



VARKEY FOUNDATION

Changing lives through education

METHODOLOGY FOR ENTRY PROCESSING, EVALUATION, SELECTION AND VOTING FOR THE 2016 GLOBAL TEACHER PRIZE (GTP)

The 2016 Global Teacher Prize:

- “The Global Teacher Prize (GTP) is a US \$1 million award presented annually to an exceptional teacher who has made an outstanding contribution to their profession.”
- The winner of the award is voted by the Global Teacher Prize Academy, from a shortlist of 10 candidates selected by the GTP Prize Committee.
- More details can be found at: www.globalteacherprize.org

Assertion by the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation:

This document (the “Methodology”) sets out our end-to-end process for conducting the Global Teacher Prize. As Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation we assert that we have correctly applied the specific rules denoted by (i) - (xvi) within this Methodology (highlighted in ***bold underlined italics*** throughout the document)

Independent assurance by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP:

To help demonstrate the integrity of the Global Teacher Prize, our application of specific rules (i) - (xvi) has been subject to independent assurance by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP UK (“PwC”). Their independent assurance opinion on our application of specific rules (i) - (xvi) is set out on the final page of this document. The specific rules (i) - (xvi) relate to:

- 1) **Entry processing**
- 2) **Varkey Foundation pre-committee evaluation**
- 3) **Prize Committee selection**
- 4) **Academy voting**
- 5) **Background checks**

The specific rules (i) - (xvi) that have been independently assured by PwC are set out below in the table on page 7.

Round 1: Entry processing

All 1,788 entrants submitted their entry into an online form on the GTP website, administered by a third party provider – Fission Strategy ('Fission'). Each entry comprised seven sections, relating to different areas of teaching excellence and experience. These were:

- 1) Story
- 2) Innovation
- 3) Achievement
- 4) Citizens
- 5) Community
- 6) Profession
- 7) Use of Prize funds

The data in each section, as well as key personal information (name, country of residence, age of pupils, main subjects and state/independent sector) was captured in the online form for further analysis.

A heuristical analysis application (HAA) was written by Professor Peter Millican (Oxford University) to screen the entries to assess whether they were of sufficient quality to merit further review. The HAA scored each English language entry out of ten, based on the text in each of the seven sections. All entries were exported through an automated process from Fission and imported into the application.

(i) The data for all 1,152 English entries received was exported from Fission and submitted to the HAA for analysis. The remaining 636 non-English entries were passed to round 2.

(ii) No changes were made to the original entries that could affect the final outcome of the Global Teacher Prize.

Integrity checks were performed by Professor Millican to ensure that all of the entries in English had been imported into the HAA, and that no changes were made to them. All of the 636 non-English language entries were automatically passed to round 2.

(iii) All English entries underwent an automated screening process developed by Peter Millican (Oxford University) that ranked each entry on a scale of 1 - 10.

The 1,152 entries were classified on a scale of 1 to 10, with entries classified into three groups, split between those that would advance to round 2, those that required manual review, and those that did not advance to round 2.

Following HAA review, a human review was performed on a sample of entries as a sense check to ensure that the entries had been appropriately scored by the application.

(iv) All entries with a score of 1 - 5 did not reach round 2.

(v) All entries with a score of 9 - 10 were automatically put through to round 2.

(vi) All with a score of 6 - 8 were manually reviewed.

See list below summarising which HAA scores progressed to round 2:

1 – 5 Does not progress to round 2

6 – 8 All entries manually reviewed by Mark Turrell of OrcaSci to determine whether each one progresses to round 2

9 – 10 Automatically progresses to round 2

Round 2: Varkey Foundation pre-committee evaluation

The GTP staff and a selection of business and education experts were invited to evaluate the batch of 1,061 entries that progressed to round 2 (comprising 425 English entries and 636 non-English entries). The objective of this round was to have each entry independently scored by suitably qualified evaluators to narrow the entries down to a list of Top 50 candidates for the Prize Committee's consideration.

(vii) All entries to reach round 2 were reviewed by at least one evaluator.

There were two categories of evaluators at this round. All entries were read by a master evaluator or a volunteer evaluator.

