Status of Instruction Study

Phase 2

UZBEKISTAN EDUCATION for<br>EXCELLENCE PROGRAM



MISSISSIPPI STATE
UNIVERSITY.

# Uzbekistan Education for Excellence Program 

Status of Instruction Study: Phase 2, Fiscal Year 2022-Year 3 Cooperative Agreement No. 72011519CA00004

## Submitted to:

Lisa Lahalih
Agreement Officer's Representative
USAID/Central Asia/Uzbekistan
3 Moyqorghon Street
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 70093
Tel.: (99871) 1402486
Fax: (99871) 1206309
lilahali@usaid.gov

## Submitted by:

RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Rd
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Dr. Carmen Strigel
Project Manager
cstrigel@rti.org

July 13, 2022
This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by RTI International. The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

RTI International is a registered trademark and trade name of Research Triangle Institute.

## CONTENTS

Section I: Background ..... 1
Section II: Methodology ..... 2
Section III: Respondent Characteristics ..... 4
3.1 Distribution of Respondents ..... 4
3.2 School Directors: Experience in Current Role and Current Teaching Responsibilities ..... 6
3.2.1 School Directors' Experience Serving as a School Director ..... 6
3.2.2 School Directors' Teaching Roles During the 2020/2021 School Year ..... 7
3.3 Methodologists: Experience in Current Role and Past Teaching Experience ..... 10
3.3.1 Methodologists' Experience in Their Current Role. ..... 10
3.2.2 Methodologists' Past Teaching Experience ..... 11
3.4 Respondents' Access to Technology ..... 14
3.4.1 School Directors' Ownership of a Smartphone or Tablet ..... 14
3.4.2 Methodologists' Ownership of a Smartphone or Tablet ..... 15
Section IV: Findings ..... 16
4.1 Planning and Preparation ..... 16
4.1.1 Lesson Planning Time and Resources: School Directors and Methodologists Perspectives ..... 16
4.1.2 Subject Knowledge and Pedagogy ..... 19
4.1.3 Teachers' Knowledge of Students ..... 24
4.1.4 EFL Teachers' Use of Standards and Expectation-Setting ..... 27
4.1.5 Student Resources Inside and Outside School ..... 27
4.1.6 Teacher Resources Inside and Outside School ..... 30
4.1.7 Other Materials and Facilities in Schools to Support Teaching and Learning ..... 34
4.1.8 ICT Formative Assessments ..... 35
4.2 The Classroom Environment ..... 36
4.2.1 Fostering an Environment of Respect and Rapport ..... 36
4.2.2 Motivating Students and Creating a Positive Culture for Learning ..... 36
4.2.3 Managing Student Behaviors ..... 37
4.2.4 Expectations for Learning and Achievement ..... 37
4.2.5 Supporting Struggling Students ..... 40
4.2.6. Classroom Spaces: Furniture, Organization for Active Learning, and Accessibility for Studentswith Disabilities43
4.3 Instructional Practices ..... 44
4.3.1 Strategies Used by EFL Teachers ..... 44
4.3.2 Student Participation and Engagement in English Classes ..... 45
4.3.3 EFL Assessments ..... 49
4.3.4 Student Participation and Engagement in ULA Classes ..... 54
4.3.5 Student Participation and Engagement in Mathematics Classes ..... 55
4.3.6 Student Participation and Engagement in ICT Classes ..... 57
4.3.7 Use of Internet-Based Instructional Programs in ICT Classes ..... 59
4.3.8 Strategies ICT Teachers Use to Introduce New Concepts in Lessons ..... 59
4.4 Professional Tasks of Teachers ..... 60
4.4.1 Teaching and Non-Teaching Responsibilities of EFL Teachers ..... 60
4.4.2 Teaching Responsibilities of ICT Teachers ..... 60
4.4.3 EFL Teachers' Reflection on Teaching ..... 61
4.4.4 Practices of EFL Teachers in Managing and Sharing Students' Progress with Families ..... 62
4.4.5 EFL Teacher Collaboration and Participation in School Projects ..... 62
Section V: Discussion, conclusions, and recommendations ..... 64
5.1 Lesson Planning and Preparation ..... 64
5.1.1 Lesson Planning Time and Resources ..... 64
5.1.2 Subject Knowledge and Pedagogy ..... 64
5.1.3 Teachers' Knowledge of Students ..... 65
5.1.4 Setting and Communicating Instructional Outcomes and Activities in EFL Classes ..... 65
5.1.5 Student Access to Computers, Mobile Devices and Internet Inside and Outside School ..... 65
5.1.6 Teacher Resources in Schools ..... 66
5.1.7 Components of Formative Assessments and Teachers' Views on Assessment ..... 66
5.2 The Classroom Environment ..... 67
5.2.1 Motivating Students and Nurturing an Environment of Respect and Rapport ..... 67
5.2.2 Expectations for Learning and Achievement ..... 67
5.2.3 Supporting Struggling Students ..... 68
5.3 Instructional Practices ..... 68
5.3.1 Lesson Time Spent on Group Work ..... 68
5.3.2 Lesson Time Spent on Student Independent Work ..... 68
5.3.3 Lesson Time Spent on Lecturing or Whole Class Instruction ..... 69
5.3.4 Typical Lesson Activities ..... 69
5.3.5 EFL Teachers' Techniques to Engage Students in Discussions ..... 69
5.3.6 EFL Teachers' Assessment Practices ..... 69
5.4 Teacher Professional Responsibilities ..... 71
5.4.1 EFL and ICT Teachers with Additional Responsibilities ..... 71
5.4.2 EFL Teachers' Reflective practices and Participation in Collaborative Activities ..... 71
5.4.3 Participation in a Professional Community ..... 71
Annexes ..... 72
Annex 1. Status of Instruction Study Phase 2 Items: Consolidated Final Items against the Framework for Teaching ..... 72

## FIGURES AND TABLES

## List of Figures

Figure 1. Grades Taught by School Directors during the 2020/2021 School Year.......................................... 9
Figure 2. Subjects Taught by School Directors during the 2020/2021 School Year........................................ 9
Figure 3. Methodologists' Subjects of Practice ............................................................................................. 11
Figure 4. Grades Methodologists Taught Before Their Current Role ............................................................ 13
Figure 5. Subjects Methodologists Taught before Being Appointed to Their Current Role ............................ 13
Figure 6. Average Time Teachers Spend Planning One Lesson .................................................................. 16
Figure 7. Teacher Utilization of a Common Lesson Planning Template ....................................................... 17
Figure 8. Teachers' Resources for Planning Lessons................................................................................... 17
Figure 9. Teachers' Use of Methodological Guides, by Subject..................................................................... 18
Figure 10. Teachers' Use of Methodological Guides ..................................................................................... 18
Figure 11. Desired Resources to Support Lesson Planning .......................................................................... 19
Figure 12. EFL and ICT Teachers' Subject Knowledge, Teaching Ability, and English Knowledge ............... 20
Figure 13. EFL Teachers' Methods to Ensure Students' Learning................................................................. 21
Figure 14. Mathematics Teachers' Views on Instructional Practices ............................................................. 23
Figure 15. ICT Teachers' Views on Instructional Practices........................................................................... 24
Figure 16. Teachers' Opinions about Natural Skill vs. Learning Effort ........................................................... 25
Figure 17. Teacher Responses about Social, Cultural, and Political Factors Influencing Learning English... 26
Figure 18. EFL Teachers' Knowledge of Students with Learning Disabilities ................................................ 26
Figure 19. Teachers' Methods to Gather and Use Information about Student Language Abilities ................. 27
Figure 20. Frequency of EFL Teachers Sharing Lesson Plans with Students.........................................................................................................................................
Standards ..........
Figure 21. Student Access to Computers and Mobile Devices, Reported by EFL Teachers ......................... 28
Figure 22. Students with Devices with Reliable Internet, Reported by EFL Teachers ................................... 29
Figure 23. Students with Computers and Reliable Internet outside of School, Reported by ICT Teachers ... 29
Figure 24. Functional Student Computers in School Computer Labs, Reported by ICT Teacher .................. 30
Figure 25. Functional Student Computers in School Computer Labs, Reported by School Directors............ 30
Figure 26. Functional Laptops in Schools for Teachers' Use ......................................................................... 31
Figure 27. EFL Teachers' Access to Reliable Internet ................................................................................... 31
Figure 28. EFL Teachers' Access to and Use of Visual or Audio Resources................................................. 32
Figure 29. EFL Teachers' Other Resources................................................................................................... 32
Figure 30. EFL Resources' Origins and Alignment to Outcomes ................................................................... 33
Figure 31. Mathematics Teachers' Views on Using Manipulatives for Mathematics ...................................... 33
Figure 32. Materials Available for Lessons When Needed ............................................................................. 34
Figure 33. Elements of ICT End-of-Course Assessments.............................................................................. 35
Figure 34. Teacher Actions to Promote Respectful Student Interactions ....................................................... 36
Figure 35. Teacher Actions to Motivate Students and Establish a Culture of Learning.................................. 37
Figure 36. Student Behavior Management Strategies ................................................................................... 37
Figure 37. ULA Teachers' Expectations of Student Ability Entering Grade 1................................................. 38
Figure 38. Grade at Which ULA Teachers Expect Students to Read Fluently and Comprehend................... 38
Figure 39. Mathematics Teachers' Expectations for Students' Knowledge upon Entering Grade 1............... 39
Figure 40. Grade at Which Mathematics Teachers Predict Students Will Know Basic Multiplication............. 39
Figure 41. ICT Teachers' Computer Knowledge Expectations for Students Starting Grade 5 ....................... 40
Figure 42. Grade at Which ICT Teachers Predict Students Will Know Keyboarding ..................................... 40
Figure 43. EFL Teachers' Support of Students Who Fail English Assignments............................................. 41
Figure 44. EFL Teachers' Support Methods for Students Who Fall Behind ................................................... 41
Figure 45. ULA Teachers' Strategies to Support Students Who Cannot Read a Word Correctly ..... 42
Figure 46. Mathematics Teachers' Strategies to Support Students Who Cannot Solve a Problem ..... 42
Figure 47. Strategies Used by ICT Teachers to Support Struggling Students ..... 43
Figure 48. Classroom Accessibility, Arrangement, and Organization ..... 44
Figure 49. EFL Teachers' Explanatory Approaches ..... 44
Figure 50. Time Spent on Pair or Group Work in English Lessons, by Grade ..... 45
Figure 51. EFL Teacher Opinions about Group Work ..... 46
Figure 52. English Class Time for Lectures vs. Independent Student Work ..... 46
Figure 53. EFL Teacher Techniques to Foster Discussion ..... 47
Figure 54. Questioning Techniques Used by EFL Teachers ..... 47
Figure 55. EFL Teachers' Approaches for Scaffolding Dialogic Reading ..... 48
Figure 56. Activities in a Typical English Lesson ..... 49
Figure 57. EFL Assessment Practices during Class ..... 50
Figure 58. EFL Lesson Assessment Techniques ..... 51
Figure 59. EFL Teacher Adjustments in Response to Formative Assessment Results ..... 52
Figure 60. Elements of English End-of-Course Assessments ..... 52
Figure 61. Sources for EFL Assessments ..... 53
Figure 62. Teachers' Opinions on English Assessments ..... 53
Figure 63. Time Spent on Pair or Group Work in ULA Lessons, in Grades 1 and 4 ..... 54
Figure 64. ULA Lesson Time Spent on Explaining Language Concepts ..... 54
Figure 65. Activities in a Typical ULA Lesson ..... 55
Figure 66. Time for Independent Student Work in Mathematics Classes, Grades 1 and 4 ..... 56
Figure 67. Time for Explaining Concepts or Student Group Work in Mathematics Lessons ..... 56
Figure 68. Activities in a Typical Mathematics Lesson ..... 57
Figure 69. ICT Lesson Time for Independent Student Work, Grades 5 and 9 ..... 57
Figure 70. Time Spent in ICT Lessons on Whole Class Instruction or Group Work ..... 58
Figure 71. Activities in a Typical ICT Lesson ..... 58
Figure 72. Internet-Based Instructional Programs for ICT ..... 59
Figure 73. ICT Teachers' Typical Presentation Methods for New Concepts ..... 59
Figure 74. EFL Teachers' Other Taught Subjects and Time Spent Teaching English ..... 60
Figure 75. Percentage of EFL Teachers with Other Professional School Responsibilities ..... 60
Figure 76. Percentage of ICT Teachers Who Teach Other Subjects ..... 61
Figure 77. EFL Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices ..... 61
Figure 78. EFL Teachers' Actions to Manage and Communicate Student Progress ..... 62
Figure 79. EFL Teachers' Participation in Collaborative Events ..... 63
List of Tables
Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Region and Category ..... 5
Table 2. Distribution of Respondent by Category and Gender ..... 6
Table 3. School Director Respondents' Years of Experience by Region ..... 6
Table 4. School Director Respondents Who Reported Having Teaching Duties during the 2020/2021 School Year ..... 8
Table 5. Methodologists Respondents' Years of Experience by Region ..... 10
Table 6. Methodologist Respondents with Prior Teaching Experience by Region ..... 12
Table 7. School Director Respondents Who Reported Owning a Smartphone or Tablet by Region ..... 14
Table 8. Methodologist Respondents Who Reported Owning a Smartphone or Tablet by Region ..... 15
Table 9. ULA Teachers' Preferences for Instructional Practices ..... 22
Table 10. Other Resources and Facilities Available in Schools ..... 34
Table A-1. Survey Items ..... 72

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

COVID-19
EFL
FFT
ICT
MoPE
SIS
ULA
USAID
coronavirus disease 2019
English as a Foreign Language
Framework for Teaching
Information and Communication Technology
Ministry of Public Education
Status of Instruction Study
Uzbek Language Arts
United States Agency for International Development

## SECTION I: BACKGROUND

The Uzbekistan Education for Excellence Program (the Program), funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), aims to support the Government of Uzbekistan's vision for high quality education. The curricular focus of the Program is on Uzbek Language Arts (ULA), Mathematics, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in public primary and secondary schools of the country.
The Program is implemented as a partnership between USAID, the Uzbekistan Ministry of Public Education (MoPE), and a consortium of implementing partners lead by RTI International with Florida State University and Mississippi State University. The Program provides the expertise and experience needed to help the MoPE to achieve and sustain three overarching results:

1. Improved ULA and Mathematics outcomes in grades 1-4
2. Enhanced ICT instruction for grades 1-11
3. Improved EFL instruction in grades 1-11

The Program will pilot foundational education teaching and learning materials and teacher professional development in up to 1,000 target schools in Namangan and Sirdaryo Regions.
The Status of Instruction Study (SIS) aims to shed light on teachers' knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, skills, and behaviors, as well as the available resources at the school level and for the targeted subjects, and how these resources are used. The SIS was designed to inform the customization and development of student textbooks, teacher guides, and teacher professional development approaches.

