary of the development levels for each assessment type is presented in Appendix 3.

In reality, assessment systems are likely to be at different levels of development in different areas. For example, a system may be *Established* in the area of examinations, but *Emerging* in the area of large-scale, system-level assessment, and vice versa. While intuition suggests that it is probably better to be further along in as many areas as possible, the evidence is unclear as to whether it is necessary to be functioning at *Advanced* levels in all areas. Therefore, one might view the *Established* level as a desirable minimum outcome to achieve in all areas, but only aspire beyond that in those areas that most contribute to the national vision or priorities for education. In line with these considerations, the ratings generated by the rubrics are not meant to be additive across assessment types (that is, they are not meant to be added to create an overall rating for an assessment system; they are only meant to produce an overall rating for each assessment type). The methodology for assigning development levels is summarized in Appendix 4.

Education in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

The DRC is a low-income country in sub-Saharan Africa. GDP per capita (current US\$) is \$454, and annual growth was approximately 8.5% in 2013.

Two types of public schools operate in the country - schools that are directly controlled by the government and schools that are known as government-regulated schools. The government-regulated schools are funded by the government (the government is responsible for key activities, such as paying teachers and other staff, providing inspectors for pedagogical quality assurance, and certifying students) and are managed by church organizations. Due to limited support from the government, the Catholic Church negotiated additional financial assistance from parents that would provide for teacher salaries. While this support was meant to be temporary, it has continued because the government's education budget has been insufficient to fully cover teacher salaries. Private schools accredited by the government and private schools not accredited by the government also operate in the country.

The Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Technical Education¹ adopted the Interim Education Plan (2012-2014), the country's first education sector plan, which laid out three objectives: increasing access to schooling, equity, and retention in school; improving the quality and relevance of education; and strengthening governance in the education sector. The government has worked to operationalize the education sector plan by increasing the amount of the government's budget allocated to education to 9.5% in 2011, and to more than 14% in 2013.

Detailed information was collected on the DRC's student assessment system using the SABER-Student Assessment questionnaires and rubrics. It is important to remember that *these tools primarily focus on benchmarking a country's policies and arrangements for assessment activities at the system or macro level. Additional data*

¹ In December 2014, the Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Technical Education has been renamed Ministry of Primary, Secondary and Civics

Education, following the transfer of vocational training to a new ministry, the Ministry of Technical and Vocational Education.

would need to be collected to determine actual, on-the-ground practices in the DRC, particularly by teachers and students in schools. The following sections discuss the findings by each assessment type, accompanied by suggested policy options. The suggested policy options were determined in collaboration with key local stakeholders based on the DRC's immediate interests and needs. Detailed, completed rubrics for each assessment type in the DRC are provided in Appendix 5.

Classroom Assessment

Level of development



In the DRC, there is no national document that provides overall guidelines for classroom assessment practice. At the same time, resources are available to teachers to support them in carrying out their classroom assessment activities. These include a National Curriculum document that outlines what students are expected to learn at different age and grade levels; textbooks and workbooks; scoring criteria and rubrics for grading students' work; and school report cards that provide teachers with information on the maximum marks that students can be awarded in different subject areas.

There are also mechanisms in place to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment. For example, pre- and in-service teacher training programs address competencies in classroom assessment, and teachers have opportunities to participate in conferences and workshops on classroom assessment.

Classroom assessment practices are generally considered to be of 'moderate' quality. While they are typically aligned with a curricular framework, they tend to be overly focused on student recall of information and used as administrative tools rather than pedagogical resources. It is difficult to offer a definitive statement on the quality of classroom assessment practices since there are limited mechanisms in place to systematically monitor their quality across the education system (notwithstanding that classroom assessment is supposed to be a required component of school inspection and teacher supervision and performance evaluation).

There are several required uses of classroom assessment information, including for diagnosing student learning issues, providing feedback to students on their learning, informing parents about their child's learning, planning next steps in instruction, grading students for internal classroom uses, and providing input for certification and selection. Classroom assessment marks are combined with grades achieved on the formal certification examination that takes place at the end of each school

cycle. For primary school, the relevant examination is the Test National de Fin d'Etude Primaire (TENAFEP), and for secondary school, it is the Examen d'Etat.

In the DRC, schools are required to report on individual student performance to students and parents at pre-designated times during the school year. A summarized record of each student's marks is produced and reported to the local education authority, and a copy is kept in the school.

A variety of summative information about student performance is required to be reported in school report cards, including a student's individual performance in all subjects and a student's performance relative to other students. A qualitative assessment of student performance in everyday class activities, indicated by the statements, "Excellent," "Very good," "Good," "or Mediocre", is also required to be reported.

Suggested policy options:

1. *Issue:* There is no national document that provides overall guidelines for classroom assessment practice.

Suggested policy option: The unit responsible for primary- and secondary-level curriculum development in the Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Technical Education should develop a formal document with guidelines on classroom assessment practice and make it available to teachers across the system. For example, in Uganda, the National Curriculum Development Centre produces national syllabi and other documents that include guidelines for classroom assessment. A first step in developing such a document in the DRC could be a consultative meeting to explore approaches that teachers can use to help students achieve the standards laid out in the DRC's National Curriculum document.

2. *Issue:* There are only some resources for classroom assessment activities that are available to teachers system-wide.

Suggested policy option: Increase the variety and accessibility of the resources available to teachers for their classroom assessment activities. A starting

point could be to have the unit responsible for primary- and secondary-level curriculum development in the Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Technical Education develop item banks with examples of multiple-choice and open-ended questions aligned with the national curriculum and make them widely available to teachers. Also, the DRC could consider developing something similar to Mozambique's *Provinha*, which is a grade 3 reading assessment administered and scored by teachers. The *Provinha* serves as a resource for teachers, as results are intended to be used formatively at the school level to improve teaching practices and student learning outcomes in reading.

3. *Issue:* There are minimal formal, country-level mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.

Suggested policy option: Increase or strengthen the formal mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. For example, the unit responsible for research and evaluation in the Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Technical Education could start by commissioning a national review on the quality of education in the country, which includes a component on classroom assessment practices.

Examinations

Level of development



The Examen d'Etat (National Exam) has been administered in its current form to all students in grade 12 for over 20 years. The results are used for certification of secondary school completion (in technical or academic fields), and student selection to tertiary education or technical jobs.

A formal policy document authorizes the examination. *Ordonnance loi numéro 67/250 du 5 juin 1967* is the law that created the Examen d'Etat and provides its framework.

Funding for the examination is provided by the government based on a law (*Arrêté Ministériel numéro MINEPSP/CABMIN/0040/2004 du 20 avril 2004*), as well as through student fees, which represent the majority of the funding for the examination. Funding covers all core examination activities; specifically, examination design, administration, data analysis, and data reporting.

Inspection General de l'Education (General Inspectorate of Education) is the unit in the Ministry of Education that has been in charge of the examination since 1967. There is an adequate number of core staff responsible for the examination that is further supported by additional, 'non-core' personnel, mainly teachers. These additional personnel are selected to be invigilators, or to support the core staff in the examination centers.

The country offers a few opportunities to learn about the examination. Such opportunities include workshops and presentations on student assessment that are made available to members of the pedagogical committee, inspectors, and assessment specialists following the administration of the examination. Teachers are provided with opportunities to learn about the general content and skills measured by the examination (e.g., through teacher training courses on curriculum and pedagogy) and about other aspects of the examination process (e.g., how the tests are developed and scored, how results are reported and used). However, only one examination-related task - acting as a judge during an

oral exam - is commonly carried out by teachers themselves, although teachers are sometimes asked to support other examination-related tasks as well.

There is comprehensive material available to prepare for the examination, which is made available to most students by their teachers. Such material includes examples of the types of questions that are on the examination, information on how to prepare for the examination, and a report on past student performance on the examination.

The technical commissions and teams involved in different aspects of the examination process implement the formal mechanisms that ensure its quality. Specifically, all proctors and administrators are trained according to a standard protocol; there is a standardized manual for examination administrators; a pilot is conducted before the main data collection takes place; all booklets are numbered; there is double scoring of data; scorers are trained to ensure high inter-rater reliability; double processing of data takes place; and external and internal observers are invited to watch key examination procedures.

Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination is reportedly minimal and involves incidents of collusion among candidates via mobile phones, passing of papers, or the equivalent. Students who do not perform well on the examination may retake the examination, take preparatory courses to retake the examination, or repeat the grade. An issue of concern is that students' results on the examination are not confidential; student names and results are published online on the Ministry of Education website and are accessible by the public.