Master evaluators: Rebecca Warbrick (Varkey Foundation), Dr Yvonne Lindow (OrcaSci), Mark Turrell (OrcaSci), Michelle Whitehead and Marta Jakab (independent contractors sourced by Orasci) read and evaluated some entries that progressed to this round.

Volunteer evaluators: 22 other evaluators, all with education expertise, volunteered to assist with the scoring process. Volunteer evaluators with foreign language skills reviewed non-English entries.

Scoring process

Evaluators received a clear explanation of the process from Mark Turrell of OrcaSci, and an evaluation guide containing the following information:

- Criteria sheet including an explanation behind each criteria (see below) and how to interpret them;
- A system for judges to share problems and issues;
- Instructions on the scoring process; and
- Two test entries that they could score, which enabled the lead master judges to calibrate the scoring.

The 1,061 entries in round 2 were then scored between 1 and 5 on each of the following criteria to produce an overall score:

- 1) Story (how compelling is the entrant's story)
- 2) Innovation
- 3) Role model
- 4) Contribution to teaching
- 5) Developing students
- 6) Improving access
- 7) Credentials
- 8) Use of funds (i.e. intended use of prize money)
- 9) 'Wow' candidate
- 10) Concern

(viii) Two master evaluators reviewed the scores for all entries and selected the final Top 50 for consideration by the Prize Committee.

Once all evaluators had submitted their scores, two master evaluators (Rebecca Warbrick and Mark Turrell) compiled a Top 50 listing of applicants based on the scores from round 2. This review also considered the portfolio mix of the Top 50. During this review, entries were assigned at least one of the following labels:

- Round 2 – entry did not progress beyond round 2
- Top 50 – entry to be placed in the Top 50
- Some Top 50 entries were flagged as having 'Top 10' potential
- Some Top 50 entries were flagged as 'concern' for follow up (e.g. was the applicant definitely a teacher?)

The Top 50 candidates were then considered by the Prize Committee.

Round 3: Prize Committee selection of Top 10 candidates (and reserve list)

The Prize Committee was responsible for selecting the final Top 10 candidates and reserve list.

Member of the Prize Committee

The Prize Committee consisted of:

Voting members:

- Vikas Pota, CEO, Varkey Foundation
- Anne Mroz, Editor, Times Educational Supplement (TES)
- Sir Mike Tomlinson, former Head of Ofsted, the UK schools' inspectorate
- Jay Varkey, Trustee, Varkey Foundation
- Nancie Atwell, 2015 winner of the Global Teacher Prize
- Vandana Goyal, CEO, The Akanksha Foundation
- Jacque Kahura, Top 10 Finalist, 2015 Global Teacher Prize
- David Edwards, Deputy General Secretary, Education International
- Jiang Xuepin, Education Consultant and Author

Non-voting members in attendance:

- Rebecca Warbrick, Varkey Foundation
- PwC

(ix) Each voting member of the Prize Committee received in advance a link to a database containing information packs for the remaining Top 50 candidates.

(x) Members of the prize committee agreed to abide by the GTP code of conduct. This included a declaration of any relationships with Top 50 candidates that could cause a conflict of interest. Prize Committee members were excluded from the assessment of any such candidates.

The Prize Committee selection round involved extended discussions between the members of the Prize Committee, starting with a face to face meeting on 12 November 2015 for all members (facilitated by Rebecca Warbrick) and followed by telephone calls and email discussions.

(xi) Following discussion and debate on the Top 50 candidates, a vote was held and consensus reached by the Prize Committee on the final Top 10 candidates to be voted on by the Academy.

The reserve list of two candidates was also agreed by the Prize Committee.

Round 4: Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy

The Top 10 candidates selected by the Prize Committee were subject to a vote by the Global Teacher Prize Academy (the Academy). All 153 Academy members are prominent figures in their respective fields from around the world. Academy members include head teachers, education experts, sector commentators, journalists, public officials, technology entrepreneurs, company directors and scientists. The list of Academy members is public:

<http://www.globalteacherprize.org/academy-members>

An information pack summarising each Top 10 candidate was sent to each Academy member via email for them to review before voting. The information pack was also available on the Academy voting portal.