This report presents the SIS methodology and findings from online surveys with over 4000 teachers, 183 school directors and 131 methodologists from all regions of Uzbekistan, including the Republic of Karakalpakstan and Tashkent City.

## SECTION II: METHODOLOGY

The overall methodology for SIS phase 2 (SIS2) is the same as that for the SIS phase 1 and can be found in detail in the methodology section of the SIS phase 1 report ${ }^{1}$. Some of that section (found on pages $2-4$ ), such as the general study design, purpose, research questions, and the conceptual framework used for this study, is repeated below.
In SIS2 the Program applied a descriptive quantitative design, taking into account the contextual realities resulting from coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). The following research questions were used to guide the final study design:

1. What resources do teachers use, and how much time do they invest in lesson planning?
2. What resources are available at the school and in the classroom to support instruction in the subject areas under study?
3. What instructional techniques are commonly used by Uzbek teachers for questioning, student engagement, student grouping, and student formative assessment and performance feedback?
4. Do teachers engage in school-based community of practice activities?
5. What opportunities and support are currently available to teachers to enhance their content knowledge and pedagogical skills?

RTI's previously conducted a situation analysis for English language instruction in Ethiopia, ${ }^{2}$ a study on teacher guides, ${ }^{3}$ and a School Snapshot focused on management effectiveness ${ }^{4}$. This work provided context for designing this study. The Program also adapted the Framework for Teaching (FFT), developed then revised by The Danielson Group in 2021:5

The FFT is an evolving instructional resource that provides a roadmap for effective teaching. It outlines 22 components and 76 elements organized into Four Domains of Teaching Responsibility [Planning \& Preparation, Learning Environments, Learning Experiences, and Principled Teaching]. Over time, the FFT has evolved to reflect new learning in the field and meet the needs of today's classrooms and students.
This framework provided useful domains and components to organize the SIS and allow for harmonization of relevant items across the four targeted subjects. The SIS was designed in the online survey system Voxco, and the link to the survey was shared with teachers, school directors, and methodologists through MoPE Telegram channels. Respondents filled out the

[^0]survey from May through October 2021. Data were exported from Voxco and analyzed in Stata by RTI home office statisticians.

The survey focused on four subjects: Language Arts, Mathematics, ICT, and EFL. In the 2021/2022 school year, for grades 1-4, mother tongue (grammar) and literature (reading) subjects were combined to create a single Language Arts subject. The survey came before this change and therefore Language Arts in this report refers to both grammar and literature subjects. Although there are various languages used in Uzbekistan's public schools, this report uses Uzbek Language Arts to refer to Language Arts. ${ }^{6}$ Mathematics begins in grade 1 and is separated into Algebra and Geometry in grade 7. ICT is taught starting in grade 5. EFL is taught in $95.5 \%$ of public schools and, where offered, begins in grade $1 .{ }^{7}$

[^1]
## SECTION III: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

### 3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

A total of 4,477 respondents completed the survey, as shown broken down by region and category in Table 1. Andijan Region had the highest number of respondents (965), representing $22 \%$ of the total sample. The regions with the least number of respondents were Qashqadaryo (147, 3\%) and Navoiy (146, 3\%). Sample distribution by respondent categories indicates that Uzbek Language Arts and Mathematics (ULA/Math) teachers were the largest group ( 2,578 respondents), followed by EFL teachers $(1,028)$ and ICT teachers (557). Methodologists were the smallest category, with only 131 respondents. Andijan Region had the largest proportion of respondents in the categories of ULA/Math teachers (22\%), EFL teachers (21\%), ICT teachers (21\%), and school directors (29\%), while Surxondaryo had the greatest percentage of methodologists (17\%). There were no respondents from Navoiy Region in the category of school directors, and Fergana and Xorazm had one each.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Region and Category

| Region | Overall Sample |  | Respondent Category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ULA/Math Teachers |  | EFL Teachers |  | ICT Teachers |  | School Directors |  | Methodologists |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Andijan | 965 | 22 | 575 | 22 | 211 | 21 | 115 | 21 | 53 | 29 | 11 | 8 |
| Bukhara | 475 | 11 | 194 | 8 | 166 | 16 | 98 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 12 |
| Fergana | 169 | 4 | 90 | 4 | 55 | 5 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Jizzakh | 157 | 4 | 99 | 4 | 26 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Namangan | 233 | 5 | 109 | 4 | 49 | 5 | 36 | 7 | 32 | 18 | 7 | 5 |
| Navoiy | 146 | 3 | 95 | 4 | 28 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Qashqadaryo | 147 | 3 | 70 | 3 | 32 | 3 | 29 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Samarqand | 286 | 6 | 212 | 8 | 47 | 5 | 17 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| Sirdaryo | 160 | 4 | 97 | 4 | 36 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 |
| Surxondaryo | 331 | 7 | 220 | 9 | 29 | 3 | 49 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 22 | 17 |
| Tashkent | 244 | 6 | 172 | 7 | 44 | 4 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Xorazm | 319 | 7 | 165 | 6 | 96 | 9 | 38 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 15 |
| Karakalpakstan | 561 | 13 | 367 | 14 | 100 | 10 | 49 | 9 | 30 | 16 | 15 | 12 |
| Tashkent City | 284 | 6 | 113 | 4 | 109 | 11 | 39 | 7 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 4477 | 100* | 2578 | 100 | 1028 | 100 | 557 | 100 | 183 | 100 | 131 | 100 |

Note: * Percentages may not total to $100 \%$ because of rounding.

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents by category and gender. Overall, there were more women respondents in the sample than men ( $84 \%$ vs. $16 \%$ ). However, findings by respondent categories demonstrate relatively high national levels of gender equity among school directors, methodologists, and ICT teachers. In contrast, across Uzbekistan, 94\% of ULA/Math teachers and $83 \%$ of EFL teachers are women.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondent by Category and Gender

| Respondent Category | Overall Total <br> Respondents | Percentage of <br> Women <br> Respondents | Percentage of Men <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School directors | 183 | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| Methodologists | 131 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| ULA/Math teachers in grades <br> $1-4$ | 2,578 | $94 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| ICT teachers in grades 5-11 | 557 | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| EFL teachers in grades $1-11$ | 1,028 | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{4 , 4 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ |

### 3.2 SCHOOL DIRECTORS: EXPERIENCE IN CURRENT ROLE AND CURRENT TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

### 3.2.1 School Directors' Experience Serving as a School Director

The distribution of school director respondents by their years of experience is shown in Table 3. Across regions, $50 \%$ of the school directors who responded had $1-5$ years of experience in that position; this was also true for $100 \%$ of school directors from Bukhara, Ferghana, and Xorazm Regions. Over a third (37\%) of school director respondents reported having either 6-10 or 11-15 years of experience. A small percentage of school directors (2\%) started serving in this role in 2021. There were no responses from Navoiy Region because there were no respondents in this category from this region.

Table 3. School Director Respondents' Years of Experience by Region

| Regions | Years of Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 - 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 +}$ | Total School <br> Director <br> Respondents |
| Andijan | $0 \% *$ | $57 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 53 |
| Bukhara | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 2 |
| Fergana | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 1 |
| Jizzakh | $0 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 9 |
| Namangan | $6 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | 32 |
| Navoiy | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| Qashqadaryo | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 9 |
| Region | $0 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 4 |
| Samarqand | $0 \%$ |  |  | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 6 |
| Sirdaryo | $17 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. School Director Respondents' Years of Experience by Region

| Regions | Years of Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total School Director Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-20 | 21-25 | 26+ |  |
| Surxondaryo Region | 0\% | 36\% | 27\% | 27\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 11 |
| Tashkent | 0\% | 78\% | 11\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 11\% | 9 |
| Xorazm | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1 |
| Karakalpakstan | 0\% | 33\% | 37\% | 20\% | 7\% | 3\% | 0\% | 30 |
| Tashkent City | 0\% | 31\% | 19\% | 25\% | 19\% | 6\% | 0\% | 16 |
| TOTAL | $\begin{gathered} 2 \% \\ (n=3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ (n=91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \% \\ & (\mathrm{n}=38) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \% \\ (n=29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (n=15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (n=5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ (n=2) \end{gathered}$ | 183 |

Note: * Percentages may not total to 100\% because of rounding. Data included in Teacher Support System Study (RTI, 2022)

### 3.2.2 School Directors' Teaching Roles During the 2020/2021 School Year

Table 4 shows that, in addition to serving as school director, $44 \%$ of school directors also have teaching responsibilities. Surxondaryo, Samarqand, and Jizzakh Regions have the highest proportions of school directors who indicated that they taught a class during the 2020/2021 school year: 82\%, $75 \%$, and $67 \%$ respectively. All school director respondents in Bukhara, Fergana, and Xorazm Regions reported not teaching a class. There were no respondents in this category from Navoiy Region.

Table 4. School Director Respondents Who Reported Having Duties during the 2020/2021 School Year

| Region | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{c}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \frac{c}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{N} \\ & \stackrel{y}{N} \\ & N \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \\ & \overline{0} \\ & \text { त } \\ & \text { Z } \end{aligned}$ | Qashqadaryo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 픙 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total number of school directors | 53 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 30 | 16 | 183 |
| Number of school directors who taught a class in 2020/201 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 81 |
| Percentage of school directors who taught a class in 2020/201 | 51\% | 0\% | 0\% | 67\% | 34\% | 0 | 56\% | 75\% | 33\% | 82\% | 33\% | 0\% | 40\% | 19\% | 44\% |

Figure 1 shows that most school director respondents (32\%-36\%) who said they taught a class during the 2020/2021 school year taught grades 5-9. Few school directors (not more than $12 \%$ per grade) reported teaching grades 1-4.

Figure 1. Grades Taught by School Directors during the 2020/2021 School Year


The subjects taught by school directors during the 2020/2021 school year are presented in Figure 2. A majority of them ( $81 \%$ ) said they taught subjects other than ULA, Mathematics, ICT, and EFL. Because the majority of school director respondents reported teaching grades $5-9$, the branching of subjects from grade 5 onward could have resulted in the many school directors indicating they teach "other subjects" not included in the response options.

Figure 2. Subjects Taught by School Directors during the 2020/2021 School Year


Note: Graphs within this report using percentages may not have percentages total to $100 \%$ because of rounding.

### 3.3 METHODOLOGISTS: EXPERIENCE IN CURRENT ROLE AND PAST TEACHING EXPERIENCE

### 3.3.1 Methodologists' Experience in Their Current Role

Table 5 displays the distribution of methodologist respondents by their years of experience. Across regions, $70 \%$ of the methodologist respondents had $1-5$ years, $23 \%$ had $6-10$ years, and $4 \%$ had $11-15$ years of experience in their current role. Only $1 \%$ of methodologists started serving in this role in 2021. All respondents from Namangan, Navoiy, and Qashqadaryo Regions and Tashkent City reported having 1-5 years of experience as a methodologist, whereas all respondents from Fergana Region had 6-10 years of experience.

Table 5. Methodologists Respondents' Years of Experience by Region

| Regions | Years |  |  |  |  |  | Total Methodologist Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 to 5 | 6 to 10 | 11 to 15 | 16 to 20 | 26+ |  |
| Andijan | 9\% | 82\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 11 |
| Bukhara | 0\% | 53\% | 40\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15 |
| Fergana | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2 |
| Jizzakh | 0\% | 83\% | 17\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6 |
| Namangan | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7 |
| Navoiy | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3 |
| Qashqadaryo | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7 |
| Samarqand | 0\% | 67\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6 |
| Sirdaryo | 0\% | 71\% | 29\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7 |
| Surxondaryo | 0\% | 64\% | 18\% | 5\% | 0\% | 13\% | 22 |
| Tashkent | 0\% | 75\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4 |
| Xorazm | 0\% | 58\% | 26\% | 11\% | 5\% | 0\% | 19 |
| Karakalpakstan | 0\% | 53\% | 40\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15 |
| Tashkent City | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7 |
| TOTAL | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ (n=1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (\mathrm{n}=91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \% \\ (n=30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & (n=5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & (n=1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (n=3) \end{aligned}$ | 131 |

When asked the subject for which they are a methodologist, $50 \%$ of the respondents said they are a methodologist for "other" disciplines (Figure 3). Only 10\% of methodologist respondents are methodologists for ULA and Mathematics, $20 \%$ for ICT, and $21 \%$ for English.

Figure 3. Methodologists' Subjects of Practice


### 3.2.2 Methodologists' Past Teaching Experience

Table 6 presents the percentage of methodologist respondents who stated that they worked as teachers before being appointed to their current role. All methodologists from the following regions indicated that they had teaching experience: Bukhara, Jizzakh, Namangan, Qashqadaryo, Sirdaryo, and Tashkent Regions and Tashkent City. These regions correspond to those where most methodologists reported having 1-5 years of experience, except Bukhara Region, where slightly more than half of methodologist respondents (53\%) reported having this level of experience. Fifty percent of methodologist respondents from Fergana, 64\% from Andijan, and 67\% from Navoiy Regions reported having prior teaching experience.