Suggested policy options:

1. *Issue:* The Democratic Republic of Congo offers very few opportunities for key stakeholders to acquire knowledge and skills relevant for carrying out the Examen d'Etat, including in such areas as examination design, test and item development, and the development of scoring criteria.

Suggested policy option: Develop and offer regular opportunities to learn about the Examen d'Etat in

particular, and student assessment activities in general. For example, the General Inspectorate of Education could collaborate with local universities to develop a course on student assessment, which is offered annually, and made available to educators, staff working on the examination, university teachers and students, and assessment specialists. Other options that the General Inspectorate of Education could consider include allocating funding for staff working on the Examen d'Etat to attend international courses or workshops on assessment topics. For example, in 2011, a team of 10-15 staff from Instituto Nacional de Desenvolvimento de Educação (INDE), the Examinations Council of Mozambique (CNECE), and local Mozambique universities traveled to Brazil to participate in short courses on topics such as test design, item analysis, statistical analysis, and proficiency scale development.

2. *Issue:* There are minimal mechanisms in place to monitor the impact of the examination. The impact of the examination refers to its broader positive or negative consequences for the education system and society; for instance, whether the examination contributes to enhanced quality in primary or secondary education, or puts undue pressure on schools, teachers, and students.

Suggested policy option: Begin to put in place some mechanisms to monitor the impact of the examination. For example, allocate funding from the General Inspectorate of Education for expert review groups to regularly review the impact of the examination on schools, teachers, and students and come up with recommendations for improvements. A first step for the DRC could be to learn from other countries' experience in this area. For example, a team from the Examinations Council of Zambia traveled to Barbados to learn from the Caribbean Examinations Board about topics such as mitigating malpractice in examinations and using social media to distribute preparation materials.

3. *Issue:* It is important for teachers to learn about the skills and content assessed by the examination in order to ensure adequate exposure and preparation for students. However, DRC teachers have limited

opportunities to learn about the examination, and are involved in only some examination-related tasks.

Suggested policy option: The General Inspectorate of Education could provide more opportunities for teachers to be involved in a variety of examination-related tasks, such as creating examination questions and scoring guides. This would help improve their understanding of the content and skills assessed in the examination.

4. *Issue:* Student results are public and not confidential.

Suggested policy option: Implement policies and procedures to ensure confidentiality of students' examination results. For example, assign a unique identification number to each student taking the examination and report results according to these numbers.

National Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)

Level of development



Since 2010, the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) has been implemented every two years for the purposes of monitoring education quality at the country level and supporting schools and teachers. It also has served as the baseline assessment for the Project for the Improvement of Quality Education (PIEQ), which is a USAID-funded education intervention in the DRC. EGRA has been administered to a regionally representative random sample of students in grades 2, 4, and 6.

The Ministry of Education authorized the assessment in 2010 with the formal policy document, *MINEPSP/SG/80/384/2010 DU 25 MARS 2010*. This document is available to the public upon request. There is a detailed schedule (derived from the list of deliverables for EGRA work that the Education Development Center, an international consulting organization, has committed to USAID), specifying the years of future assessment rounds, grade level(s) of students to be assessed, and subject areas to be covered.

To date, funding for EGRA has been provided solely by donors and has been sufficient to cover most core activities, including assessment design and administration, data analysis and reporting, planning, and staff per diems and transport.

To date, the team working on EGRA has comprised an adequate number of staff, including international experts from the Research Triangle Institute, staff from the Ministry of Education, and local project staff. Technical staff from the Research Triangle Institute trained local staff in target provinces to implement the assessment. However, additional local capacity development for carrying out assessment activities needs to be conducted.

The DRC offers very few opportunities to learn about NLSAs. Only non-university training courses or workshops on student assessment have been made available to the core NLSA team, educators, and assessment specialists. General presentations on EGRA

also have been provided to inspectors from the Ministry of Education responsible for primary, secondary, and professional instruction, as well as to teachers and test administrators. Only some teachers had opportunities to learn about EGRA results and student performance on the EGRA.

Formal mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the quality of the EGRA administration and data processing. For example, all proctors and administrators have been trained according to a protocol, and a standardized manual for administrators was developed. In addition, a pilot was conducted before the main data collection took place, all booklets were numbered, and scorers were trained to ensure high inter-rater reliability.

EGRA was administered to students in the local language on an as-needed basis (for example, when the student's dominant language was not French). However, accommodations or alternative assessments were not provided for students with disabilities; nor were special plans made to ensure that EGRA was administered to students in hard-to-reach areas.

Country results and information have been disseminated using a select number of communication strategies. For example, copies of the DRC's full country report as well as brochures with a summary of these results have been made available to key stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, USAID, international NGOs, and some civil society representatives. However, no products and services providing information about EGRA results have been disseminated to schools.

EGRA results have provided information on the level of reading in Congolese schools, and supported a discourse on the issues of reading acquisition in the country. EGRA results also have informed the new reading curriculum at the primary level as well as an in-service teacher training module that is focused on improving the reading abilities of students. Specifically, due to EGRA results, reading as a subject now figures more prominently in in-service teacher training programs. In addition, new reading benchmarks have been developed. Reading will also be promoted from a sub-subject to a main subject in the primary-level curriculum.

Suggested policy options:

1. *Issue:* To date, funding for EGRA has come only from external loans or donors.

Suggested policy option: Identify in-country sources of funding for NLSA activities and ensure regular funding for NLSA activities in the Ministry of Education's budget. Draft and formalize a policy document that authorizes the use of these resources for carrying out the NLSA in the DRC. For example, in 2011, Ethiopia formally allocated funding and designated a budget line item for its national large-scale assessment activities.

2. *Issue:* Given that in-country staff have had limited opportunities to learn about the NLSA and student assessment in general, and international experts have had a major role in carrying out EGRA, there is room for additional capacity building of local and ministry staff to independently carry out the assessment in the future. Opportunities to learn about the NLSA should include aspects of test design, item development, and scoring criteria.

Suggested policy option: Put in place policies and supports to ensure sufficient human resource capacity within the DRC for carrying out the NLSA. One option is to allocate funding for staff working on the EGRA in the Ministry of Education to attend international workshops on student assessment in order to enhance their knowledge of assessment-related activities. For example, staff responsible for carrying out NLSA activities at the Examinations Council of Zambia received funding to attend a statistics course at the University of Michigan, which covered topics such as sampling, basic and advanced statistical analysis, and report writing.

3. *Issue:* NLSA results and information have not been covered by the media. In order to effectively utilize NLSA results for informing policy, results must be disseminated and understood by various stakeholders, including parents, students, educators, and policymakers.

Suggested policy option: Develop a communications strategy for disseminating NLSA results and

collaborate with various media outlets in order to ensure wide coverage of results. For example, in 2013, key education stakeholders came together in Zambia to devise a broad-reaching communications plan that would raise awareness about learning outcomes across the country and motivate citizens to take action. Each activity in the communications plan was designed to reach specific audiences. For instance, an easy-to-read brochure with a summary of NLSA findings and recommendations for action was created for teachers, school administrators, and policymakers; a 10-minute film about the NLSA results, entitled, "Are Zambia's Children Learning?", was created for parents and other concerned citizens and aired on broadcast television; and a DVD, including a teacher discussion guide and case studies on effective teaching strategies, was developed for use in in-service teacher trainings.

International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)

Level of development



The DRC completed its participation in PASEC in 2010 and plans to participate in PASEC 2018.

There is no country-level policy document addressing the DRC's participation in PASEC, and funds for ILSA activities in the country have primarily been allocated by donors, such as the World Bank and CONFEMEN. Funding for ILSA activities has covered implementation of the assessment exercise, data processing and analysis, disseminating and reporting assessment results in the country, attendance at international meetings, ILSA staff salaries, and research and development activities. Funding has not covered international participation fees.

A team in the Directorate for Planning in the Ministry of Education is responsible for ILSA activities. The team was in charge during the 2010 PASEC assessment exercise.

The DRC offers minimal opportunities to learn about ILSAs. Some workshops and meetings on understanding ILSA and ILSA databases have been organized by the Directorate of Planning for staff involved in implementation of the ILSA and education partners. Funding for attending international workshops or trainings on ILSA also has been offered in the context of official ILSA meetings.

DRC country results and other information for PASEC have been disseminated using a small number of communication strategies. Copies of both the country-level and international reports were distributed to key stakeholders. In addition, the DRC's results were communicated through a press release, and brochures and PowerPoint presentations with the country's results were made available online and distributed to key stakeholders. At the same time, PASEC results were communicated to only a few schools in the capital city of Kinshasa. Some DRC media outlets covered PASEC results. Media coverage was limited to a few small articles, and PASEC results were written about and discussed in online blogs or forums.