Academy voting procedure:

Academy members cast their votes independently during a voting window that lasted two weeks, from 1 January 2016 to 16 January 2016. Each member was permitted to cast 10 votes, split however they chose between the Top 10 candidates.

(xii) All Academy members confirmed their compliance with the GTP code of conduct.

(xiii) The Academy vote was cast via a voting system developed using Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com).

This system was designed to ensure that:

- Academy members were provided with an information pack covering all Top 10 candidates and reminded to review this before voting;
- Academy members awarded exactly 10 votes to valid candidates;
- Each Academy member voted once and once only during the voting window;
- Access and security controls prevented unauthorised voting by non-Academy members; and
- Votes were strictly confidential with access to cumulative totals restricted to PwC.

Prior to voting, the minimum quorum for the Academy voting process was set at 50% of the 153 registered academy members.

(xiv) The minimum quorum of 50% of Academy members was met, with 106 successfully voting.

(xv) The candidate awarded the most votes by the Academy was announced as the winner of the prize.
(at the prize ceremony in Dubai on 13 March 2016)

The winner as determined by the Academy voting was Hanan Al Hroub.

Round 5: Background checks

(xvi) Background checks were completed for all Top 10 (and reserve list) candidates with findings reviewed by Rebecca Warbrick and Vikas Pota. Documentation was retained of their conclusions on each candidate.

Background checks were performed on each of the Top 10 candidates (including two spare entrants), comprising two elements:

- Online open source research; and
- Employment reference-taking.

These background checks were restricted to the candidates themselves; no checks or research was performed on the conduct of family members or associates of the shortlisted candidates.

The online open source research and employment reference-taking was performed by the PwC corporate intelligence team:

Online open source research

The PwC corporate intelligence team conducted open source research to obtain information on the background, track record, reputation and integrity of each of the Top 10 candidates.

This included research of public record information in English and in local languages where possible. At a minimum (and where relevant) this included research of open sources in the following languages: French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Turkish, Russian, Arabic and Chinese.

Research of online open sources included, where available: press articles, litigation records, social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter, and databases containing details of corporate affiliations (such as directorships and shareholdings) as well as other open sources such as web forums.

Employment reference taking

The PwC pre-employment screening team took employment references for each of the Top 10 candidates, checking their employment history over 7-10 years. Prior to these checks, each of the Top 10 candidates completed a consent form and submitted to the Varkey Foundation, who then shared these with PwC.

Specific rules subject to independent assurance by PwC:

Rule number	Methodology section	Rule description
(i)	1) Entry processing	The data for all 1,152 English entries received was exported from Screen Door and submitted to the HAA for analysis. The remaining 636 non-English entries were passed to round 2.
(ii)	1) Entry processing	No changes were made to the original entries that could affect the final outcome of the Global Teacher Prize.
(iii)	1) Entry processing	All English entries underwent an automated screening process developed by Peter Millican (Oxford University) that ranked each entry on a scale of 1 - 10.
(iv)	1) Entry processing	All entries with a score of 1 - 5 did not reach round 2.
(v)	1) Entry processing	All entries with a score of 9 - 10 were automatically put through to round 2.
(vi)	1) Entry processing	All with a score of 6 - 8 were manually reviewed.
(vii)	2) Varkey Foundation pre-committee evaluation	All entries to reach round 2 were reviewed by at least one evaluator.
(viii)	2) Varkey Foundation pre-committee evaluation	Two master evaluators reviewed the scores for all entries and selected the final Top 50 for consideration by the Prize Committee.
(ix)	3) Prize Committee selection of Top 10 candidates (and reserve list)	Each voting member of the Prize Committee received in advance a link to a database containing information packs for the remaining Top 50 candidates.
(x)	3) Prize Committee selection of Top 10 candidates (and reserve list)	Members of the prize committee agreed to abide by the GTP code of conduct. This included a declaration of any relationships with Top 50 candidates that could cause a conflict of interest. Prize Committee members were excluded from the assessment of any such candidates.
(xi)	3) Prize Committee selection of Top 10 candidates (and reserve list)	Following discussion and debate on the Top 50 candidates, a vote was held and consensus reached by the Prize Committee on the final Top 10 candidates to be voted on by the Academy.
(xii)	4) Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy	All Academy members confirmed their compliance with the GTP code of conduct.
(xiii)	4) Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy	The Academy vote was cast via a voting system developed using Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com).
(xiv)	4) Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy	The minimum quorum of 50% of Academy members was met, with 106 successfully voting.
(xv)	4) Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy	The candidate awarded the most votes by the Academy was announced as the winner of the prize.
(xvi)	5) Background checks	Background checks were completed for all Top 10 (and reserve list) candidates with findings reviewed by Rebecca Warbrick and Vikas Pota. Documentation was retained of their conclusions on each candidate.