Table 6. Methodologist Respondents with Prior Teaching Experience by Region

| Region |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{c}{\frac{2}{N}} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त } \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { त } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & \text { Niv } \\ & \text { X } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{I}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total number of methodologists | 11 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 7 | 131 |
| Number of methodologists with prior teaching experience | 7 | 15 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 4 | 17 | 14 | 7 | 119 |
| Percentage of methodologists with prior teaching experience | 64\% | 100\% | 50\% | 100\% | 100\% | 67\% | 100\% | 83\% | 100\% | 91\% | 100\% | 90\% | 93\% | 100\% | 91\% |

Findings in Figure 4 indicate that the most common grades for methodologist respondents to teach when they were teachers were grades 5-9 ( $31 \%$ or $34 \%$ for each grade). Few methodologist respondents taught in grades 1-4. These results are similar to findings from the school directors (see Figure 1).

Figure 4. Grades Methodologists Taught Before Their Current Role


Subjects that methodologist respondents taught before becoming methodologists are highlighted in Figure 5. Most of the methodologist respondents ( $56 \%$ ) said they taught "other" subjects, while a small number reported that they taught ULA/Math (11\%), ICT (14\%), and English (20\%). These findings indicate that the subjects that methodologists taught while serving as teachers correspond with subjects they now practice as methodologists (see Figure 3). This is true for all subjects beside ICT (14\% taught and 20\% practice): $11 \%$ taught and $10 \%$ practice ULA/Math; 21\% taught and 20\% practice English; and $56 \%$ taught and $50 \%$ practice other subjects.

Figure 5. Subjects Methodologists Taught before Being Appointed to Their Current Role


### 3.4 RESPONDENTS' ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY

### 3.4.1 School Directors' Ownership of a Smartphone or Tablet

Table 7 presents the distribution of school director respondents who reported owning a smartphone or tablet by region. All respondents from the following five regions indicated that they own a smartphone or tablet: Bukhara, Fergana, Samarqand, Sirdaryo, Tashkent, and Xorazm, Regions. Respondents from Karakalpakstan were least likely to own such a device, with $77 \%$ reporting that they did. These findings suggest that access to technology among school director respondents is high across the country.

Table 7. School Director Respondents Who Reported Owning a Smartphone or Tablet by Region

| Region |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{N} \\ & \stackrel{y}{N} \\ & N \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त̄ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { त̃ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\bar{J}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\mathbf{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{r} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Ï }} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total number of school directors | 53 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 30 | 16 | 183 |
| Number of school directors with smart phones or tablets | 51 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 23 | 15 | 167 |
| Percent of school directors with smart phones or tablets | 96\% | 100\% | 100\% | 89\% | 91\% | 0 | 89\% | 100\% | 100\% | 91\% | 100\% | 100\% | 77\% | 94\% | 91\% |

### 3.4.2 Methodologists' Ownership of a Smartphone or Tablet

The distribution by region of methodologist respondents who own a smartphone or tablet is shown in Table 8. Findings indicate that access to mobile technology is high among methodologist respondents across all regions except Ferghana Region. All methodologist respondents indicated that they own a smartphone or tablet in Navoiy, Samarqand, and Tashkent Regions and the Republic of Karakalpakstan. In contrast, only $50 \%$ of the methodologist respondents (one of two) in Fergana Region said that they have a smartphone or tablet.

Table 8. Methodologist Respondents Who Reported Owning a Smartphone or Tablet by Region

| Region |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{ᄃ}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 증 } \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { त } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{I}} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total number of Methodologists | 11 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 7 | 131 |
| Number of Methodologists with smart phones or tablets | 9 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 16 | 15 | 6 | 112 |
| Percent of Methodologists with smart phones or tablets | 82\% | 87\% | 50\% | 67\% | 71\% | 100\% | 86\% | 100\% | 86\% | 82\% | 100\% | 84\% | 100\% | 86\% | 86\% |

## SECTION IV: FINDINGS

### 4.1 PLANNING AND PREPARATION

### 4.1.1 Lesson Planning Time and Resources: School Directors and Methodologists Perspectives

In Uzbekistan, lesson planning was compulsory for teachers until the 2020/2021 school year. Schools designed their own templates, and methodologists checked plans as part of monitoring.

Figure 6 shows the views school directors and methodologists held about the amount of time teachers spend planning one lesson. The most frequently mentioned time was less than an hour ( $43 \%$ of school directors and $45 \%$ methodologists), followed by 1-2 hours (29\%, $27 \%$ ). Fifteen percent of school directors and $16 \%$ of methodologists report that teachers were not currently planning their lessons, whereas $2 \%$ of school directors (and no methodolists) said that teachers never planned their lessons.

Figure 6. Average Time Teachers Spend Planning One Lesson


Regarding use of a common template for lesson planning, $69 \%$ of school directors and methodologists reported that teachers use the required lesson planning form provided by the school or the MoPE (Figure 7). However, some school directors ( $26 \%$ ) and methodologists (24\%) said that teachers did not have a lesson planning template and therefore planned lessons in a free mode or made detailed notes for each lesson.

Figure 7. Teacher Utilization of a Common Lesson Planning Template


As shown in Figure 8, the most commonly used resources by teachers to plan their lessons were student textbooks ( $80 \%$ of school directors, $86 \%$ of methodologists), followed by methodological guides and internet resources (both reported by over $70 \%$ of school directors respondents and by $68 \%$ of methodologists). Least popular were lesson resources from other teachers within the respective schools (18\% and 11\%).

Figure 8. Teachers' Resources for Planning Lessons


Most school director respondents (over 60\%) reported that their teachers used a methodological guide or a teacher guide for the respective subjects they teach (Figure 9). In Uzbekistan, a methodological guide is a collection of general teaching approaches recommended for a subject-not a teaching guide, which would detail the steps of a lesson. The study did not differentiate between the two guides. Methodological guides are common whereas teachers guides are not. In comparison, methodologist respondents mostly reported that teachers in their region or district did not use either a methodological guide or a teacher guide for any of the subjects they teach. The variation between school directors and
methodologists' responses could be a result of methodologists not having detailed information about their schools.

Figure 9. Teachers' Use of Methodological Guides, by Subject


Figure 10 shows how teachers used methodological guides. Most school directors (69\%) and methodologists (63\%) said that teachers used methodological guides to plan lesson activities and as a source of general reference. Fewer teachers used methodological guides for their professional development.

Figure 10. Teachers' Use of Methodological Guides


School directors and methodologists were asked which resources they would like their teachers to have to help them plan their lessons. As shown in Figure 11, the most frequently requested resources were online resources, pre-made lesson plans, and guidance on how to teach key topics (e.g., fractions, comprehension skills). The only resources not desired by the majority of respondents were lessons and resources from other teachers.

Figure 11. Desired Resources to Support Lesson Planning


### 4.1.2 Subject Knowledge and Pedagogy

EFL and ICT teachers were asked about their subject knowledge, teaching ability, and English proficiency (Figure 12). Overall, EFL teacher respondents reported higher competency levels than their ICT counterparts. The greatest proportion of EFL teacher respondents ( $52 \%-57 \%$ ) said that they had high subject knowledge, teaching capability, and knowledge of English, whereas most ICT teacher respondents (57\%-63\%) reported having medium knowledge in those three areas. Nearly a third (31\%) of ICT teacher respondents indicated that their English ability is shallow and 8\% said that they did not know English. This is concerning because ICT terms are often based in English, so ICT teachers who do not know English have a limited basic and ongoing vocabulary of ICT, which will limit their subject knowledge and teaching ability. Another reason that teachers who are more in fluent English are typically more effective at teaching ICT is because most of the materials for ICT lesson planning are taken from web-based resources, which are most often in English.

Figure 12. EFL and ICT Teachers' Subject Knowledge, Teaching Ability, and English Knowledge


To understand how EFL teachers typically assist students in learning content, teachers were given statements related to several teaching practices and asked to indicate how often they employed each in their lessons. As seen in Figure 13, the majority of teachers used each of the teaching methods in their lessons either always or most of the time. The methods that at least $70 \%$ of teachers used always or most of the time were: audio-visual materials ( $86 \%$ ), structured work in pairs and groups to enhance active usage of English (83\%) and differentiating and using the features of social language (e.g., basic interpersonal communication skills) while teaching (72\%). The least routinely applied practices were: asking students to do written translations (50\%); focusing on teaching English through realworld assignments and problem-solving, concentrating on fluency (53\%); and differentiating and using academic language (e.g., cognitive academic language proficiency) in teaching (55\%).

Figure 13. EFL Teachers' Methods to Ensure Students' Learning


ULA teachers were given pairs of opinions related to instructional practices and asked to specify which opinion they agreed with the most in each pair (Table 9). Overall, teacher respondents exhibited varied pedagogical knowledge: in some scenarios, most of them strongly agreed with the most desirable opinion, but in others most agreed with the least desirable opinion. When teaching students reading and writing skills, the majority of ULA teacher respondents leaned towards the most desirable view, strongly agreeing that:

- Teachers must first explain the meaning of nouns (85\%), rather than letting students learn to identify nouns through reading a story.
- It is a teacher's role to teach students the skills they need to learn to read words independently and fluently ( $81 \%$ ), rather than teaching students all the words they need to know to be able to read.
- Student must learn to read and write at the same time (80\%), rather than learning to read before learning to write.
- When teaching a student how to read a new word, it is more important for the student to know the sounds of the syllables and letters in that word ( $74 \%$ ) than to see the full word many times.

Teacher respondents' views on the types of reading comprehension questions and books for students to read did not differ greatly and also leaned toward less desirable opinions.
Teachers were slightly more likely to believe that understanding questions that have more than one correct answer is better for comprehension than they were to believe that understanding questions with one correct answer is better for comprehension ( $54 \%$ vs. $46 \%$; slight majority answered desirably). Similarly, the proportion of teacher respondents who believed that students should read books according to their grade level was close to that of teacher respondents who believed that students should read books according to their skill level ( $55 \%$ vs. $45 \%$; slight majority answered less desirably). When asked about the value of assessment, most teacher respondents felt that evaluating students' reading proficiency is more important to determine student performance levels (i.e., their grades) than to determine what support students need ( $69 \%$ vs. $31 \%$; majority answered less desirably).

Table 9. ULA Teachers' Preferences for Instructional Practices

| Teaching Practices | Percentage of <br> Teachers |
| :--- | :--- |
| To teach nouns the teacher must first explain their meaning. | 85 |
| Through reading a story students learn to identify nouns. | 15 |
| My role as a teacher is to teach students all the words they need to know to become readers. | 19 |
| My role as a teacher is to teach students the skills they need so they can learn to read words <br> autonomously, and become good readers. | 81 |
| Students need to learn to read first before learning to write. | 20 |
| Students need to learn to read and write at the same time. | 80 |
| When teaching students how to read a new word, it is important that students know the <br> sounds of the syllables and letters of this word. | 74 |
| When teaching students how to read a new word, it is important that they have the <br> opportunity to see the full word many times. | 26 |
| Understanding questions that have multiple correct answers is better for comprehension. | 54 |
| Understanding questions that have one correct answer is better for comprehension. | 46 |
| Students should read books according to their grade level. | 55 |
| Students should read books according to their skill level. | 45 |
| It is more important to assess students' level of reading to determine what support they need. | 31 |
| It is more important to evaluate the reading level of students to determine their performance | 69 |

Figure 14 shows that Mathematics teacher respondents had strong subject teaching ability, because majority of them chose the most desirable opinion for two out of three sets of opinions. As seen in the figure, the number of teacher respondents who believed that it is essential to discuss a wrong answer was considerably higher than that of teachers who thought that discussing a wrong answer would confuse students ( $86 \%$ vs. $14 \%$ ). In addition, the majority of teacher respondents ( $70 \%$ ) agreed that the process of solving a problem, not of producing the correct answer (30\%), was the most important part of a Mathematics lesson. However, the number of teacher respondents who believe that students can use their previous knowledge to solve a new problem was less than teacher respondents who felt teachers must always first show primary students how to solve a problem ( $39 \%$ vs. $61 \%$ ). These results demonstrate that math teachers understand some more modern, research-
based strategies for teaching math in primary school, while continuing to hold more traditional ideas about how math has been taught in Uzbekistan.

Figure 14. Mathematics Teachers' Views on Instructional Practices


ICT teachers were also given sets of views regarding instructional practices and asked to choose which one they agreed with more (Figure 15). The majority of teacher respondents ( $60 \%$ ) felt that students should ask questions when they don't understand a concept, rather than waiting for the teacher to explain before they ask. More teacher respondents thought that it is important to discuss wrong answers ( $79 \%$ ) than teacher respondents thought that discussing wrong answers would distract students (21\%). The majority of teacher respondents ( $84 \%$ ) believed that modeling skills is an effective pedagogical technique in any grade, whereas a small number of teacher respondents (16\%) thought it was only useful in the early grades. Results further demonstrate that most teacher respondents thought that the problem-solving process, rather than the correct answer, is the most important part of an ICT lesson ( $70 \%$ vs. $30 \%$ ). However, $73 \%$ of ICT teacher respondents-even higher than the $61 \%$ of Mathematics teachers-were of the opinion that in an ICT class a student must first be shown by the teacher how to solve a given problem; only $27 \%$ of respondents believed that students can apply what they have already learned to solve new problems.

Figure 15. ICT Teachers' Views on Instructional Practices


### 4.1.3 Teachers' Knowledge of Students

Teachers were given two perspectives on how students learn and asked to choose the one with which they agreed with most. Most EFL teacher respondents (57\%) felt that "all students can be successful at learning English if they work hard." Only 43\% agreed with the contrasting viewpoint, that some children are innately better than others at learning foreign languages. Likewise, the proportion of ICT teacher respondents who felt that all children can be good at ICT if they try hard was higher (62\%) than those who thought that some children are just naturally smarter than other children at ICT (38\%).

In opposition, most Mathematics teachers (59\%) felt that some children are naturally better at Mathematics than other children. A smaller percentage of teacher respondents ( $41 \%$ ) agreed with the alternative opinion: that if they try hard, all children can be good at Mathematics. Most ULA teacher respondents (78\%) believe that the ability of students to
learn to read depends largely on their learning skills (equivalent to "trying hard") rather than how smart students are (equivalent to being "naturally better").