PASEC results have been used to inform decision-making in the country, including the Reform Roadmap in the Ministry of Education. Results also have been used to track the impact of reforms on student achievement levels; and to inform curriculum improvement, teacher training programs, resource allocation, and other assessment activities in the system. Moreover, there is evidence of a positive impact of the ILSA on education quality, as PASEC results have contributed to the Education Sector Strategy and the Education Interim Plan.

Suggested policy options:

- Issue:* There is no country-level policy document addressing participation in PASEC or other ILSAs.

Suggested policy option: Develop a policy document that outlines goals and guidelines for the DRC's participation in ILSAs. For example, in Uganda, the Government White Paper on Education (1992), recommended review and diversification of the assessments used by the National Examinations Board, which underpinned the decision to participate in SACMEQ. The DRC could learn from Uganda's experience and take similar steps to articulate an overarching framework for ILSA in the country.
- Issue:* The DRC offers minimal in-country opportunities to learn about ILSAs.

Suggested policy option: Make available regular, in-country opportunities to learn about ILSAs. For example, provide access to online courses on ILSA to individuals working on an ILSA in the Directorate of Planning, educators, university teachers and students, as well as assessment specialists.
- Issue:* Country results and information were covered by only some DRC media outlets. In addition, results and information were disseminated using a small number of communication strategies.

Suggested policy option: Ensure that ILSA results are widely disseminated in the country. Develop products, such as PowerPoint presentations or brochures, specifically geared toward schools, which discuss the results of the ILSA.

Appendix 1: Assessment Types and Their Key Differences

| | Classroom | Large-scale assessment Surveys | | Examinations | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | National | International | Exit | Entrance |
| Purpose | To provide immediate feedback to inform classroom instruction | To provide feedback on overall health of the system at particular grade/age level(s), and to monitor trends in learning | To provide feedback on the comparative performance of the education system at particular grade/age level(s) | To certify students as they move from one level of the education system to the next (or into the workforce) | To select students for further educational opportunities |
| Frequency | Daily | For individual subjects offered on a regular basis (such as every 3-5 years) | For individual subjects offered on a regular basis (such as every 3-5 years) | Annually and more often where the system allows for repeats | Annually and more often where the system allows for repeats |
| Who is tested? | All students | Sample or census of students at a particular grade or age level(s) | A sample of students at a particular grade or age level(s) | All eligible students | All eligible students |
| Format | Varies from observation to questioning to paper-and-pencil tests to student performances | Usually multiple choice and short answer | Usually multiple choice and short answer | Usually essay and multiple choice | Usually essay and multiple choice |
| Coverage of curriculum | All subject areas | Generally confined to a few subjects | Generally confined to one or two subjects | Covers main subject areas | Covers main subject areas |
| Additional information collected from students? | Yes, as part of the teaching process | Frequently | Yes | Seldom | Seldom |
| Scoring | Usually informal and simple | Varies from simple to more statistically sophisticated techniques | Usually involves statistically sophisticated techniques | Varies from simple to more statistically sophisticated techniques | Varies from simple to more statistically sophisticated techniques |

Appendix 2: Basic Structure of Rubrics for Evaluating Data Collected on a Student Assessment System

| Dimension | Development Level | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| | LATENT (Absence of, or deviation from, attribute) | EMERGING (On way to meeting minimum standard) | ESTABLISHED (Acceptable minimum standard) | ADVANCED (Best practice) | Justification |
| EC—ENABLING CONTEXT | | | | | |
| EC1—Policies | | | | | |
| EC2—Leadership, public engagement | | | | | |
| EC3—Funding | | | | | |
| EC4—Institutional arrangements | | | | | |
| EC5—Human resources | | | | | |
| SA—SYSTEM ALIGNMENT | | | | | |
| SA1—Learning/quality goals | | | | | |
| SA2—Curriculum | | | | | |
| SA3—Pre-, in-service teacher training | | | | | |
| AQ—ASSESSMENT QUALITY | | | | | |
| AQ1—Ensuring quality (design, administration, analysis) | | | | | |
| AQ2—Ensuring effective uses | | | | | |

Appendix 3: Summary of the Development Levels for Each Assessment Type

| Assessment Type | LATENT | EMERGING | ESTABLISHED | ADVANCED |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | <i>Absence of, or deviation from, the attribute</i> | <i>On way to meeting minimum standard</i> | <i>Acceptable minimum standard</i> | <i>Best practice</i> |
| CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT | There is no system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices. | There is weak system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices. | There is sufficient system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices. | There is strong system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices. |
| EXAMINATIONS | There is no standardized examination in place for key decisions. | There is a partially stable standardized examination in place, and a need to develop institutional capacity to run the examination. The examination typically is of poor quality and is perceived as unfair or corrupt. | There is a stable standardized examination in place. There is institutional capacity and some limited mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of acceptable quality and is perceived as fair for most students and free from corruption. | There is a stable standardized examination in place and institutional capacity and strong mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of high quality and is perceived as fair and free from corruption. |
| NATIONAL (OR SYSTEM-LEVEL) LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT | There is no NLSA in place. | There is an unstable NLSA in place and a need to develop institutional capacity to run the NLSA. Assessment quality and impact are weak. | There is a stable NLSA in place. There is institutional capacity and some limited mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of moderate quality and its information is disseminated, but not always used in effective ways. | There is a stable NLSA in place and institutional capacity and strong mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of high quality and its information is effectively used to improve education. |
| INTERNATIONAL LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT | There is no history of participation in an ILSA nor plans to participate in one. | Participation in an ILSA has been initiated, but there still is need to develop institutional capacity to carry out the ILSA. | There is more or less stable participation in an ILSA. There is institutional capacity to carry out the ILSA. The information from the ILSA is disseminated, but not always used in effective ways. | There is stable participation in an ILSA and institutional capacity to run the ILSA. The information from the ILSA is effectively used to improve education. |

Appendix 4: Methodology for Assigning Development Levels

1. The country team or consultant collects information about the assessment system in the country.

2. Based on the collected information, a level of development and score is assigned to each dimension in the rubrics:

- Latent = 1 score point
- Emerging = 2 score points
- Established = 3 score points
- Advanced = 4 score points

3. The score for each quality driver is computed by aggregating the scores for each of its constituent dimensions. For example:

The quality driver, 'Enabling Context,' in the case of ILSA, has 3 dimensions on which a hypothetical country receives the following scores: Dimension A = 2 points; Dimension B = 2 points; Dimension C = 3 points. The hypothetical country's overall score for this quality driver would be: $(2+2+3)/3 = 2.33$

4. A preliminary level of development is assigned to each quality driver.

5. The preliminary development level is validated using expert judgment in cooperation with the country team and The World Bank Task Team Leader.

For scores that allow a margin of discretion (i.e., to choose between two levels of development), a final decision has to be made based on expert judgment. For example, the aforementioned hypothetical country has an 'Enabling Context' score of 2.33, corresponding to a preliminary level of development of 'Emerging or Established.' Based on qualitative information not captured in the rubric, along with expert judgment, the country team chooses 'Emerging' as the most appropriate level.

6. Scores for certain key dimensions under 'Enabling Context' (in the case of EXAM, NLSA, and ILSA) and under 'System Alignment' (in the case of CLASS) were set as ceiling scores, i.e., the overall mean score for the particular assessment type cannot be greater than the score for these key dimensions. These key variables include formal policy, regular funding, having a permanent assessment unit, and the quality of assessment practices.

Appendix 5: SABER-Student Assessment Rubrics for the Democratic Republic of the Congo

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of the CONGO
Classroom Assessment

ENABLING CONTEXT AND SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

Overall policy and resource framework within which classroom assessment activity takes place in a country or system, and the degree to which classroom assessment activity is coherent with other components of the education system.