Independent assurance report to the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation for the 2016 Global Teacher Prize

This report is produced in accordance with the terms of our contract dated 14 July 2015 for the purpose of reporting to the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation on the performance of an independent limited assurance engagement over the directors' assertion that management has correctly applied specific rules (i) – (xvi) within its methodology (the "Methodology") in conducting the 2016 Global Teacher Prize.

Specific rules (i) – (xvi) relate to entry processing, selection and voting for the Global Teacher Prize 2016.

The assertion of the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation that management has correctly applied specific rules (i) – (xvi) is set out on the first page of the accompanying Methodology.

Intended users and purpose

This report is prepared for, and only for, the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation, and solely for the purpose of reporting to them on their assertion that they have correctly applied the specific rules (i) – (xvi) of the Methodology and no other purpose. We do not, in giving our opinion, accept or assume responsibility (legal or otherwise) or accept liability for, or in connection with, any other purpose for which our report including the opinion may be used, or to any other person to whom our report is shown or into whose hands it may come, and no other persons shall be entitled to rely on our opinion.

We permit the disclosure of our report, in full only and in the company of the Methodology, to enable the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation to demonstrate that they have discharged their governance responsibilities by commissioning an independent assurance report in connection with the application of the specific rules (i) – (xvi) of the Methodology, without assuming or accepting any responsibility or liability to any third parties on our part. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation for our work or this report save where terms are expressly agreed and with our prior consent in writing.

Respective responsibilities of the Varkey Foundation and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

The Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation are responsible for establishing an appropriate Methodology and specific rules (available on the Global Teacher Prize website at <http://www.globalteacherprize.org/methodology>) for conducting the 2016 Global Teacher Prize.

It is our responsibility to examine the application of the specific rules (i) – (xvi), to form an independent conclusion based on our work, and to report that conclusion to the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation.

Our approach

Our examination was conducted in accordance with ISAE 3000 *Assurance Engagements other than Audits and Reviews of Historical Financial Information* (revised) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.

We performed a limited assurance engagement, as defined in ISAE 3000 (revised). The objective of a limited assurance engagement is to enable us to state whether, on the basis of procedures, anything has come to our attention that causes us to believe that management's assertion that the 2016 Global Teacher Prize has been conducted in accordance with its Methodology is not fairly stated in all material respects.

We performed the following procedures:

- Examining the Methodology and specific rules (i) – (xvi) and assessing any key assumptions and limitations
- Obtaining an understanding of the third party voting system and controls
- Assessment of adherence to specific rules (i) – (xvi), through testing of controls and substantive testing.
- Confirming accurate reporting of Top 50 and Top 10 candidates, and the announcement of the correct winner, as voted for by the Academy; and
- Enquiries of relevant management.

Inherent limitations

Our assurance procedures are limited to assessing the application of specific rules (i) – (xvi) and are subject to this inherent limitation:

- The evaluators, Prize Committee and are responsible for their judgments and voting for the 2016 Global Teacher Prize. Our responsibility is to assess the assertion by the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation that management has followed specific rules (i) – (xvi), not to comment on the appropriateness of the resulting Top 50, Top 10 or the winner.

Conclusion

Based on the results of our work, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that the assertion of the Chief Executive and trustees of the Varkey Foundation that it has applied specific rules (i) – (xvi) in conducting the 2016 Global Teacher Prize is not fairly stated in all material respects.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Chartered Accountants
London, UK
28 April 2016