Figure 16. Teachers' Opinions about Natural Skill vs. Learning Effort


EFL teachers were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement "Psychological, social, cultural, and political factors shape students' English learning" (Figure 17). According to the findings, many teacher respondents (56\%) agreed and 29\% strongly agreed with this viewpoint. Only $1 \%$ of them strongly disagreed and 5\% disagreed with the assertion.

Figure 17. Teacher Responses about Social, Cultural, and Political Factors Influencing Learning English


EFL teachers were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the statement "I am able to identify students with learning disabilities." As seen in Figure 18, most teacher respondents ( $53 \%$ ) agreed, and $27 \%$ strongly agreed. A very small percentage of teacher respondents (1\%) strongly disagreed and 5\% disagreed.

Figure 18. EFL Teachers' Knowledge of Students with Learning Disabilities


The frequency with which EFL teachers implemented specific activities related to acquiring and using information about students' linguistic abilities is presented in Figure 19. A plurality of teacher respondents (49\%) stated that they offered students assignments depending on their language ability most of the time during teaching. When asked whether they consult with their colleages before the school year to learn about the abilities of their incoming English classes, the plurality of respondents ( $35 \%$ ) also said they do most of the time. Findings showed that just $1 \%$ of teacher respondents said that they never give students tasks based on their language capabilities, and just 5\% of teacher respondents never confer with other teachers to learn about their students' abilities.

Figure 19. Teachers' Methods to Gather and Use Information about Student Language Abilities


### 4.1.4 EFL Teachers' Use of Standards and Expectation-Setting

Figure $\mathbf{2 0}$ shows how frequently EFL teachers linked their lessons to educational standards and explained lesson objectives and activities to students. Most teacher respondents always $(44 \%)$ or most of the time (37\%) inform their students about what they would learn at the beginning of the lesson. Regarding lesson activities, the majority again answered either most of the time or always, although for this question, "most of the time" represented the plurality ( $40 \%$ ) and "always" came second ( $35 \%$ ). Most teacher respondents ( $52 \%$ ) said they always base their lessons on the national education standards, and $34 \%$ reported that they did this most of the time.

Figure 20. Frequency of EFL Teachers Sharing Lesson Plans with Students or Using Educational Standards


### 4.1.5 Student Resources Inside and Outside School

EFL teachers were given statements to reply to about students' access to computers and mobile devices (Figure 21). Findings indicate limited student access to computers in schools. The majority (57\%) of EFL teacher respondents said that their students never get access to a functioning computer in the language laboratory (i.e., lingo lab) or classroom.

Additionally, 59\% also said that in their English classes, students never or only sometimes have access to computers. Despite limited access to computers or mobile devices at school, students had more access at home; the majority (56\%) of EFL teacher respondents reported that their students have access to computers or mobile devices outside of school always or most of the time.

Figure 21. Student Access to Computers and Mobile Devices, Reported by EFL Teachers


Student access to computers and smart phones with reliable internet outside of school, as reported by the EFL teachers, is shown in Figure 22. Overall, 65\% of EFL teachers responded that half or three-quarters of their students had computers and reliable internet access at home or outside of school. Similarly, when asked how many of their students have smart phones with reliable internet, most teacher respondents (54\%) said a half or three quarters of their students did.

Figure 22. Students with Devices with Reliable Internet, Reported by EFL Teachers


ICT teachers were also asked the proportion of students that have computers and reliable internet access at home or elsewhere outside of school. As seen in Figure 23, ICT teacher respondents most commonly reported that half (reported by 30\%) or three-quarters (reported by $22 \%$ ) of their students had this access.

Figure 23. Students with Computers and Reliable Internet outside of School, Reported by ICT Teachers


To understand the availability of computers to aid the teaching of ICT in schools, ICT teachers were asked the number of working student computers in their school computer lab. As shown in Figure 24, half of teacher respondents reported 11-15 computers. When asked about the age of the computers in their labs, a plurality of teacher respondents said 2-5 years (29\%), and the next largest portion said 6-10 years (27\%).

Figure 24. Functional Student Computers in School Computer Labs, Reported by ICT Teacher


Similar to ICT teacher respondents, most school director respondents reported at least 11 functional computers in their computer lab for students to use (Figure 25). Only 2\% of school directors said they do not have any working computers in their school lab.

Figure 25. Functional Student Computers in School Computer Labs, Reported by School Directors


### 4.1.6 Teacher Resources Inside and Outside School

School directors were asked the number of working laptops in their school for teachers to use (Figure 26). Most of respondents ( $59 \%$ ) marked 1-5. However, the second most common answer, from $21 \%$ of school directors, was that they do not have any functioning laptops for teachers in their schools.

Figure 26. Functional Laptops in Schools for Teachers' Use


As shown in Figure 27, EFL teacher respondents' access to internet was higher at home than at school. Combined, $74 \%$ of EFL teacher respondents indicated that they have stable internet at home always or most of the time. For reliable internet at school, those two responses totaled 53\%; for reliable internet during classes, those two responses totaled only 46\%.

Figure 27. EFL Teachers' Access to Reliable Internet


Figure 28 depicts the frequency with which EFL teacher respondents accessed and used video- and audio-based resources in their classes. More teachers regularly had and used working audio resources in their classroom than they had and used video resources. More than half ( $53 \%$ ) of EFL teachers said that they frequently (always or most of the time) have working audio equipment in their classes; conversely, only $49 \%$ expressed that they often have working video equipment in their classes. More than three-quarters ( $79 \%$ ) said they frequently use audio-based resources in classes, whereas $66 \%$ of teachers frequently used video-based recsources. Of respondents, $19 \%$ never had functional video technology in their classrooms and $18 \%$ never had audio technology in their classrooms.

Figure 28. EFL Teachers' Access to and Use of Visual or Audio Resources


Additional resources EFL teacher respondents used in English lessons are shown in Figure 29. According to the findings, the most frequently used resources were photo-captured images and drawn pictures (used by $41 \%$ of teachers always, by $43 \%$ most of the time), followed by age-appropriate and linguistically convenient resources (used by $30 \%$ of teachers always, by $48 \%$ most of the time). A majority of teachers also reported that they regularly use technology resources (e.g., internet, software, computers, and associated media) to supplement English learning ( $30 \%$ always, $39 \%$ most of the time). The least used resource type was texts in English that were about topics covered in other classes (e.g., history).

Figure 29. EFL Teachers' Other Resources


Figure 30 shows where EFL teachers obtained resources and how frequently they aligned resources to instructional outcomes. The internet is the most used source of materials, with $90 \%$ of teacher respondents reporting that they always or most of the time can use it to obtain appropriate resources for their lessons. This source was followed by the district public education department, where $48 \%$ of teacher respondents said they always or most of the time got their lesson resources. The findings also show that majority of teacher respondents ( $76 \%$ ) linked the resources in their classroom to the learning outcomes of the lesson always or most of the time.

Figure 30. EFL Resources' Origins and Alignment to Outcomes


Manipulatives are teaching aids meant to be handled and seen by students to demonstrate concepts being taught; one example is colored plastic sticks. Mathematics teachers were given two perspectives about the use of manipulatives in different grades and asked to indicate the one they preferred (Figure 31). Findings show that most teacher respondents ( $66 \%$ ) believed that manipulatives should be used in Mathematics lessons in all elementary grades. A third (34\%) of teacher respondents disagreed, feeling that manipulatives are only useful in grade 1 Mathematics lessons.

Figure 31. Mathematics Teachers' Views on Using Manipulatives for Mathematics
Manipulatives (such
as plastic colored
sticks) are only
useful in Grade 1
mathematics
classes
Manipulatives (such as plastic colored sticks) should be used in all grades in primary mathematics classes


### 4.1.7 Other Materials and Facilities in Schools to Support Teaching and Learning

Figure 32 disaggregates the materials that teacher respondents can find at need for their classrooms, according to school directors. A vast majority (97\%) of school director respondents said that their teachers have access to at least one functioning computer, and $90 \%$ of them stated that their teachers have access to a projector for their lessons. About two-thirds of school director respondents reported that their teachers have access to a DVD player and a screen ( $67 \%$ ) or a functioning set of speakers ( $65 \%$ ). The least accounted for resource was a CD player, although $61 \%$ of respondents still indicated one was available when needed. Refer to Figure $\mathbf{2 8}$ to see what equipment and audio or visual resources EFL teachers specifically use.

Figure 32. Materials Available for Lessons When Needed


When asked about the availability of other relevant resources and facilities in schools (Table 10), more than $80 \%$ of school director respondents reported that they had (and students used) a library with books or a lab with functioning computers. Also common ( $70 \%$ or more) was schools' possession of English audio tapes, CDs, and DVDs, or at least one functioning printer for teachers' use. However, a notable percentage of school director respondents said that they did not have a library with books in English (43\%), nor enough paper or toner for teachers to be able to copy even two or three times a year (36\%).

Table 10. Other Resources and Facilities Available in Schools

| Resources and Facilities | Percentage of School <br> Director Respondents |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| A library with books and students are using it | 87 |  |  |
| A library with books but few students are using it | 13 |  |  |
| No library | 1 |  |  |
| A library with books in English and students are using it | 41 |  |  |
| A library with books in English but few students are using it | 16 |  |  |
| No library with books in English | 43 |  |  |
| English audio tapes, CDs, DVDs, etc., used by teachers | 70 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Uzbekistan Education for Excellence Program |  |  |  |

Table 10. Other Resources and Facilities Available in Schools

| Resources and Facilities | Percentage of School <br> Director Respondents |
| :--- | :--- |
| English audio tapes, CDs, DVDs, etc., not used by teachers | 5 |
| No English audio tapes, CDs, DVDs, etc. | 25 |
| At least one working copy machine for teachers' use | 49 |
| At least one working copy machine for school administration use | 28 |
| No working copy machine | 22 |
| Enough paper and toner for each teacher to copy once a week | 36 |
| Enough paper and toner for each teacher to copy once a month | 13 |
| Enough paper and toner for each teacher to copy once a quarter | 16 |
| Not enough paper or toner for teachers to copy even 2-3 times a year | 36 |
| At least one functioning printer for use by the teachers | 74 |
| At least one functioning printer for school administration use | 23 |
| No functioning printer | 3 |
| Reliable access to internet | 69 |
| Limited access to internet | 29 |
| No access to internet | 2 |
| A lab with functioning computers and the students are using it | 81 |
| A lab with functioning computers but few students are using it | 13 |
| No lab with functioning computers | 6 |

### 4.1.8 ICT Formative Assessments

When teachers were asked about the format of ICT end-of-course assessments (Figure 33), $80 \%$ of them said the assessments were computer-based. Only 20\% of teacher respondents reported that assessments were paper and pencil.

Figure 33. Elements of ICT End-of-Course Assessments


### 4.2 THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

### 4.2.1 Fostering an Environment of Respect and Rapport

Selected actions through which EFL teachers promoted an environment of respect among students are shown in Figure 34. Overall, findings show that most teacher respondents frequently engaged in actions to nurture respectful and empathetic relationships among students. The vast majority of teacher respondents ( $95 \%$ ) of teachers indicated that they always or most of the time set an example and taught their students how to respect each other. In addition, $88 \%$ of teacher respondents reported that they always or most of the time monitored how students in their English classes treated each other and created an environment of respect for students from diverse backgrounds.

Figure 34. Teacher Actions to Promote Respectful Student Interactions


### 4.2.2 Motivating Students and Creating a Positive Culture for Learning

Figure 35 presents teacher practices concerning student motivation and the creation of a suitable learning environment. At least $84 \%$ of teachers always or most of the time practiced each method of motivation. The activity that $93 \%$ of teachers used always or most of the time to inspire their pupils was to remind them that if they worked hard, they would achieve high levels of English proficiency and grade-level subject standards. A high number of teacher respondents ( $88 \%$ ) also stated that they always or most of the time assisted students in setting realistic yet ambitious objectives for language development and English learning.

Figure 35. Teacher Actions to Motivate Students and Establish a Culture of Learning


### 4.2.3 Managing Student Behaviors

Teachers were asked how often they used specific student behavior management strategies, and their responses are portrayed in Figure 36. The most common strategy was teachers attempting to understand the reason for student misbehavior (used always by 44\% and most of the time by $43 \%$ of teacher respondents). This method was followed by assisting students to understand what constitutes appropriate conduct through modeling and practice of good behaviors ( $38 \%$ used always and $48 \%$ used most of the time).

Figure 36. Student Behavior Management Strategies


### 4.2.4 Expectations for Learning and Achievement

Figure 37 shows ULA teachers' beliefs about what students should already know when joining grade 1. Most teacher respondents ( $56 \%$ ) felt that when entering grade 1, students must know some letters and the sounds they represent. No other option was expected by half or more of teachers. The two second most common predictions, both expected by $46 \%$ of respondents, were that students should know how to answer questions about a story, and they should know how to write some letters. Few teacher respondents expected students to know how to write short words (30\%) or write their names (33\%) at that point of schooling.

Figure 37. ULA Teachers' Expectations of Student Ability Entering Grade 1


ULA teachers were also asked during which grade they would expect a student to learn to read fluently and comprehend. As shown in Figure 38, the most frequently chosen was end of grade 1 ( $48 \%$ of teacher respondents), followed by end of grade 2 (35\%).

Figure 38. Grade at Which ULA Teachers Expect Students to Read Fluently and Comprehend


Figure 39 outlines Mathematics teacher respondents' expectations of students' Mathematics skills joining grade 1. If students learn these lessons in kindergarten, they can apply them in grade 1 to help grow their Mathematics skills. The most frequently selected skills were recognition of numbers $1-10$ ( $63 \%$ of teacher respondents), doing simple addition and subtraction (51\%), and writing numbers $1-10$ ( $50 \%$ ). Few teacher respondents ( $8 \%$ ) thought that students would know common measurement units when entering grade 1.