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT AND SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1: <i>Setting clear guidelines for classroom assessment</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q1) There is no country-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.¹</p> | <p>(Q1-3) There is an informal or draft country-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q1-3) There is a formal country-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment, but the document is not available online to anybody interested.</p> | <p>(Q1-3) There is a formal country-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment, publicly available online to anybody interested.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT AND SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 2: <i>Aligning classroom assessment with country learning goals</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q4) There are no country-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q4) There are very few country-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q4) There are some country-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.²</p> | <p>(Q4) There are a variety of country-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</p> |
| <p>(Q5) There is no official curriculum or standards document.</p> | <p>(Q5) There is an official curriculum or standards document, but it is not clear what students are expected to learn.</p> | <p>(Q5) There is an official curriculum or standards document that specifies what students are expected to learn, but the desired level of performance is not clear.³</p> | <p>(Q5) There is an official curriculum or standards document that specifies what students are expected to learn and the desired level of performance.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT AND SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 3: <i>Having effective human resources to carry out classroom assessment activities</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q6) There are no formal country-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q6) There are very minimal formal country-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q6) There are some formal country-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment.⁴</p> | <p>(Q6) There are a variety of formal country-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessment.</p> |

ASSESSMENT QUALITY

Quality of classroom assessment design, administration, analysis and use.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: <i>Ensuring the quality of classroom assessment</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q7) Classroom assessment practices are very weak, or there is no information available on classroom assessment practices.</p> | <p>(Q7) Classroom assessment practices are known to be weak.</p> | <p>(Q7) Classroom assessment practices are known to be of moderate quality.⁵</p> | <p>(Q7) Classroom assessment practices are known to be of high quality.</p> |
| <p>(Q8) There are no formal country-level mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</p> | <p>(Q8) There are minimal formal country-level mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.⁶</p> | <p>(Q8) There are some formal country-level mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</p> | <p>(Q8) There are varied formal country-level mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</p> |
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: <i>Ensuring effective uses of classroom assessment</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q10) There are no required uses of classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q10) There are minimal required uses of classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q10) There are varied required uses of classroom assessment.</p> | <p>(Q10) There are varied required uses of classroom assessment, including its use as an input for selection or certification.⁷</p> |
| <p>(Q11) Schools are not required to report information on individual student performance.</p> | <p>(Q11-12) At least some schools are required to report information on individual student performance.</p> | <p>(Q11-12) All schools are required to report information on individual student performance to parents.</p> | <p>(Q11-12) All schools are required to report information on individual student performance to parents and other key stakeholders.⁸</p> |
| <p>(Q11) Information on student performance is not required to be reported.</p> | <p>(Q13-14) Minimal information on student performance is required to be reported.</p> | <p>(Q13-14) Some information on student performance is required to be reported in school report cards.</p> | <p>(Q13-14) A variety of information about student performance is required to be reported in school report cards.⁹</p> |

Classroom Assessment: Development-level rating justifications

1. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, there is no national document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.
2. Resources available to teachers for their classroom assessment activities include the National Curriculum document, which outlines what students are expected to learn at different age and grade levels, textbooks and workbooks, scoring criteria and rubrics for grading students work, as well as school report cards which provide teachers with information on the maximum marks that can be awarded to students in different subjects.
3. The National Curriculum document outlines what students are expected to learn at different age and grade levels, but does not specify the desired level of performance.
4. Country-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop competencies in classroom assessments include pre- and in-service teacher training that address competencies in classroom assessment, opportunities for teachers to participate in conferences and workshops on classroom assessment, and school inspection and teacher supervision includes a component focused on classroom assessment.
5. Classroom assessment practices are known to be of moderate quality. Although it is rare that they rely mainly on multiple-choice type questions, they are very commonly about recalling information. It is rare that teachers do not use explicit criteria for grading students' work and to observe errors in the grading of students' work. While it is rare that classroom assessment activities in practice are not aligned with a curricular framework, it is common that classroom assessment activities are used as administrative tools rather than as pedagogical resources.
6. Two formal country-level mechanisms monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. Specifically, classroom assessment is a required component of a teacher's performance evaluation and classroom assessment is a required component of school inspection and teacher supervision.
7. Classroom assessment information is required to be used for diagnosing student learning issues, providing feedback to students on their learning, informing parents about their child's learning, planning the next steps in instruction, grading students for internal classroom uses, and providing input for certification and selection (specifically, classroom assessment marks are combined with the grades achieved on the examination that is organized by the government at the end of a cycle for certification (Test National de Fin d'Etude Primaire (TENAFEP) for primary school and Examen d'Etat for secondary school).
8. Schools are required to report on individual student performance to students and parents at different pre-designated times during the school year. A summarized record of each student's marks are produced and reported to the local education authority with copy kept in the school.
9. A variety of information about student performance is required to be reported in school report cards, including student's individual performance in all subjects and student's performance relative to other students. Student general appreciation of learning ability (a qualitative assessment of student performance in everyday class exercises, marked by qualitative statements Excellent, Very good, Good, Mediocre) is also required to be reported.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of the CONGO

Examinations

ENABLING CONTEXT

Overall framework of policies, leadership, institutional arrangements, fiscal and human resources in which the assessment activity takes place in a country, and the extent to which that framework is directly conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment activity.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 1: <i>Setting clear policies for the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q1_III-IV) There is no examination.</p> | <p>(Q1_III-IV) The examination has been operating on an irregular basis.</p> | <p>(Q1_III-IV) The examination has been operating regularly.¹</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension</p> |
| <p>(Q3) There is no examination, or there is no policy pertaining to the examination.</p> | <p>(Q3-5) There is an informal or draft policy that authorizes the examination; or there is a formal policy that is not available.</p> | <p>(Q3-5) There is a formal policy that authorizes the examination, available upon request or with restricted access.²</p> | <p>(Q3-5) There is a formal policy that authorizes the examination, publicly available online to anyone interested.</p> |
| <p>(Q6) There is no examination, or the examination is not standardized.</p> | <p>(Q6-7) The examination is at most partially standardized at the country level, or has minimum procedures in place to ensure standardization.</p> | <p>(Q6-7) The examination is at least partially standardized at the country level, with at least some procedures in place to ensure standardization.</p> | <p>(Q6-7) The examination is fully standardized at the country level, and a variety of procedures are in place to ensure standardization.³</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 2: <i>Having leadership for the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q8-9) There is no examination, or the country does not have leadership for the examination.</p> | <p>(Q8-9) The country has weak leadership for the examination.</p> | <p>(Q8-9) The country has strong leadership for the examination, from an individual person or from a stakeholder body.⁴</p> | <p>(Q8-9) The country has strong leadership for the examination from both an individual person and a permanent stakeholder body.</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 3: <i>Having regular funding for the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q10) There is no examination, or there is no funding allocated for the examination.</p> | <p>(Q10-11) There is irregular funding for the examination, or the funding is not allocated by law or regulation.</p> | <p>(Q10-11) There is a regular funding for the examination that is allocated by law or regulation.⁵</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q12) There is no examination, or there is no funding coming from the government, student fees, or donors.</p> | <p>(Q12) The funding for the examination comes primarily from donors or loans.</p> | <p>(Q12) The funding for the examination comes primarily from the government or student fees.⁶</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q13) There is no examination, or there is no funding to cover activities.</p> | <p>(Q13) There is funding to cover at least some of the core activities.</p> | <p>(Q13) There is funding to cover all or most core activities.⁷</p> | <p>(Q13) There is funding to cover all core activities, plus research and development.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 4: <i>Having institutional capacity for the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>There is no examination, or there is no examination unit.</p> | <p>(Q14-15) There is a temporary unit, or a unit with minimum experience, in charge of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q14-15) There is a permanent unit with some experience in charge of the examination.⁸</p> | <p>(Q14-15) There is a permanent unit with vast experience in charge of the examination.⁸</p> |
| <p>(Q16) There is no examination, or it is not clear to which body the examination unit is accountable.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q16) The examination unit is accountable to a clearly recognized body.⁹</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q18) There is no examination, or the examination unit does not have facilities to carry out the examination.</p> | <p>(Q18) The examination unit has only a few of the required facilities to carry out the examination.¹⁰</p> | <p>(Q18) The examination unit has all of the required facilities to carry out the examination.</p> | <p>(Q18) The examination unit has up-to-date versions of all required facilities to carry out the examination.</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 5: <i>Having human resources for the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q19-20) There is no examination, or there is no staff allocated to the examination unit.</p> | <p>(Q19-20) The examination unit has an inadequate number of staff to carry out the examination.</p> | <p>(Q19-20) The examination unit has an adequate number of staff to carry out the examination, with some quality problems.¹¹</p> | <p>(Q19-20) The examination unit has an adequate number of staff to carry out the examination, with no quality problems.</p> |
| <p>(Q21-22) There is no examination, or the country offers no annual opportunities to learn about the examinations.</p> | <p>(Q21-22) The country offers very few annual opportunities to learn about the examinations.¹²</p> | <p>(Q21-22) The country offers some annual opportunities to learn about examinations to the examination staff.</p> | <p>(Q21-22) The country offers a wide range of annual opportunities to learn about examinations. These opportunities are available to a broad audience, including the examination staff.</p> |
| <p>(Q23-24) There is no examination, or teachers have no opportunities to learn about the examination, and are not involved in examination-related tasks.</p> | <p>(Q23-24) Teachers have at least some opportunities to learn about the examination, or are involved in at least some examination-related tasks.</p> | <p>(Q23-24) Teachers have at least some opportunities to learn about the examination, and are involved in at least some examination-related tasks.¹³</p> | <p>(Q23-24) Teachers have opportunities to learn about different aspects of the examination, and are involved in most examination-related tasks.</p> |

SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

Degree to which the assessment is coherent with other components of the education system.





| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1: <i>Aligning the examination with learning goals</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q26-27) There is no examination, or the examination is not aligned with official learning goals or curriculum.</p> | <p>(Q26-27) The examination is weakly aligned with official learning goals or curriculum, or there are no regular reviews to ensure alignment.</p> | <p>(Q26-27) The examination is at least sufficiently aligned with official learning goals or curriculum, and there are regular reviews of the examination take place to ensure alignment.¹⁴</p> | <p>(Q26-27) The examination is fully aligned with official learning goals or curriculum, and regular external reviews take place to ensure alignment.</p> |
| <p>(Q28-29) There is no examination, or there the material to prepare for the examinations is available to a small number of students at most.</p> | <p>(Q28-29) The material is accessible to less than half of the students.</p> | <p>(Q28-29) There is comprehensive material to prepare for the examination that is accessible to most students.¹⁵</p> | <p>(Q28-29) There is comprehensive material to prepare for the examination that is widely accessible to all or almost all students.</p> |
| <p>(Q30) There is no examination, or the examination is not consistent with other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q30) The examination is minimally consistent with other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q30) The examination is sufficiently consistent with other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q30) The examination is fully consistent with other assessment activities.¹⁶</p> |

ASSESSMENT QUALITY

Degree to which the assessment meets technical standards, is fair, and is used in an effective way.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: <i>Ensuring the quality of the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q31) There is no examination, or there are no formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q31) There are minimal formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q31) There are some formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q31) There are a variety of formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination. ¹⁷</p> |
| <p>(Q32) There is no examination, or there is no documentation about the technical aspects of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q32) There is some documentation about the technical aspects of the examination.</p> | <p>(Q32) There is a comprehensive technical report about the examination available upon request or with restricted access. ¹⁸</p> | <p>(Q32) There is a comprehensive technical report about the examination publicly available online.</p> |
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: <i>Ensuring fairness</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q33) There is no examination, or the majority of the students may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.</p> | <p>(Q33) A significant proportion of students may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.</p> | <p>(Q33) A small proportion of students may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.</p> | <p>(Q33) All students can take the examination; there are no language, gender or other equivalent barriers. ¹⁹</p> |
| <p>(Q37; Q33) There is no examination, or student results are not confidential, or inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination is high. ²⁰</p> | <p>(Q37; Q33) Student results are not confidential, and there is some inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination.</p> | <p>(Q37; Q33) Student results are confidential, and inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination is low.</p> | <p>(Q37; Q33) Student results are confidential, and there is no inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination.</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p>  | <p>EMERGING</p>  | <p>ESTABLISHED</p>  | <p>ADVANCED</p>  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 3: <i>Ensuring appropriate uses of the examination</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q34; Q37) There is no examination, or student results are not perceived as credible, or are not recognized by any broader certification or selection system.</p> | <p>(Q34; Q37) Student results are perceived as credible by at least some stakeholders.</p> | <p>(Q34; Q37) Student results are perceived as credible by most stakeholders, and are nationally recognized.</p> | <p>(Q34; Q37) Students' results are perceived as credible by most stakeholders, and are internationally recognized.²¹</p> |
| <p>(Q39) There is no examination, or there are no options in the education system for students who do not perform well on the examination.</p> | <p>(Q39) There are very few options in the education system for students who do not perform well on the examination.</p> | <p>(Q39) There are some options in the education system for students who do not perform well on the examination.²²</p> | <p>(Q39) There are a variety of options in the education system for students who do not perform well on the examination.</p> |
| <p>(Q40) There is no examination, or there are no mechanisms in place to monitor the examination.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q40) There are some mechanisms in place to monitor the examination.²³</p> | <p>(Q40) There are a variety of mechanisms in place to monitor the examination.</p> |

Examinations: Development-level rating justifications

1. The Examen d'Etat (National Exam) has been administered to all students in grade 12 for over twenty years in its current form. The examination is used for certification of secondary school completion (in technical or academic fields), and selection to tertiary education or technical jobs.
2. Ordonnance loi numéro 67/250 du 5 juin 1967 is a law that created the Examen d'Etat and provides its framework. Loi Cadre de l'Education was promulgated February 2014. Other relevant policy documents include the ministeriel numero MINEPSP/CABMIN/0040/2004 du 20 avril 2004 and the Loi cadre numero 14/004 du 11 fevrier 2014 de l'enseignement national. The policy documents are available upon request at the Journal Officiel de la Republique and at the Ministry of Education in the "Recueil des directives officielles".
3. The examination is fully standardized (assessment design, administration, scoring and reporting are the same for all students taking the examination). A variety of procedures are in place to ensure the exam's standardization, including that the examination papers and tasks are the same or are equivalent for all students, examination administrators are trained to ensure that all students take the examination under the same conditions, quality control monitors are used to ensure the same administration conditions in all locations where the examinations are taken, the same scoring criteria are used to correct the examination papers and tasks, and examination results are reported using the same procedures for all students.
4. The Ministry of Education provides leadership for the examination. The Ministry of Education is a nationally recognized authority in the country. It has pushed for further development of the examination. It has the influence and power to determine the examination agenda in the country, and has obtained funding for examination activities. The Ministry of Education had managed and continues to manage important assessment projects and programs in the country, and key members have participated in international steering or technical committees on assessment. The Ministry of Education has also been able to convene stakeholders in the country to address examination issues.
5. Funding for the examination is provided by the government based on a law (Arrêté Ministériel numéro MINEPSP/CABMIN/0040/2004 du 20 avril 2004).
6. Funding for the examination is also provided by student fees, which comprises the majority of the funding for the examination.
7. Funding covers all core examination activities, specifically examination design (12% of funding), administration (34% of funding), data analysis (9% of funding), and data reporting (3% of funding). Funding also covers planning (2% of funding) and expenses related to staff (such as per diem, training of scorers, and others, excluding staff salaries) (40% of funding).
8. Inspection Général de l'Education (General inspectorate of education) is the unit in the Ministry of Education that has been in charge of the examination since 1967.
9. The Inspection General de l'Education is accountable to the National Committee for the exam (Comité National de l'Examen d'Etat), which is also part of the Ministry of Education.





10. The examination unit has up-to-date computers and communication tools for all technical staff. It does not have up-to-date computer servers or top level storage facilities and security for the building.
11. There is an adequate number of core staff who are responsible for the examination. The core staff are supported by the personnel of the ministry, mainly teachers, who are selected to be invigilators or to support the staff in the examination centers. Quality problems have been limited to only the poor training of examination administrators.
12. Only courses, workshops, and presentations on student assessment are available to members of the pedagogical committee, inspectors, and some teachers and assessment specialists following the administration of the examination.
13. Teachers are provided with the opportunities to learn about the content and skills measured by the examination (e.g., courses on curriculum and pedagogy) and opportunities to learn about other aspects of the examination (e.g., how tests are developed and scored, how results are reported and used). However, only one examination-related task - acting as a judge during an oral exam - is mainly carried out by teachers. Teachers are sometimes asked to support other examination-related tasks as well.
14. The examination is strongly aligned with the content areas of the national curriculum. The examination is also aligned with the skills areas of the national curriculum and with the pedagogical approaches and activities that are compatible with the national curriculum. Regular internal and ad hoc reviews of the alignment between the examination and what it is intended to measure take place.
15. Material to prepare for the examination includes examples of the types of questions that are on the examination, information on how to prepare for the examination and a report on past student performance on the examination which is made available to most students by their teachers. While schools are to provide the material to students, the comprehensiveness and quality of the material is dependent upon the quality of the resources that the teacher is able to locate.
16. The examination is fully consistent with the classroom assessment, national and international assessment large-scale assessments.
17. The technical commissions and teams who are involved in different aspects of the examination process implement the formal mechanisms that are in place to ensure the quality of the examination. Specifically, all proctors or administrators are trained according to a protocol, there is a standardized manual for examination administrators, a pilot is conducted before the main data collection takes place, all booklets are numbered, there is double scoring of data, scorers are trained to ensure high inter-rater reliability, double processing of data takes place, and external and internal reviewers or observers are invited to observe key examination procedures.
18. The National board of the Exam "Comité National de l'Examen d'Etat" produces a comprehensive technical report (cf. Arrêté ministériel numéro MINEPSP/CABMIN/0040/2004 du 20 avril 2004, article 53) that is available only to certain stakeholders (such as the Minister of Education).