Figure 39. Mathematics Teachers' Expectations for Students' Knowledge upon Entering Grade 1


Teachers were also asked when they would expect a student to fluently know simple multiplication solutions that involve digits up to 10. As shown in Figure 40, a majority of teacher respondents ( $80 \%$ ) stated they expect that ability at the end of the grade 2.

Figure 40. Grade at Which Mathematics Teachers Predict Students Will Know Basic Multiplication


Figure 41 shows what computer knowledge ICT teacher respondents expected students starting grade 5 to already know. Most teacher respondents (78\%) believed that students entering grade 5 should know what a computer is and what it can be used for. Less than $5 \%$ of teacher respondents thought that students should know how to save files, open computer programs, or type on a keyboard.

Figure 41. ICT Teachers' Computer Knowledge Expectations for Students Starting Grade 5


Regarding the grade when teachers expected a student to have mastered keyboarding (Figure 42), the majority of teacher respondents (58\%) chose the end of grade 5. The respondents were split somewhat equally between expectations of earlier accomplishment ( $7 \%-13 \%$ per grade), with $38 \%$ overall believing students become proficient at keyboarding before grade 5 .

Figure 42. Grade at Which ICT Teachers Predict Students Will Know Keyboarding


### 4.2.5 Supporting Struggling Students

Figure 43 depicts various approaches used by EFL teachers to help a student who is frustrated and unable to complete an English assignment correctly. Most teacher respondents ( $54 \%$ ) indicated that they used the scaffolding technique, which involves moving a student progressively from reading simple to complex text, to assist him or her to
find the right approach or answer. The second most often reported strategy (24\%) was helping the student after school.

Figure 43. EFL Teachers' Support of Students Who Fail English Assignments


Methods that EFL teacher respondents used to support a student who comes to class chronically unprepared and falls behind are presented in Figure 44. The most frequent approaches, each selected by $38 \%$ of teacher respondents, were giving a student an assignment to keep them busy without involving them in whole class activities; and helping that student after school.

Figure 44. EFL Teachers' Support Methods for Students Who Fall Behind


Figure 45 illustrates how ULA teachers assisted a student who is cannot read a word correctly and is frustrated. Most teacher respondents ( $65 \%$ ) said that they helped the student find the right answer with clues and support. Very few teacher respondents (7\%) said that they asked other students to read with a struggling student.

Figure 45. ULA Teachers' Strategies to Support Students Who Cannot Read a Word Correctly


Figure 46 illustrates how Mathematics teachers assisted a student who cannot solve a problem and is frustrated. A plurality of teachers (48\%) stated that they helped the student after class, and $30 \%$ said they repeated the same topic with the whole class.

Figure 46. Mathematics Teachers' Strategies to Support Students Who Cannot Solve a Problem


Figure 47 depicts approaches that ICT teacher respondents used to support a student who did not know the next step and was frustrated. The most frequently picked technique was to help the student to find the correct answer with guidance and support ( $79 \%$ ). Other options had much smaller percentages of practice: $9 \%$ of respondents scheduled time to help the student after class, $6 \%$ of teachers asked another student to help, and $4 \%$ told the student to look for the solution in the textbook or notebook.

Figure 47. Strategies Used by ICT Teachers to Support Struggling Students


### 4.2.6. Classroom Spaces: Furniture, Organization for Active Learning, and Accessibility for Students with Disabilities

EFL teachers were asked if they agreed or disagreed with statements about the accessibility of their classrooms for students with disabilities and common classroom organization strategies to facilitate learning. As shown in Figure 48, the majority of teacher respondents disagreed ( $31 \%$ ) or strongly disagreed ( $28 \%$ ) that their classrooms were accessible to student with disabilities. Examples of accomodations include desks to accommodate students in wheelchairs, screen readers, voice amplifiers, and speakers for the hard of hearing. Regarding arrangement of furniture, most teacher respondents agreed (57\%) or strongly agreed ( $21 \%$ ) that they rearranged the furniture in their classrooms to suit diverse activities such as games and group work. Findings further show that most teacher respondents agreed (47\%) or strongly agreed (20\%) that their classrooms are arranged to support active learning.

Figure 48. Classroom Accessibility, Arrangement, and Organization


### 4.3 INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

### 4.3.1 Strategies Used by EFL Teachers

Figure 49 shows how frequently teacher respondents use different explanation methods during lessons. Most teacher respondents frequently (i.e., always or most of the time) used each approach. However, teacher respondents most frequently (always or most of the time) facilitated student learning by putting new English words and phrases in context when introducing them ( $81 \%$ ). Of these teachers, $29 \%$ did this always and $52 \%$ most of the time. The second most common practice was translating new English words into the student's native language, with $72 \%$ of respondents doing this frequently: $35 \%$ always and $37 \%$ most of the time. A small number of teacher respondents ( $66 \%$ ) said they frequently used native language and visual support to ensure that students understood concepts during lessons.

Figure 49. EFL Teachers' Explanatory Approaches


### 4.3.2 Student Participation and Engagement in English Classes

The time students in EFL classes spent working in small groups or pairs in grades 1, 4, 7, and 11, as reported by teachers, is presented Figure 50. A typical English lesson lasts 40 minutes. Across all four grades, the greatest proportion of respondents reported that students generally spent $51 \%-75 \%$ ( $20-30$ minutes) of the time working in small groups or pairsFigure 50. This was followed by the $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) option in grades 1,4 , and 7 (reported by about a third of teacher respondents in each). In every grade apart from grade $1,76 \%-100 \%$ was the least common response for time students spend working in small groups or pairs. In grade 1 the least common response was $25 \%$ or less. However, teacher observation findings from the Program's Teacher Guide Uptake Study (TGUS)I indicated that $75 \%$ of EFL teachers' use of student activities were either individual tasks or whole-class question and answer sessions. ${ }^{8}$ The TGUS summarizes the pilot of new ICT and EFL materials in 213 schools in Sirdaryo and Namangan districts at the beginning of the 2021/2022 school year, Phase 1, and the end of the school year, Phase II.

Figure 50. Time Spent on Pair or Group Work in English Lessons, by Grade


Teachers were offered three opinions about group work in their English lesssons and asked to rate how often each statement was true for them (Figure 51). EFL teacher respondents were generally positive about the importance of group work in English lessons. The greatest proportion of them indicated that most of the time they organized group work well and achieved the desired results (47\%); they found group work effective for learning English $(48 \%)$; and their students enjoyed working in groups (51\%).

[^2]Figure 51. EFL Teacher Opinions about Group Work


Figure 52 shows the time EFL teacher respondents spent talking and students do not, and time students worked independently in a typical English lesson, which lasts 40 minutes. The majority of teachers ( $56 \%$ ) reported that they spend $51 \%-75 \%$ of the lesson time talking. A plurality of teacher respondents ( $45 \%$ ) said $26 \%-50 \%$ of the class time was used for students to work individually. Teacher Guide Uptake Study I classroom observations found that in most observed EFL lessons (78\%), the students spent most of the lesson listening to the teacher talking. ${ }^{9}$ However, in Teacher Guide Uptake Study II, which used a further refined observation tool, only $9 \%$ of lesson time was spent by the teacher actually lecturing, and an average $75 \%$ of lesson time was comprised of individual students answering teachers' questions to the whole class. ${ }^{10}$

Figure 52. English Class Time for Lectures vs. Independent Student Work


Figure 53 shows the frequency with which EFL teacher respondents employ various approaches to ensure student engagement in discussion. Although the plurality of teacher

[^3]respondents reported that they utilized each technique most of the time, asking "thoughtprovoking questions and engaging all students in the discussion" was the most commonly used approach. Nearly a quarter of teachers (23\%) said they used this technique always, and nearly half (49\%) said they used this technique most of the time. Notably, almost a quarter (22\%) of teacher respondents never divided students according to their abilities (e.g., strong learners with strong learners) during group work.

Figure 53. EFL Teacher Techniques to Foster Discussion


Figure 54 illustrates EFL teachers' use of different questioning techniques to ensure student comprehension. The most selected method was breaking down complex questions into simpler sub-questions (used by 49\% of teacher respondents), followed by translating questions into the native language (27\%).

Figure 54. Questioning Techniques Used by EFL Teachers


Teachers were provided a variety of approaches to use with students to help them move from reading more simple to more compex text (i.e., scaffolding dialogic reading) and asked them to indicate which ones they employed in a typical English lesson. As shown in Figure 55 , the approaches most frequently chosen were "read the passage aloud once, defining
underlined vocabulary as you read; students follow along in their text" (used by 55\% of teachers); and "have students work in pairs or individually to answer the supplementary questions" (used by $50 \%$ ).

Figure 55. EFL Teachers' Approaches for Scaffolding Dialogic Reading


Figure 56 lists activities that take place during a typical English lesson. The following were the most chosen by teacher respondents: the teacher demonstrates how to read an unfamiliar word ( $75 \%$ ), teacher assigns homework ( $68 \%$ ), teacher reviews or evaluates homework ( $68 \%$ ), teacher explains grammar rules ( $67 \%$ ), and students do grammar exercises ( $66 \%$ ). Fewer than $45 \%$ of teacher respondents reported that in a typical English lesson, students did written translations (44\%), the teacher modeled how to read a text (41\%), or students wrote an idea or story (31\%).

Figure 56. Activities in a Typical English Lesson


### 4.3.3 EFL Assessments

Teacher assessment practices in EFL lessons are presented in Figure 57. The most prominent practices that teacher respondents applied always or most of the time were monitoring progress and achievement of students (83\%) and providing students with feedback about their participation ( $80 \%$ ). When asked if they progressed through the lesson as planned, $41 \%$ said that they did always or most of the time. In contrast, $69 \%$ desirably changed how they're teaching during a lesson based on student performance.

Figure 57. EFL Assessment Practices during Class


When asked which formative assessment methods they use in their lessons (Figure 58), EFL teacher respondents placed games as the most common (59\%), followed by fill-in-theblank exercise sheets ( $58 \%$ ) and sentence sequence cards ( $55 \%$ ) -placing cards with individual words or short phrases into an order that completes a sentence. Fewer than 40\% of teacher respondents reported that they used the following techniques, from most used to least: students signaling with red, yellow, and green cards (red for "don't understand," yellow for "need more instruction/unclear," and green for "good/understand"); students signaling their understanding with "stop" or "continue" cards; students signaling their understanding with a raised or lowered thumb; and students responding with 3-2-1 flashcards (they write or draw three things they learned, two things found interesting, and one question you still have); red, yellow, green cards (red is "don't understand", yellow is "need more instruction/unclear", green is "good/understand"); stop/continue signals (used by students to indicate that additional explanation is needed during the lesson; and raising or lowering the thumb (student signal).

Figure 58. EFL Lesson Assessment Techniques


Teacher adaptions in response to results of formative assessments are presented in Figure 59. According to the findings, the most frequent response of teacher respondents to formative assessment results was to schedule time after the lesson or school to provide additional instruction to students when necessary; almost a quarter (24\%) of teacher respondents strongly agreed and $62 \%$ agreed that they did so. The second most prevalent activity was altering lessons throughout the teaching process; $16 \%$ of teacher respondents strongly agreed and $63 \%$ agreed that they did so.

Figure 59. EFL Teacher Adjustments in Response to Formative Assessment Results


Figure 60 presents elements of the English end-of-course assessments. The most popular elements were writing exercises on grammar (chosen by $76 \%$ of teachers), followed by speaking on a prepared topic (55\%), and reading (40\%). "Presentation project" was the least chosen component (20\%).

Figure 60. Elements of English End-of-Course Assessments


Sources of EFL assessment exercises and the frequency with which teachers used each of them are presented in Figure 61. Findings indicate that teachers used assessment exercises from the student textbook most frequently ( $29 \%$ always and $47 \%$ most of the time). A notable proportion of teachers also reported that they used assessment exercises from the teacher guide regularly ( $22 \%$ always and $43 \%$ most of the time). A smaller number of teachers said they prepared their own assessments.

Figure 61. Sources for EFL Assessments


EFL teachers were asked if they agreed or disagreed with statements expressing their satisfaction with and use of student assessments. As shown in Figure 62, the majority of teacher respondents were satisfied with the format of the assessment ( $66 \%$ ) and the frequency of assessment (62\%) that they use. However, $13 \%$ of teacher respondents were unsatisfied with the format and $11 \%$ with the frequency of assessment.
Regarding use of assessments, most teacher respondents agreed that the assessment they used provided them with information about student learning and achievement of learning outcomes ( $80 \%$ ), and also informed their students about their progress in learning English ( $81 \%$ ). Despite this, $46 \%$ of teacher respondents believed that the assessment procedures they were employing should be changed ( $13 \%$ strongly agreed, and $33 \%$ agreed).

Figure 62. Teachers' Opinions on English Assessments


### 4.3.4 Student Participation and Engagement in ULA Classes

Figure 63 shows the percentage of time spent on student group work or pairs in a typical ULA lesson in grades 1 and 4 . In both grades, the plurality of teacher respondents ( $46 \%$ for grade 1, 39\% for grade 4) judged that students spend $26 \%-50 \%$ (10-20 minutes) of lesson time working in small groups or pairs.

Figure 63. Time Spent on Pair or Group Work in ULA Lessons, in Grades 1 and 4


When ULA teachers were asked about the percentage of time they spent explaining language concepts to students in a typical lesson (Figure 64), 48\% of them said 26\%-50\% of the class time (10-20 minutes). The smallest number of teacher respondents (11\%) reported that they spent $25 \%$ of less ( 10 minutes or less) of lesson time explaining ULA notions to students.

Figure 64. ULA Lesson Time Spent on Explaining Language Concepts


Figure 65 lays out several activities that might occur in a typical ULA lesson. The most frequently picked activities (used by at least $60 \%$ of ULA teacher respondents) were: the teacher reads the story aloud (68\%); teacher demonstrates how to read an unfamiliar word ( $68 \%$ ); teacher gives homework (62\%); students read text independently ( $60 \%$ ); and students write words ( $60 \%$ ). The least picked activities were: teachers model how to read a word (52\%); and students are given an opportunity to write to convey their thoughts or stories (44\%).