19. All students can take the examination.
20. Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination is minimal and involves only collusion among candidates via mobile phones, passing of papers or equivalent. However, student results are public and not confidential.
21. Examination results are perceived as credible by most stakeholder groups, and are recognized by selection and certification systems in the country and abroad.
22. Students who do not perform well on the examination may retake the examination, take preparatory courses to retake the examination, and may repeat the grade.
23. Only a permanent oversight committee is in place to monitor the examination.





DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of the CONGO
National (or System-Level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)

ENABLING CONTEXT





Overall framework of policies, leadership, institutional arrangements, fiscal and human resources in which the assessment takes place in a country, and the extent to which that framework is directly conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment activity.

| <p>LATENT</p>  | <p>EMERGING</p>  | <p>ESTABLISHED</p>  | <p>ADVANCED</p>  |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 1: <i>Setting clear policies for the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q3_III) No NLSA has taken place in the country.</p> | <p>(Q3_III, IV) The NLSA has been operating on an irregular basis.¹</p> | <p>(Q3_III, IV) The NLSA has been operating regularly.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q5) There was no NLSA, or there was no policy document pertaining to NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q5-7) There was an informal or draft policy document that authorized the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q5-7) There was a formal policy document that authorized the NLSA, available upon request or with restricted access.²</p> | <p>(Q5-7) There was a formal policy document that authorized the NLSA that is publicly available online to anyone interested.</p> |
| <p>(Q8) There was no NLSA, or there was no assessment schedule for future NLSAs.</p> | <p>(Q8-9) There was a common, informal understanding that there would be an NLSA in the future.</p> | <p>(Q8-9) There was a schedule for future NLSAs, specifying when (year), who (grade level) and what (subject areas) would be assessed, but it is not publicly available.³</p> | <p>(Q8-9) There was a publicly available official assessment schedule for future NLSAs, specifying when (year), who (grade level) and what (subject areas) would be assessed.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 2: <i>Having leadership for the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q10-11) There was no NLSA, or the country did not have leadership for the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q10-11) The country had weak leadership for the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q10-11) The country had leadership for the NLSA from an individual person or from a stakeholder body.⁴</p> | <p>(Q10-11) The country had leadership for the NLSA from both an individual person and a permanent stakeholder body.</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p>  | <p>EMERGING</p>  | <p>ESTABLISHED</p>  | <p>ADVANCED</p>  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 3: <i>Having regular funding for the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q12) There was no NLSA, or there was no funding for the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q12-13) There was funding for the NLSA.⁵</p> | <p>(Q12-13) There was regular funding for the NLSA that was allocated by law or regulation.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q12) There was no NLSA, or there was no funding for the NLSA from internal or external sources.</p> | <p>(Q14) The funding for the NLSA came only or primarily from loans or external donors.⁶</p> | <p>(Q14) The funding for the NLSA came primarily or only from the country's internal funding sources.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q12) There was no NLSA, or there was no funding.</p> | <p>(Q15) There was funding to cover at least some minimum core activities of the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q15) There was funding to cover all or most core activities of the NLSA.⁷</p> | <p>(Q15) There was funding to cover all core activities, plus research and development.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 4: <i>Having institutional capacity for the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q16) There was no NLSA, or there was no NLSA team.</p> | <p>(Q16-18) There was a temporary or ad hoc team in charge of the NLSA, or other equivalent.⁸</p> | <p>(Q16-18) There was a permanent team, at least nationally recognized, with at least some experience in NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q16-18) There was a permanent team, internationally recognized, with vast experience in NLSA.</p> |
| <p>(Q19-20) There was no NLSA, or it is unclear to which body the NLSA unit was accountable.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q19-20) The NLSA unit was accountable to a clearly recognized body.⁹</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q21) There was no NLSA, or the NLSA unit did not have facilities to carry out the assessment.</p> | <p>(Q21) The NLSA unit had only a few of the required facilities to carry out the assessment.¹⁰</p> | <p>(Q21) The NLSA unit had all of the required facilities to carry out the assessment.</p> | <p>(Q21) The NLSA unit had up-to-date versions of all required facilities to carry out the assessment.</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p>  | <p>EMERGING</p>  | <p>ESTABLISHED</p>  | <p>ADVANCED</p>  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 5: <i>Having human resources for the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q16) There was no NLSA, or there was no NLSA staff.</p> | <p>(Q22-23) The NLSA team had an inadequate number of staff to carry out the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q22-23) The NLSA team had an adequate number of staff to carry out the NLSA, with some quality problems.</p> | <p>(Q22-23) The NLSA team had an adequate number of staff to carry out the NLSA, without quality problems.¹¹</p> |
| <p>(Q24-25) There was no NLSA, or the country did not offer annual opportunities to learn about NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q24-25) The country offered very few annual opportunities to learn about NLSA.¹²</p> | <p>(Q24-25) The country offered some annual opportunities to learn about NLSA, albeit only to the NLSA team members.</p> | <p>(Q24-25) The country offered a wide range of annual opportunities to learn about NLSA. These opportunities were available to a broad audience, including the NLSA team members.</p> |
| <p>(Q26) There was no NLSA, or teachers did not have annual opportunities to learn about the NLSA.¹³</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q26) Teachers had annual opportunities to learn about the content and skills measured by the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q26) Teachers had annual opportunities to learn about different aspects of the NLSA.</p> |

SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

Degree to which the assessment is coherent with other components of the education system.

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1: <i>Aligning the NLSA with learning goals</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q27-28) There was no NLSA, or the country did not have official learning goals or curriculum, or the NLSA was not aligned with the official learning goals or curriculum.</p> | <p>(Q27-28) There were some mechanism to review the alignment of the NLSA and what it was intended to measure.¹⁴</p> | <p>(Q27-28) The NLSA was sufficiently aligned with official learning goals or curriculum, and a regular internal review took place to ensure alignment.</p> | <p>(Q27-28) The NLSA was fully aligned with official learning goals or curriculum, and a regular external review took place to ensure alignment.</p> |
| <p>(Q29) There was no NLSA, or students had no previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q29) Students had limited previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q29) Students had sufficient previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the NLSA.¹⁵</p> | <p>(Q29) Students had extensive previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the NLSA.</p> |
| <p>(Q30) There was no NLSA, or the NLSA was not consistent with other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q30) The NLSA was minimally consistent with other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q30) The NLSA was sufficiently consistent with other assessment activities.¹⁶</p> | <p>(Q30) The NLSA was fully consistent with other assessment activities.</p> |

ASSESSMENT QUALITY

Degree to which the assessment meets technical standards, is fair and is used in an effective way.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: <i>Ensuring the quality of the NLSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q31-32) There was no NLSA, or there were no mechanisms to include all student groups in the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q31-32) There were informal or ad hoc mechanisms to include all student groups in the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q31-32) There were some formal mechanisms to include all student groups in the NLSA.¹⁷</p> | <p>(Q31-32) There were a variety of formal mechanisms to include all student groups in the NLSA.</p> |
| <p>(Q31-32) There was no NLSA, or there were no formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q33) There were very few formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q33) There were some formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA.¹⁸</p> | <p>(Q33) There were a variety of formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA.</p> |
| <p>(Q34) There was no NLSA, or there was no technical documentation about the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q34) There was some documentation about the technical aspects of the NLSA.</p> | <p>(Q34) There was a comprehensive technical report for the NLSA, available upon request or with restricted access.</p> | <p>(Q34) There was a comprehensive technical report for the NLSA, publicly available online.¹⁹</p> |

(CONTINUED)

ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2:
Ensuring effective uses of the NLSA

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| (Q35-37) There was no NLSA, or country results and information were not disseminated. | (Q35-37) Country results and information were disseminated using some communication strategy, excluding dissemination to schools. ²⁰ | (Q35-37) Country results and information were disseminated using a variety of communication strategies, including dissemination to some schools. | (Q35-37) Country results and information were disseminated using a variety of communication strategies, including dissemination to most schools. |
| (Q38-39) There was no NLSA, or NLSA results and information were not covered by the media. ²¹ | (Q38-39) NLSA results and information had hardly any coverage in the media. | (Q38-39) NLSA results and information were covered by some media outlets. | (Q38-39) NLSA results and information were covered by a wide variety of media. |
| (Q40-41) There was no NLSA, or results from the NLSA were not used to inform decision making in the country. | (Q40-41) Results from the NLSA were minimally used to inform decision making in the country. ²² | (Q40-41) Results from the NLSA were used in some ways to inform decision making in the country. | (Q40-41) Results from the NLSA were used in a variety of ways to inform decision making in the country. |
| (Q42) There was no NLSA, or there were no mechanisms in place to monitor the NLSA. ²³ | This option does not apply to this dimension. | (Q42) There were some formal mechanisms in place to monitor the NLSA. | (Q42) There were a variety of formal mechanisms in place to monitor the NLSA. |
| (Q43) There was no NLSA, or there is no clear evidence or consensus about the positive impact of the NLSA on education quality. ²⁴ | This option does not apply to this dimension. | (Q43) There is a general consensus about the positive impact of the NLSA on education quality. | (Q43) There is evidence of the positive impact of the NLSA on education quality. |