Figure 65. Activities in a Typical ULA Lesson


### 4.3.5 Student Participation and Engagement in Mathematics Classes

Figure 66 shows the percentage of time spent on student independent work in a typical Mathematics lesson in grades 1 and 4. In grade 1, most teacher respondents ( $56 \%$ ) believed that students spent $51 \%-75 \%$ (20-30 minutes) of the lesson time working independently. But in grade 4, half of teacher respondents (50\%) reported a lower amount of time of independent work ( $26 \%-50 \%$, 10-20 minutes).

Figure 66. Time for Independent Student Work in Mathematics Classes, Grades 1 and 4


Mathematics teachers were asked the percentage of lesson time they spend explaining Mathematics concepts to students, as well as the time they spend on small group work in a typical Mathematics lesson. Findings in Figure 67 show that during a Mathematics lesson, most teacher respondents ( $51 \%$ ) used $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) of the time to explain Mathematics concepts to students, and a similar proportion (49\%) spent the same range of time to engage students in small group work.

Figure 67. Time for Explaining Concepts or Student Group Work in Mathematics Lessons


Figure 68 shows a variety of activities that take place in a typical Mathematics lesson. The most frequently chosen activities were: teacher shows students how to solve a problem ( $68 \%$ ); students solve problems independently at their desks ( $66 \%$ ); students solve problems at the board (65\%); teacher evaluates individual work of students (64\%); and teachers explains concepts or strategies ( $62 \%$ ). Least used was student engagement in small or large groups to solve Mathematics problems, reported by only $43 \%$ of teacher respondents.

Figure 68. Activities in a Typical Mathematics Lesson


### 4.3.6 Student Participation and Engagement in ICT Classes

The percentage of time spent on student individual work in a typical ICT lesson in grades 5 and 9 is presented in Figure 69. The vast majority of teachers reported time for independent work ranged from $25 \%$ to $75 \%$ of class time, with about half of teachers in each grade reporting using $50 \%$ of class time for it. Interestingly, about $5 \%$ of teacher respondents in both grades said that they use $100 \%$ of the lesson time on student independent work.

Figure 69. ICT Lesson Time for Independent Student Work, Grades 5 and 9


Teachers were also asked the percentage of lesson time they spend instructing or lecturing the whole class, and the percentage of less time they spend on student group work (Figure 70. Time Spent in ICT Lessons on Whole Class Instruction or Group Work
). Findings show that during a typical ICT lesson, the plurality of teachers used $25 \%$ of the time on whole classroom instruction ( $48 \%$ of respondents) and $25 \%$ of the time to engage students in small group work ( $41 \%$ of respondents). Nearly a quarter ( $23 \%$ ) of teachers did not spend more than $10 \%$ of the lesson time on small group work.

Figure 70. Time Spent in ICT Lessons on Whole Class Instruction or Group Work


Figure 71 presents activities that took place in a typical ICT lesson. The most frequently chosen actions were mainly teacher-centered: teacher demonstrates a new or more complex skill ( $71 \%$ ), teacher checks or evaluates homework ( $60 \%$ ), and teacher evaluates students' independent work ( $58 \%$ ). A smaller number of teacher respondents reported that they explained concepts or approaches to students (42\%), or that they gave students an opportunity to practice new or more complex skills independently (51\%) or in small groups (52\%).

Figure 71. Activities in a Typical ICT Lesson


### 4.3.7 Use of Internet-Based Instructional Programs in ICT Classes

When asked if they used internet-based instructional programs to teach ICT concepts, most teacher respondents (70\%) said yes (Figure 72). Those respondents alone were then asked the language of these programs (limited to one language). Each respondent was allowed to select one language. The majority ( $73 \%$ ) chose Uzbek language.


Figure 72. Internet-Based Instructional Programs for ICT

### 4.3.8 Strategies ICT Teachers Use to Introduce New Concepts in Lessons

Figure 73 shows the approaches teacher respondents used to typically present new concepts to students. The most teacher respondents selected lecturing to students and then giving them time to practice (63\%). The fewest teachers chose exploratory teaching, in which teachers introduce a concept and then provide limited or as-needed instruction (14\%).

Figure 73. ICT Teachers' Typical Presentation Methods for New Concepts


### 4.4 PROFESSIONAL TASKS OF TEACHERS

### 4.4.1 Teaching and Non-Teaching Responsibilities of EFL Teachers

Figure 74 shows the subjects taught by EFL teacher respondents as well as the amount of time they spend teaching English. As seen in the figure, a vast majority (91\%) of teacher respondents reported that they exclusively taught English. Seven percent of teacher respondents said that they taught English and other foreign languages, and 2\% taught English and other subjects. When asked what percentage of their teaching time was spent on English, $45 \%$ of teacher respondents chose $76 \%-100 \%$, and $44 \%$ said $51 \%-75 \%$.

Figure 74. EFL Teachers' Other Taught Subjects and Time Spent Teaching English

shows that the majority ( $86 \%$ ) of teachers had other professional responsibilities in their schools other than teaching English, compared to 14\% who did not.

Figure 75. Percentage of EFL Teachers with Other Professional School Responsibilities


### 4.4.2 Teaching Responsibilities of ICT Teachers

ICT teachers were also asked whether they were currently teaching another subject in addition to ICT (Figure 76). Only a third of teachers (34\%) stated that they taught another subject and $66 \%$ said they did not.

Figure 76. Percentage of ICT Teachers Who Teach Other Subjects


### 4.4.3 EFL Teachers' Reflection on Teaching

The majority of EFL teacher respondents reported implementing every reflective practice listed in Figure 77. The three most popular practices (combining "agree" and "strongly agree" answers) were: comparison of their teaching practice and experience to that of other teachers (89\%); reflection after each lesson on which aspects went well and which could be improved ( $89 \%$ ); and consideration of new ways of teaching that could improve the quality of learning ( $88 \%$ ). Teacher respondents were least likely to affirm that their schools encouraged reflective behaviors ( $62 \%$ agreed or strongly agreed).

Figure 77. EFL Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices


### 4.4.4 Practices of EFL Teachers in Managing and Sharing Students' Progress with Families

Figure 78 shows selected practices used by EFL teacher respondents to manage and share student learning achivements. A vast majority of them (94\%) said that they kept reports of their students' progress and helped their students create a portfolio to keep track of their work and progress ( $86 \%$ ). Findings further indicate that the greatest proportion of teacher respondents ( $90 \%$ ) also shared with the parents of their students about their children's learning achievements.

Figure 78. EFL Teachers' Actions to Manage and Communicate Student Progress


### 4.4.5 EFL Teacher Collaboration and Participation in School Projects

Selected activities in which EFL teacher respondents collaborate as members of a learning community to improve student learning are presented in Figure 79. The dominant option was school initiatives, projects, and events beyond classroom (i.e., extracurricular activities) (84\%), followed by joint planning sessions with colleagues teaching English (82\%). The fewest teacher respondents ( $58 \%$ ) said they worked with special education teachers to accommodate their students with special needs.

Figure 79. EFL Teachers' Participation in Collaborative Events


## SECTION V: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents conclusions on findings sorted by survey component.

### 5.1 LESSON PLANNING AND PREPARATION

### 5.1.1 Lesson Planning Time and Resources

Findings from the school directors and methodologists show that most teachers spent less than an hour to plan each lesson. These findings differ with the SIS1 results, which indicated that most teachers took more than an hour to plan each of their lessons. Furthermore, school directors and methodologists stated that about $16 \%$ of teachers did not plan their lessons and SIS1 indicated that most of such teachers were EFL and ICT.

More than two-thirds ( $69 \%$ ) of school directors and methodologists reported that teachers use the required lesson planning form, confirming the SIS1 findings, which showed that majority (about $63 \%$ ) of teachers used the required lesson planning template. Although these results demonstrate greater usage of the requisite lesson planning form, there is still a substantial amount of teachers (about a third) who do not use this form. According the SIS1 findings, most of the teachers who did not use a lesson planning template (instead planning in a free mode or using detailed notes) were ULA and Mathematics teachers.
Similar to the SIS1 results, most school directors and methodologists chose student textbooks, methodological guides, and internet resources as the most commonly used resources by the teachers to plan their lessons.

Relative to the methodologists, a larger proportion of school directors reported that teachers used a methodological guide for the respective subjects they teach. The most frequently selected use of the methodological guide was to plan lesson activities and for general reference. These findings correspond with SIS1 findings, which showed a widespread use of methodological guide as a resource for planning lessons.
Findings of SIS2 further confirmed results of SIS1 that indicated most teachers desired premade lesson plans, guidance on how to teach key topics, and online resources, in addition to the resources they used to plan their lessons. This finding indicates a demand for teacher guides.

### 5.1.2 Subject Knowledge and Pedagogy

The majority of ULA teachers demonstrated strong knowledge of pedagogy. They understood the explain-first approach to teaching nouns, the role of a teacher in teaching reading, prerequisite relationships in reading and writing skills development, and the effectiveness of the Phonics Method (teaching students the sounds of letters, groups of letters, and syllables) in teaching reading (as opposed to the Whole-Word Approach). However, teacher opinions were almost equally divided on the best types of questions for comprehension (questions with multiple correct answers or questions with one correct answer) and books students should read (books appropriate for students level or books appropriate for students ability). Most teachers also thought that the cardinal objective of assessing students' level of reading is to determine their performance level, rather than determine their support need. This implies that teachers mainly gave assessments for grading rather than diagnostic purposes.

Mathematics teachers also exhibited solid subject teaching knowledge. The majority of them believed that it is essential to discuss wrong answers with students, and understood that the most important part of a Mathematics lesson is the process of solving a problem, not deriving the correct answer. However, a minority of teachers believed that students can use their previous knowledge to solve a new problem. Most of them thought that primary students should be shown how to solve a problem every time.
Most ICT teachers agreed that students should ask questions when they don't understand a concept, that it is important to discuss wrong answers with students, that modeling a skill for students is useful in all grades, not just early grades, and that the process of solving a problem is the most important part of an ICT lesson. Similar to Mathematics teachers, a smaller proportion of ICT teachers thought that students can apply prior knowledge to solve new problems. Although more ICT teachers showed positive opinions on most of the teaching practices, the majority of them reported that they have medium subject, pedagogical, and English language knowledge, and 8\% of them said they do not know English.

Unlike their ICT counterparts, a larger number of EFL teachers said they have high subject knowledge, subject teaching ability, and knowledge of English. Findings further show that they frequently used a variety of techniques to ensure students understand content, but more of them always or most of the time used audio or visual materials; organized work in pairs and groups to encourage active use of English; and distinguished and used the features of social language than other strategies. A smaller percentage of EFL teachers focused on teaching English through real-world assignments and problem-solving; asked students to do written translations; and used differentiation and use of academic language in their teaching.

### 5.1.3 Teachers' Knowledge of Students

A greatest proportion of EFL teachers think that psychological, social, cultural, and political factors shape students ability to learn English. The majority of EFL and ICT teachers believed that all children can be good at learning their subjects if they try hard. Similarly, ULA teachers mostly believed learning skills (trying hard), more than being smart (naturally being clever), decided students' ability to read. But most Mathematics teachers thought that some children are naturally better than other children at Mathematics.

Most EFL teachers indicated that they could identify students with learning disabilities. Only a small percentage ( $6 \%$ ) felt that they could not identify students with learning disabilities, and $15 \%$ were not sure whether they could.

### 5.1.4 Setting and Communicating Instructional Outcomes and Activities in EFL Classes

Findings show that a majority of EFL teachers frequently implemented actions related to setting and communicating instructional outcomes and activities in their lessons. Eighty-six percent of them reported that they always or most of the time based their lessons on national education standards. At the start of a lesson, $81 \%$ informed their students about what they would learn, and $75 \%$ informed students of their tasks.

### 5.1.5 Student Access to Computers, Mobile Devices and Internet Inside and Outside School

Findings from the ICT teachers and school directors indicate that a plurality of schools had 11-15 functioning student computers in their computer lab. Most English teachers (57\%) also reported that their students never had access to working equipment in the language
laboratory or classroom, and 59\% of them said students never or only sometimes had computer access in English class. These findings suggest limited availability of working computers in schools. Findings further show that the majority of EFL teachers believed that $50 \%$ or $75 \%$ of their students had computers with reliable internet (believed by $65 \%$ ) and smart phones with reliable internet (believed by 54\%) at home. Similarly, most ICT teachers (52\%) also stated that $50 \%$ or $75 \%$ of their students have computers and reliable internet outside of school. Overall, these finding imply that student access to computers and mobile devices is more common outside of schools than inside.

### 5.1.6 Teacher Resources in Schools

Most schools (59\%) had 1-5 laptops for teachers to use, according to school directors. Other materials that teachers normally had for their lessons when needed comprised one functioning computer; a projector; English audio tapes, CDs, DVDs; and at least one functioning printer. Most schools also had a library with books and a lab with functioning computers, both used by students.
Yet a sizable number of schools lacked other basic resources that teachers need. Fortythree percent of school directors said they did not have a library with books in English, 36\% indicated that they did not have enough paper and toner for teachers to make copies 2-3 times a year, and $21 \%$ percent reported that their schools did not have any functioning laptops for teachers. Like students, EFL teachers had more access to internet at home than at school. The internet was the most popular source of materials used in English lessons, with $90 \%$ of teachers saying they frequently used it to locate appropriate resources.
EFL teachers used audio resources more frequently in their lessons than video resources ( $79 \%$ vs. $66 \%$ ). However, about $19 \%$ of them indicated that they did not have working video or audio equipment in their classes. EFL teachers more regularly used images and pictures to supplement English learning, and used at a similar rate age-appropriate and linguistically convenient resources, and technology resources (e.g., internet, computer, and associated media).

### 5.1.7 Components of Formative Assessments and Teachers' Views on Assessment

A majority of ICT teachers ( $80 \%$ ) said that ICT end-of-course assessments were computerbased. End-of-course assessments in English were mainly comprised of writing exercises on grammar, followed by speaking on a prepared topic. The main sources of English assessment exercises were student textbooks and methodological guides. Half of teachers (54\%) also reported that they frequently prepared their own assessments. Although most English teachers were satisfied with the assessments, $13 \%$ and $11 \%$ stated that they were unsatisfied with the format and frequency of the assessments, respectively. In addition, 46\% of English teachers said they would like to change the way they assess their students.

## Recommendations:

Teacher knowledge of students, especially the students' learning process, is likely to influence lesson preparation, teaching practices, and the way teachers support struggling learners. ULA and Mathematics teachers' attitudes on how students learn need to be reoriented toward knowing that all students can do well in respective subjects if they try hard.
Therefore, the Program should provide teachers with sample lesson plans that have been completed for Mathematics and ULA using the scripted teacher guides and student textbooks so that teachers have a model of how the new curriculum maps onto a lesson plan. The Program should include sessions for teachers on methodological days about how to easily find the key topics in the teacher guides they need to plan lessons.

The Program should also provide ULA teachers with further training on types of questioning, with a specific focus on understanding making connections (i.e., text-to-text, text-to-self, text-to-world) and three levels of questioning (literal, inferential, evaluative) to enhance their exposure to and understanding of questioning comprehension strategies. ULA teachers should be helped to understand the purpose and use of diagnostic and formative assessments and how to link that to the different types of texts that students should read to improve their reading skills. ULA teachers must have an understanding on the levels of reading texts (i.e., independent, instructional, frustration) and the implications for reading activities. For example, independent reading should match students to texts at their ability level, not grade level. The Program should improve ULA teacher capacity for providing differentiated instruction and integrating other reading strategies-such as guided reading and literacy centers-into their instruction.

ICT teachers need to receive additional training to increase their content knowledge. Additionally, there should be training that prioritizes reorienting ICT teachers' techniques from teacher-centered to students-centered learning. To develop 21 st century students, MoPE needs to prioritize ensuring all schools have enough up-to-date devices for ICT teachers and students as well as sufficient internet connectivity. A structured lesson plan template and instructions, such as those provided in the ICT teacher guides, should encourage teachers to appropriately use classroom time for student-centered instruction that does not center around the student textbook but incorporates internationally accepted concepts and research-based strategies. Using the teacher guides regularly should be emphasized to ICT teachers because the guides provide pertinent information and resources for teacher planning and student learning. As all schools receive up-to-date devices and connectivity, ICT assessments can be solely computer-based, which is more secure and faster to analyze.

### 5.2 THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

### 5.2.1 Motivating Students and Nurturing an Environment of Respect and Rapport

EFL teachers used several strategies to inspire students, but the most frequent was to communicate to them that if they worked hard, they would attain high levels of English language proficiency and meet grade-level standards. In order to create a conducive environment, the majority of EFL teachers said that they frequently modeled and taught their students how to engage in respectful interactions. To manage student behaviors, most EFL teachers endeavor to understand the reasons for students' misbehavior, and also help the students understand what constitutes appropriate conduct by ongoing modeling and practice of good behaviors.

### 5.2.2 Expectations for Learning and Achievement

The most common skill that ULA teachers expected a student joining grade 1 to have was recognizing some letters and their sounds, followed by answering questions about a story, and writing some letters. Fewer teachers expected students to know how to write short words or write their names. Regarding the grade when they would expect a student to read fluently and comprehend, $48 \%$ of them said the end of grade $1,35 \%$ said the end of grade 2.
A large number of Mathematics teachers thought that when entering grade 1, students should already be able to recognize numbers $1-10$, do simple addition and subtraction, and write numbers $1-10$, but few thought that students would know measurement units.
Teachers overall expected students to fluently know simple multiplication facts that involve digits up to 10 by end of the grade 2 .

The majority of ICT teachers expected a student entering grade 5 to already know what a computer is and the importance of its elements, but very few of them thought that a student should know how to save files, open computer programs, or type on a keyboard. Asked when they expect a student to have mastered keyboarding, most teachers estimated the end of grade 5 .

### 5.2.3 Supporting Struggling Students

EFL teachers used various techniques to support students who fail English assignments, but the predominant way was to help students find the right direction or answer using a scaffolding (reading from simple to complex text) method. For students who came to class chronically unprepared and fall behind, teachers mainly, and equally, used two strategies: giving them assignments to keep them busy without involving them in whole class activities, and helping them after school.

ULA teachers mainly assisted students who were frustrated and could not read a word correctly by guiding them to find the right answer with clues and support. Most ICT teachers used the same strategy to help a student who was frustrated and did not know what to do next in their classes.

For Mathematics teachers, when a student was frustrated and cannot solve a problem, the plurality of them said they helped that student after school. The second most common strategy was to repeat the same topic with the whole class.

## Recommendations:

Because ICT starts in grade 5, it is recommended that students progressively improve their keyboarding skills from grades 5 through 7 . In guiding students to the right answer, ICT teachers should incorporate guided questioning as part of the process to allow students to come to the correct answer mostly on their own.

### 5.3 INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

### 5.3.1 Lesson Time Spent on Group Work

In a typical English lesson, which lasts 40 minutes, a plurality of teachers reported that students in grades $1,4,7$, and 11 spent $51 \%-75 \%$ (20-30 minutes) of the time working in small groups or pairs. In a typical grade 1 or 4 ULA lesson, most ULA teachers reported students spent $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) of the time on group work. Likewise, almost half, a plurality, of Mathematics teachers reported that their students spent $26 \%-50 \%$ (10-20 minutes) of the time in a typical Mathematics lesson on small group work. During a typical ICT lesson, teachers most commonly spent $25 \%$ of the time to engage students in small group work. These findings imply that EFL teachers spend the greatest chunk of lesson time on group work and ICT teachers spent the least.

### 5.3.2 Lesson Time Spent on Student Independent Work

Concerning student independent work, $45 \%$ (the largest portion) of EFL teachers said that they spent $26 \%-50 \%$ (10-20 minutes) of class time in a typical English lesson for students to work individually. The majority of teachers had positive opinions about the value of group work in learning English. In grade 1 Mathematics lessons, half of teachers said that students spent $26 \%-50 \%$ of the time working independently, whereas in grade 4 they reported a greater amount of time ( $51 \%-75 \%$ ) allocated to independent work. For ICT, the most common proportion of time for independent work was $50 \%$ (chosen by $51 \%$ of grade 5 teachers and $45 \%$ of grade 9 teachers). Notably, about $5 \%$ of ICT teachers in both grades said that they used $100 \%$ of the lesson time on student independent work.

### 5.3.3 Lesson Time Spent on Lecturing or Whole Class Instruction

The majority (56\%) of EFL teachers reported that they spent 51\%-75\% (20-30 minutes) of lesson time talking, rather than the students talking. Almost half of ULA teachers spent 26\%$50 \%$ (10-20 minutes) explaining language concepts to students in a usual ULA lesson. During a typical Mathematics lesson, just more than half of teachers used $26 \%-50 \%$ of the time to explain Mathematics concepts to students. Almost half of ICT teachers used $25 \%$ of the time on whole classroom instruction during a typical ICT lesson.

### 5.3.4 Typical Lesson Activities

The most common activities that occured in a typical English lesson were: a teacher modeling how to read an unfamiliar word, a teacher assigning homework, a teacher reviewing or grading homework, a teacher explaining grammar rules, and students doing grammar exercises. Fewer teachers reported asking students to do written translations, teacher modeling how to read a text, and students writing an idea or story to tell.

In a typical ULA lesson, the three most common practices were to read a story aloud to students, demonstrate how to read an unfamiliar word to students, and give students homework. It was less common, but still reported by $60 \%$ of respondents, for students to both read and write words. A smaller percentage of teachers said that teachers showed students how to read a word ( $52 \%$ ) and that students were given an opportunity to write to convey their thoughts or stories (44\%).
The most frequently selected activities that occurred in a typical Mathematics lesson were: the teacher showed students how to solve a problem; students solved problems independently at their desks; students solved problems at the board; teacher evaluated individual work of students; and teachers explained concepts or strategies. Least popular was student engagement in small or large groups to solve Mathematics problems.

The most common activities that took place in a typical ICT lesson were: teacher models a new or more complex skill, and teacher reviews or grades homework. The three least common activities were: teacher explains concepts or approaches to students, students practice new or more complex skills independently, and students practice new or more complex skills in small groups. The majority of teachers used internet-based instructional programs to teach ICT concepts and these programs were mainly in the Uzbek language (only $28 \%$ of the programs are in another language, mostly English and Russian).

### 5.3.5 EFL Teachers' Techniques to Engage Students in Discussions

To engage students in discussion, the approach that EFL teachers used most frequently was to ask students thought-provoking questions and engage all of them in a discussion. Less than half of teachers said that they regularly placed students by the same ability levels during group activities. Proponents of ability grouping believe it increases the motivation of students and enables teachers to adjust pace of instruction to students' needs. Students with average or below-average skills can receive additional teacher support together. Students with more advanced skills will finish the same material more quickly and are left with a period of time that is often not spent learning, but can be filled with more challenging work.

### 5.3.6 EFL Teachers' Assessment Practices

Assessment practices that teachers applied most frequently during EFL lessons were: monitoring progress and achievement of students, and providing students with feedback about their participation. To formatively assess students, most teachers used games, fill-in-the-blank" exercise sheets, and sentence sequence cards (i.e., placing cards with individual words or short phrases into an order that completes the sentence).

The most common response to assessment results was teachers setting aside time after the lessons or school to provide additional instruction to students when necessary, followed by making adjustments to the lessons during the teaching process. Though the majority of teachers assess students during lessons, some teachers (41\%) said that they always or most of the time just progressed through the lesson with the goal to complete what they planned. This implies that a sizable number of EFL teachers did not do normally assess students during their lessons, or at least did not act upon the assessments.

## Recommendations:

The Uzbekistan Education for Excellence Program should continue to support teachers to strengthen practices proven to be effective in teaching. The Program should guide Mathematics and ICT teachers to recognize that students can learn new mathematical and technological concepts using knowledge acquired in previous lessons, grades, or even their daily life. They should therefore support students to adapt this knowledge to solve new problems and learn new concepts.
The Program should support teachers to use the ULA materials that follow the gradual release of responsibility model (from the teacher demonstration to the eventual independence of the learner) and to allocate time to different parts of the lesson, which can help ensure that the ULA classroom is not dominated by teacher-centered instruction. The Program should also ensure that teachers are well-trained and receive support for using the UEEP materials. The design of the ULA materials changes the distribution of time spent on different types of activities. It includes explicit systematic phonics instruction and word study to help students develop the necessary decoding, blending, and segmenting skills to read and write. Students should be exposed to a diverse set of text types and genres in the student textbooks so that they have the opportunity to apply the different comprehension strategies to a variety of texts. The lessons also strengthen the reading and writing connection and give students the opportunity to write about texts and also to develop their own writing using supports (e.g., graphic organizers). Students have the opportunity to listen to stories above their reading level, read stories at their reading level, and be explicitly taught vocabulary to support comprehension. Throughout, students will develop their oral language skills through discussions, pair work, and listening. Teacher guides should contain explicit steps of the teacher introducing the topic or activity, engaging with students to model or practice to ensure they understand, and then having them practice on their own or with a partner. The Program should support teachers to follow the steps in the teacher guides and the timing indication in the lesson activities. By following along, they will, as intended, move away from traditional, teacher-centered instruction.
Professional development efforts should focus on training and resources for incorporating meaningful group work into the ICT classroom. Additionally, teachers should be encouraged to use the ICT teacher guides to provide them with instructions and examples on incorporating group work. Using this resource would facilitate the shift from teachercentered to student-centered lessons.

EFL teachers should be encouraged to use the teacher guides to strengthen formative assessment practices and use the test generator software, available on the digital platform, to organize summative assessments.

### 5.4 TEACHER PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

### 5.4.1 EFL and ICT Teachers with Additional Responsibilities

Nine percent (9\%) of EFL teacher respondents reported teaching English and another foreign language or another subject. In addition, only 45\% of them said they spent 75\%$100 \%$ of their teaching time teaching English-implying that majority of English teachers do not fully use their teaching time to teach. A third (34\%) of ICT teachers said they teach ICT and another subject.

### 5.4.2 EFL Teachers' Reflective practices and Participation in Collaborative Activities

The majority of EFL teachers implemented a variety of reflective teaching practices, but they were most likely to observe other teachers and reflect on how their own teaching practice and experience compared with the teachers they observed; reflect on the aspects of a lesson that went well and aspects that could be improved after each lesson; and consider new ways of teaching that can improve the quality of learning. However, more teachers reported doing any reflective practice than reported that their schools encouraged reflective practices.

### 5.4.3 Participation in a Professional Community

As members of a learning community, most teachers said they collaborated in a number of activities, but the predominant were extracurricular activities (school initiatives, projects, and events) and joint planning sessions with colleagues. Fewer teachers, but still a majority, worked with special education teachers to accommodate their students with special needs.

## Recommendations:

It is recommended, if possible, that ICT teachers only teach one subject during the course of a school day, even if they have responsibilities to teach other courses. It is recommended that ICT teachers actively participate and lean on a professional learning community to learn from one another and improve their teaching practices.

## ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1. STATUS OF INSTRUCTION STUDY PHASE 2 ITEMS: CONSOLIDATED FINAL ITEMS AGAINST THE FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING

Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## 1a: Demonstrating

 Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy- Content and structure of discipline
- Prerequisite relationships
- Content-related pedagogy

Uzbek Language Arts (ULA): Pick which statement you agree with the MOST.