National (of System-Level) Large Scale Assessment (NLSA): Development-level rating justifications

1. The Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) has been implemented every two years since 2010 for the purposes of monitoring education quality at the country level, and supporting schools and teachers. It has also served as the baseline assessment for the Project for the Improvement of Quality Education (PIEQ) which is a USAID funded education intervention. EGRA has been administered to a regionally representative random sample of students in grades 2, 4, and 6.
2. The Ministry of Education authorized the assessment with the formal policy document, MINEPSP/SG/80/384/2010 DU 25 MARS 2010, in 2010. This policy document is available to the public upon request.
3. Although there was a detailed schedule specifying the year of future assessments, grade level(s) of students to be assessed, and subject areas, it was only made available upon request. This schedule is derived from the deliverables related to implementing EGRA which have been committed by the Education Development Center to USAID.
4. The Democratic Republic of Congo had leadership for the NLSA from the Education Development Center, who lead a consortium composed of itself, Catholic Relief Services, and the Research Triangle Institute. The Education Development Center had influence and power in determining the NLSA agenda, was able to obtain funding for NLSA activities, and was able to convene stakeholder groups in the country to address NLSA issues. However, a large portion of the oversight and support for NLSA activities came from international staff and experts from outside of the country.
5. Funding for EGRA was allocated at the discretion of donors.
6. Funding for EGRA came only from external loans or donors
7. There was funding to cover most core NLSA activities. Funding for EGRA covered assessment design and administration, data analysis and reporting, planning, and staff per diems and transport.
8. The team working on EGRA was composed of international experts from the Research Triangle Institute, staff from the Ministry of Education, and local project staff.
9. The team responsible for carrying out EGRA was responsible to the donor, USAID. (This evaluation is of the team of international experts and not only of country capacity.)
10. The team responsible for carrying out EGRA had up-to-date computers for all technical staff, top-level building security and storage facilities, and up-to-date computer servers and communication tools. (This evaluation is of the team of international experts and not only of country capacity.)

11. The team responsible for carrying out the NLSA exercise had an adequate number of staff. The technical staff from the Research Triangle Institute trained local staff in target provinces to implement the assessment. There were no quality problems identified with the performance of the team responsible for the carrying out the EGRA. (This evaluation is of the team of international experts and not only of country capacity.)
12. The Democratic Republic of Congo offered very few annual opportunities to learn about NLSA. There were non-university training courses or workshops on student assessment available annually to the NLSA team, educators, and assessment specialists. Presentations on the NLSA were given to inspectors from the Ministry of Education responsible for primary, secondary, and professional instruction, as well as teachers and test administrators.
13. Only some teachers had opportunities to learn about NLSA results and student performance on the NLSA. These opportunities did not address the content and skills measured by the NLSA.
14. EGRA was aligned with the content and skills areas of the national curriculum, as well as with the pedagogical approaches and activities that are compatible with the national curriculum. Some mechanism were in place review the alignment of the NLSA and what it was intended to measure, including an ad-hoc review of the alignment of the EGRA and what it is intended to measure and a pilot was conducted before each assessment round. However, no regular internal and external review of the alignment between EGRA and what it was intended to measure has taken place.
15. Students had sufficient previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the NLSA. Textbooks or other learning resources and teachers in their classes covered similar content and skills to those covered by the NLSA. Moreover, students were exposed to more basic content and skills than those covered by the NLSA.
16. The NLSA was consistent with classroom assessment practices, the End of Primary School National Test (TENAFEP), and PASEC.
17. EGRA was administered to students in the local language when student's language was not French on an as-needed basis. Additionally, accommodations or alternative assessments were not provided for students with disabilities, and special plans were not made to ensure that EGRA was administered to students in hard-to-read areas.
18. Formal mechanisms were in place to ensure the quality of the administration and data processing of the NLSA. For example, all proctors or administrators were trained according to a protocol, and there was a standardized manual for large-scale assessment administrators. In addition, a pilot was conducted before the main data collection took place, all booklets were numbered, and scorers were trained to ensure high inter-rater reliability.
19. A comprehensive technical report on the NLSA was made publicly available online.
20. Country results and information were disseminated using some communication strategy. Copies of the Democratic Republic of Congo's country report and brochures or PowerPoint presentations with the country's results were made available to development partners, including the Ministry of Education, USAID,

international NGOs, and a few civil society representatives. No products and services providing information about the NLSA results were disseminated to schools.

21. NLSA results and information were not covered by the media.

22. Due to EGRA results, reading as a subject now figures more prominently in in-service teacher training programs. In addition, a new reading curriculum at the primary level and reading benchmarks have been developed. Reading also will be promoted from a sub-subject to a main subject in the primary-level curriculum.

23. No formal mechanisms are in place in the Democratic Republic of Congo to monitor the impact, acceptance, and credibility of the NLSA.

24. There is no clear evidence or consensus about the NLSA having a positive impact on education quality.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of the CONGO

International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)

ENABLING CONTEXT

Overall framework of policies, leadership, institutional arrangements, fiscal and human resources in which the assessment takes place in a country, and the extent to which that framework is directly conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment activity.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 1: <i>Setting clear policies for the ILSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q1, Q2) The country has not participated in an ILSA in the last 10 years.</p> | <p>(Q1, Q2) The country has participated in, but not completed, an ILSA in the last 10 years.¹</p> | <p>(Q1, Q2) The country has completed one ILSA in the last 10 years.¹</p> | <p>(Q1, Q2) The country has completed two or more ILSAs in the last 10 years.</p> |
| <p>(Q3) The country is not currently participating in an ILSA or has not taken concrete steps to participate in an ILSA in the next 5 years.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q3) The country is currently participating in an ILSA or has taken concrete steps to participate in at least one ILSA in the next 5 years.²</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q5) There was no country-level policy document that addressed participation in the ILSA.³</p> | <p>(Q5,Q6) There was an informal or draft country-level policy document that addressed participation in the ILSA.</p> | <p>(Q5,Q6) There was a formal country-level policy document that addressed participation in the ILSA that was available upon request or with restricted access.</p> | <p>(Q5,Q6,Q7) There was a formal country-level policy document that addressed participation in the ILSA that was publicly available online to anyone interested.</p> |
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 2: <i>Having sufficient funding for the ILSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q8) There was no funding for participation in the ILSA, discretionary or otherwise.</p> | <p>(Q9) Funding for the ILSA activities was primarily allocated at the discretion of the country's government or donors.⁴</p> | <p>(Q9) Funding for the ILSA activities was primarily allocated by law or regulation.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>(Q8) There was no funding from loans, external donors, or internal sources.</p> | <p>(Q10) There was funding only or primarily from loans or external donors.⁵</p> | <p>(Q10) There was funding primarily from the country's internal funding sources.</p> | <p>(Q10) There was funding only from the country's internal sources.</p> |
| <p>(Q8) There was no funding for core items or research and development.</p> | <p>(Q11) The ILSA funding covered at least minimum core items of the ILSA.</p> | <p>(Q11) The ILSA funding covered most core items.</p> | <p>(Q11) The ILSA funding covered most core items, plus research and development.⁶</p> |

(CONTINUED)

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>ENABLING CONTEXT 3: <i>Having effective institutional and human capacity for the ILSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q12-16) There was no ILSA unit or team.</p> | <p>(Q12-16) There was a unit or team that carried out the ILSA, with some issues.</p> | <p>(Q12-16) There was a recognized unit or team, with at least some experience in international assessments, that carried out the ILSA in an effective way.</p> | <p>(Q12-16) There was an internationally-recognized unit or team, with vast experience in international assessments that carried out the ILSA in an effective way.⁷</p> |
| <p>(Q17) On average, the facilities of the ILSA unit were not up-to-date.</p> | <p>(Q17) On average, the facilities of the ILSA unit were minimally up-to-date.</p> | <p>(Q17) Most of the required facilities of the ILSA unit were up-to-date.⁸</p> | <p>(Q17) The facilities of the ILSA unit were up to date. The ILSA unit had up-to-date versions of all of the required facilities to carry out the ILSA.</p> |
| <p>(Q18-20) The country offered no opportunities to learn about ILSAs.</p> | <p>(Q18-20) The country offered minimal opportunities to learn about ILSA.⁹</p> | <p>(Q18-20) The country offered adequate opportunities to learn about ILSA.</p> | <p>(Q18-20) The country offered adequate opportunities to learn about ILSA to a broad audience, including the ILSA team and educators.</p> |

SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

Degree to which the assessment is coherent with other components of the education system.

| <p>LATENT</p> <p>● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING</p> <p>● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED</p> <p>● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED</p> <p>● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1: <i>Aligning the ILSA with learning goals for the country</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q21) The ILSA was not aligned with the country's official learning goals, or the country did not have official learning goals.</p> <p>(Q22) Students were not previously exposed to the type of content and skills measured by the ILSA.</p> <p>(Q23) The ILSA was not consistent with the country's other assessment activities</p> | <p>(Q21) The ILSA was partially aligned with the country's official learning goals.</p> <p>(Q22) Students had limited previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the ILSA.</p> <p>(Q23) The ILSA was minimally consistent with the country's other assessment activities.</p> | <p>(Q21) The ILSA was sufficiently aligned with the country's official learning goals.¹⁰</p> <p>(Q22) Students had sufficient previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the ILSA.¹¹</p> <p>(Q23) The ILSA was generally consistent with the country's other assessment activities.¹²</p> | <p>(Q21) The ILSA was fully aligned with the country's official learning goals.</p> <p>(Q22) Students had extensive previous exposure to the type of content and skills measured by the ILSA.</p> <p>(Q23) The ILSA was fully consistent with the country's other assessment activities.</p> |

ASSESSMENT QUALITY

Degree to which the assessment meets technical quality standards, is fair and is used in an effective way.

| <p>LATENT ● ○ ○ ○</p> | <p>EMERGING ● ● ○ ○</p> | <p>ESTABLISHED ● ● ● ○</p> | <p>ADVANCED ● ● ● ●</p> |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: <i>Ensuring the technical quality of the ILSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q24) The country did not meet sufficient technical standards to have its data presented in the international report or an annex.</p> | <p>(Q24) The country met sufficient technical standards to have its data presented beneath the main display of the international report or in an annex.</p> | <p>(Q24) The country met all technical standards required to have its data presented in the main displays of the international report.¹³</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> |
| <p>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: <i>Ensuring effective uses of ILSA</i></p> | | | |
| <p>(Q25-27) Country results and information were not disseminated in the country.</p> | <p>(Q25-27) Country results and information were disseminated using at least one communication strategy.</p> | <p>(Q25-27) Country results and information were disseminated using some communication strategies.¹⁴</p> | <p>(Q25-27) Country results and information were disseminated using a variety of communication strategies, including dissemination to most schools.</p> |
| <p>(Q28-29) Country results and information were not covered by media in the country.</p> | <p>(Q28-29) Country results and information were covered by one media outlet in the country.</p> | <p>(Q28-29) Country results and information were covered by some media outlets in the country.¹⁵</p> | <p>(Q28-29) Country results and information were covered by a variety of media outlets in the country.</p> |
| <p>(Q30-31) Results from the ILSA have not been used to inform decision making.</p> | <p>(Q30-31) Results from the ILSA have been used in a very limited way to inform decision making in the country.</p> | <p>(Q30-31) Results from the ILSA have been used in some ways to inform decision making in the country.¹⁶</p> | <p>(Q30-31) Results from the ILSA have been used in a variety of ways to inform decision making in the country.¹⁶</p> |
| <p>(Q32) There is no clear evidence or consensus about the positive impact of the ILSA on education quality.</p> | <p>This option does not apply to this dimension.</p> | <p>(Q32) There is a general consensus about the positive impact of the ILSA on education quality.</p> | <p>(Q32) There is evidence of the positive impact of the ILSA on education quality.¹⁷</p> |

International Large Scale Assessment (ILSA): Development-level rating justifications

1. The Democratic Republic of Congo participated and completed PASEC in 2010.
2. The Democratic Republic of Congo has plans to participate in the 2018 round of PASEC.
3. There was no country-level policy document addressing the Democratic Republic of Congo's participation in PASEC.
4. Funds for ILSA activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo have been provided by donors.
5. Funding for ILSA activities have been sourced only from external donors, such as the World Bank and CONFEMEN.
6. Funding for ILSA activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo covers implementation of the assessment exercise, data processing and analysis, disseminating and reporting assessment results in the Democratic Republic of Congo, attendance at international meetings, ILSA staff salaries, and research and development activities. Funding does not cover international participation fees.
7. In the Ministry of Education, a team in the Directorate for Planning is responsible for ILSA activities. The team is internationally recognized and was in charge during the 2010 PASEC assessment exercise.
8. The ILSA unit had up-to-date computer servers and communication tools, and top-level building security and storage facilities. However, the ILSA unit did not have up-to-date computers for all technical staff.
9. Some workshops and meetings on understanding ILSA and ILSA databases have been organized by the Directorate of Planning for staff involved in implementation of the ILSA and education partners. In addition, funding for attending international workshops or trainings on ILSA was offered in the context of official ILSA meetings. However, the Democratic Republic of Congo does not offer university courses on the topic of ILSA or online courses on ILSA. The Democratic Republic of Congo also did not offer funding for international workshops or training on ILSA separate from those offered at special meetings.
10. PASEC was sufficiently aligned with the content and skill areas of the country's curriculum. In addition, it was aligned with pedagogical approaches compatible with the curriculum.
11. Textbooks and teachers in their classes covered similar content and skills to those covered by the ILSA. Moreover, students were exposed to more basic content and skills than those covered by the ILSA.
12. The ILSA was generally consistent with the country's classroom assessment practices, examinations, and national-large scale assessment. However, students did have much familiarity with the multiple-choice question format that appeared on the ILSA.

13. The Democratic Republic of Congo met all technical standards required to have its data presented in the main displays of the international report.
14. Country results and information were disseminated using some communication strategies. Copies of both the country-level and international reports were distributed to key stakeholders. In addition, the Democratic Republic of Congo's results were communicated through a press release, and brochures and PowerPoint presentations with the country's results were made available online or distributed to key stakeholders. Only schools in the capital city received products and services providing information about ILSA results.
15. Media coverage was limited to a few small articles, and ILSA results were written about or discussed in online blogs or forums.
16. ILSA results have been used to inform decision-making at the country level in the Democratic Republic of Congo. PASEC results have informed the Reform Roadmap in the Ministry of Education. Results have been used in tracking the impact of reforms on student achievement levels, and informing curriculum improvement, teacher training programs, resource allocation, and other assessment activities in the system.
17. There is evidence of a positive impact of the ILSA on education quality, as PASEC results have contributed to the Education Sector Strategy and the Education Interim Plan.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by The World Bank SABER-Student Assessment team in collaboration with Dung-Kim Pham, World Bank Senior Operations Officer and Task Team Leader for education projects in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Didier Niki-Niki, Education Specialist, Democratic Republic of Congo. The team is grateful to the Congolese education staff who contributed information for this report.

References

Clarke, M. 2012. "What Matters Most for Student Assessment Systems: A Framework Paper." READ/SABER Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: World Bank.

The Global Partnership for Education. 2014. "In the Democratic Republic of Congo, Partners Rebuild the Education System Together." Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education. Retrieved from <https://www.globalpartnership.org/success-stories/democratic-republic-congo-partners-rebuild-education-system-together> on September 1, 2014.

The Ministry of Primary, Secondary, and Vocational Education in the Democratic Republic of Congo. 2013. *National Survey on the Situation of Out of School Children and Adolescents: Democratic Republic of Congo*. Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo: Kinshasa. Retrieved from [http://www.unicef.org/education/files/DRC_OOSCI_Full_Report_\(En\).pdf](http://www.unicef.org/education/files/DRC_OOSCI_Full_Report_(En).pdf) on September 1, 2014.

World Bank. 2014. Democratic Republic of Congo Country Indicator Data. Washington, DC: World Bank. Data retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/> on September 1, 2014.

- - -. 2014. "Democratic Republic of the Congo: Overview." Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/drc/overview> on September 1, 2014.

The Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) initiative produces comparative data and knowledge on education policies and institutions, with the aim of helping countries systematically strengthen their education systems. SABER evaluates the quality of education policies against evidence-based global standards, using new diagnostic tools and detailed policy data. The SABER country reports give all parties with a stake in educational results—from administrators, teachers, and parents to policymakers and business people—an accessible, objective snapshot showing how well the policies of their country's education system are oriented toward ensuring that all children and youth learn.

This report focuses specifically on policies in the area of student assessment.

This work is a product of the staff of The World Bank with external contributions. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