- a. Students should read books according to their grade level.
b. Students should read books according to their skill level.
- a. When teaching students how to read a new word, it is important that students know the sounds of the syllables and letters of this word.
b. When teaching students how to read a new word, it is important that they have the opportunity to see the full word many times.
- a. Students need to learn to read first before learning to write.
b. Students need to learn to read and write at the same time.
- a. It is more important to assess students' level of reading to determine what support they need.
b. It is more important to evaluate the reading level of students to determine their performance level (e.g., their grades).
- a. Understanding questions that have multiple correct answers is better for comprehension.
b. Understanding questions that have one correct answer is better for comprehension.


## Table A-1. Survey Items

Component $\quad$ Subcomponents $\quad$ Questions $\quad$ Options

- a. My role as a teacher is to teach students all the words they need to know to become readers.
b. My role as a teacher is to teach students the skills they need so they can learn to read words autonomously, and become good readers.
- a. To teach nouns the teacher must first explain their meaning.
b. Through reading a story students learn to identify nouns.

Mathematics: Pick which statement you agree with the MOST

- a. Students in primary Mathematics must always be shown how to solve a problem before they solve it.
b. Students in primary Mathematics can apply prior knowledge to solve new problems.
- a. The correct answer is the most important part of Mathematics class.
b. The process of solving a problem is the most important part of Mathematics class.
- a. It is important to discuss wrong answers.
b. Discussing wrong answers will confuse students.

EFL: Please select one answer: Always,
Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never.

- I provide opportunities for my students to speak and interact with each other in English, without translating into Uzbek or Russian.
- I integrate content from Mathematics, Language, Information and Communication Technology (ICT), and other subjects into what students learn in my English classes.
- I use audio-visual materials to facilitate student learning.
- I organize work in pairs and groups to encourage active usage of English.
- During classes, my students do written translations.
- In my classroom I teach in English and focus heavily on speaking instead of grammar (direct).


## Table A-1. Survey Items

Component Subcomponents Questions Response Options

- I focus on teaching English through real-world assignments and problem-solving, being less concerned with grammar accuracy and instead focusing on fluency emphasizing the students' ability to communicate
- I distinguish characteristics of social language (e.g., basic interpersonal communication skills) in my teaching.
- I distinguish academic language (e.g., cognitive academic language proficiency) in my teaching.
- I use both English and Uzbek/Russian) in my classroom to facilitate student understanding on concepts.
- My students have opportunities to use English outside of the classroom.

1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

- Child and adolescent development
- Learning process
- Students' skills knowledge, and language proficiency
- Students' interests and cultural heritage
- Students' special needs

ULA: Pick which statement you agree with the MOST.

## Mathematics: Pick which statement you

 agree with the MOST.ICT: Pick which statement you agree with the MOST.
a. Whether students learn to read depends on how smart they are.
b. Whether students learn to read depends mostly on their learning skills.

- a. All children can be good at Mathematics if they try hard. b. Some children are just naturally better than other children at Mathematics.
- a. Students in ICT must always be shown how to solve a problem before the solve it.
b. Students in ICT can apply prior knowledge to solve new problems.
- a. The correct answer is the most important part of ICT class.
b. The process of solving a problem is the most important part of ICT class.
- a. All children can be good at ICT if they try hard.
b. Some children are just naturally better than other children at ICT.
- a. Modeling a skill for students is only useful in early grades.


## Table A-1. Survey Items



## Table A-1. Survey Items



## Table A-1. Survey Items

Component Subcomponents $\quad$ Questions Response Options

- I use resources for my lessons provided by my school district.
- I use resources shared by my colleagues.
- I am able to locate appropriate resources for my lessons on the internet.
- I align my classroom resources to instructional outcomes of the lesson.
- I use audio-based resources in my lessons.
- I use video-based resources in my lessons.
- I apply technological resources (e.g., internet, software, computers, related media) to enhance English learning.
- I use images and pictures in my lessons.
- I use different prompts in my lessons (dolls, food, household items, and other objects).
- I encourage my students to develop different learning resources and bring them to the English classroom.
- I use English texts in the same topics as they are in other subjects (history, geography, literature, etc.).
- I use age-appropriate and linguistically accessible resources.


## EF: What percentage of students have

 home or elsewhere outside of school?- $100 \%$
- $75 \%$
- $50 \%$
- $25 \%$
- Less than $10 \%$


## EFL: What percentage of students have

 smart phones with reliable internet access?- $100 \%$
- $75 \%$
- $50 \%$
- $25 \%$
- Less than $10 \%$


## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction | - Learning activities <br> - Instructional materials and resources <br> - Instructional groups <br> - Lesson and unit structure |  |  |
| 1f: Designing Student Assessments | - Congruence with instructional outcomes <br> - Criteria and standards <br> - Design of formative assessments <br> - Use for planning | ICT: What is the format of ICT end-of-course assessments? | - Computer-based <br> - Paper and pencil |
|  |  | EFL: What are the components of end-ofcourse assessments in English (select all that apply)? | - Written translations <br> - Speaking on the prepared topic <br> - Speaking on the spontaneous topic I propose <br> - Reading <br> - Written grammar exercises <br> - Project presentation <br> - Portfolio assessment |
|  |  | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - I use assessment exercises from the student textbook. <br> - I use assessment exercises from the teacher guide. <br> - I prepare my own assessment. |
|  |  | EFL: Please select one answer: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. | - I am satisfied with the format of assessment I use now. <br> - I am satisfied with the frequency of assessment I use now. <br> - The assessment I use informs me about student learning and achievement of learning outcomes. <br> - The assessment I use informs my students about their progress in learning English. <br> - I would like to change the way I assess my students. |
| Domain 2: The Classroom Environment |  |  |  |
| 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport | - Teacher interactions with students, including both words and actions | ICT: What would you expect a fifth grader starting school to already know? | - What a computer is and the purposes of its components. <br> - How computers are used. <br> - How to type on a keyboard. <br> - How to open computer applications. |

## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -Student interactions with <br> other students, including | other students, including both words and actions


| 2b: Establishing a | - | Importance of content |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Culture for | and of learning |  |
| Learning | - | Expectations for learning <br> and achievement |
|  | - | Student pride in work |

Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - Other. |
|  |  | ICT: By when would you expect a student to have mastered keyboarding? | - End of grade 1. <br> - End of grade 2. <br> - End of grade 3. <br> - End of grade 4. <br> - End of grade 5 . <br> - Other |
|  |  | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - I communicate to my students that with hard work they will acquire high levels of English proficiency and meet gradelevel content standards. <br> - I help my students to set goals for language development and English learning that are realistic but aspirational. <br> - I organize showcases of my student work. <br> - I motivate my students to learn English by discussing with them the benefits of language learning for their education, career, and personal enhancement. |
| 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures | - Instructional groups <br> - Transitions <br> - Materials and supplies <br> - Performance of classroom routines <br> - Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - I prepare my own learning materials. <br> - I use learning materials prepared by the school district. <br> - I use learning materials shared by other English teachers. <br> - I involve my students in developing learning materials. <br> - I am confident I use learning materials that are developmentally, age, and language appropriate. <br> - My school provides opportunities and financial support for learning materials development. <br> - It is expected by my school that I develop my own learning materials. |
| 2d: Managing Student Behavior | - Expectations <br> - Monitoring of student behavior | ULA: What do you do when a student is frustrated and cannot read a word correctly? | - Ask another student to help that child. <br> - Help that student after school. <br> - Help the students find the right answer with clues and support. |

## Table A-1. Survey Items



## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources |  | - My classroom is accessible for students with disabilities (desks to accommodate students in wheelchairs, screen readers, voice amplifiers, speakers, etc.). |
| Domain 3: Instruction |  |  |  |
| 3a: Communicating with Students | - Expectations for learning <br> - Directions for activities <br> - Explanations of content <br> - Use of oral and written language | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - I use student native language (Uzbek or Russian) and visual supports (e.g., graphic organizers, multimedia, and pictures) to ensure that my students understand the concepts presented in the lesson. <br> - In my lessons I make connections to my student lives beyond school, including connections to students' homes, families, hobbies, interests, etc. <br> - I use visuals and graphic organizers to support understanding of written and oral language. <br> - When introducing new English vocabulary I translate the words into student native language. <br> - When introducing new English words and phrases I put them in context to facilitate student learning. |
| 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | - Quality of questions/prompts <br> - Discussion techniques <br> - Student participation | ULA: In a typical mother tongue lesson in grade 1, how much time do students spend working in small groups or pairs? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ ( 30 minutes or more) <br> - $51 \% 75 \%$ ( $20-30$ minutes) <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) <br> - $25 \%$ or less ( 10 minutes or less) |
|  |  | ULA: In a typical mother tongue lesson in grade 4, how much time do students spend working in small groups or pairs? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ ( 30 minutes or more) <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ ( $20-30$ minutes) <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) <br> - $25 \%$ or less ( 10 minutes or less) |
|  |  | Mathematics: In a typical Mathematics lesson in grade 1, how much time do students spend working independently? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ or less |

## Table A-1. Survey Items



## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - For group activities, I place my students by the same ability level (strong with strong, intermediate with intermediate). <br> - To help students engage in the class discussion, I allow them first to converse in small groups in the native language and then to present in English. |
|  |  | EFL: To make sure your students understand you, what method(s) do you use the most? (select the one you use most frequently) | - Breaking complex questions into less complex questions. <br> - Avoiding unnecessary challenging words and phrases. <br> - Translating questions into native language. |
|  |  | EFL: In a typical English lesson, which of the following you do for scaffolding dialogic reading? Check all that apply. | - Pose the guiding question. <br> - Read the passage aloud once, glossing underlined vocabulary as you read. Students follow along in their text. <br> - Have students work in pairs or individually to answer the supplementary questions. <br> - Review answers to the supplementary questions with students. <br> - Have students work in pairs to answer the guiding question. <br> - Discuss the answer to the guiding question with the class. <br> - Have students write the answer to the guiding question. |
|  |  | In a typical English lesson in grade 4, how much time do students spend working in small groups or pairs? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ ( 30 minutes or more) <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ (20-30 minutes) <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) <br> - $25 \%$ or less ( 10 minutes or less) |
|  |  | EFL: In a typical English lesson in grade [1, 4,7 , or 11], how much time do students spend working in small groups or pairs? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ ( 30 minutes or more) <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ (20-30 minutes) <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ ( $10-20$ minutes) <br> - $25 \%$ or less ( 10 minutes or less) |
| 3c: Engaging Students in Learning | - Activites and assignments <br> - Grouping of students | ULA: In a typical lesson, what percent of your lesson time is spent with you explaining mother tongue concepts to students? | - 76-100\% (30 minutes or more) <br> - $51-75 \%$ ( $20-30$ minutes) <br> - 26-50\% (10-20 minutes) |

Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Instructional materials and resources <br> - Structure and pacing |  | - $25 \%$ or less (10 minutes or less) |
|  |  | ULA: In a typical mother tongue lesson, which of the following occur? Check as many as needed. | - Teacher reads a story aloud to students. <br> - Teachers models how to read an unfamiliar word. <br> - Teacher models how to read a text. <br> - Students read words. <br> - Students write words. <br> - Students read text independently. <br> - Teacher asks questions about a text with multiple correct answers. <br> - Students write to communicate and idea or a story. <br> - Teacher assigns homework. <br> - Teacher reviews/grades homework. |
|  |  | Mathematics: In a typical lesson, what percent of your lesson time is spent with you explaining Mathematics concepts to students? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ or less |
|  |  | Mathematics: In a typical lesson, what percent of time is spent on small group work? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ or less |
|  |  | Mathematics: In a typical Mathematics lesson, which of the following occur? (multiple response) | - Teacher explains concepts/strategies. <br> - Students solve problems at the board. <br> - Teachers models how to solve a problem. <br> - Students solve problems independently at desk. <br> - Students solve problems in small or large groups. <br> - Teacher grades independent work. <br> - Teacher assigns homework. <br> - Teacher reviews/grades homework. |

## Table A-1. Survey Items
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## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EFL: In a typical lesson, what percent of time is spent on students working individually? | - $76 \%-100 \%$ <br> - $51 \%-75 \%$ <br> - $26 \%-50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ or less |
|  |  | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - My students enjoy group work in my English classes. <br> - I find group work effective in learning English. <br> - I organize group work well and achieve desired outcomes. |
| 3d: Using assessment in instruction | - Assessment criteria <br> - Monitoring of student learning <br> - Feedback to students <br> - Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress | EFL: Please select one answer: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never. | - I am progressing through the lesson as I need to finish what I have planned. <br> - I communicate to students criteria of success during the lesson. <br> - I monitor student progress and achievements during the lesson. <br> - I provide feedback to students during the lesson. <br> - I change my instructional practices during a lesson based on my monitoring of student progress. <br> - I change my instructional practices for the next lesson based on my monitoring of student progress. <br> - I provide targeted and constructive feedback to my students. |
|  |  | EFL: What formative assessment techniques do you use? Check all that apply. | - Thumbs up or thumbs down (students signaling). <br> - Stop/go signs for students to use during instruction to indicate they need additional explanation. <br> - Red, yellow, green cards (red is "don't understand", yellow is "need more instruction/unclear," green is "good/understand"). <br> - Games. <br> - 3-2-1 flashcards (write/draw down three things you learned, two things you found interesting, and one question you still have). |

## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

- Spontaneous speaking assessments (ask students to accurately speak about a picture in the foreign language, review their weekends with partners and have the partners translate, etc.).
- Fill in the blank worksheets.
- Flashcards (pair up students to quiz one another).
- Sentence sequence cards (placing the cards with individual words or short phrases into an order that completes the sentence).
- Whiteboards that students can write on, show to the teacher, and then erase, repeat.
- Having students correct each other's homework mistakes and identify why the answers were incorrect, or same activity using past students' homework with names omitted.

| 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness | - Lesson adjustment <br> - Response to students <br> - Persistence | EFL: Please select one answer: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. | - I am flexible in pacing the instruction based on student achievement and progress. <br> - If needed I spend extra time after the lesson/school day to provide additional instruction to my students. <br> - I make lesson adjustments during the teaching process. <br> - I tend to take a more measured pace and make a change to the next day's lesson plan. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities |  |  |  |
| 4a: Reflection on Teaching | - Accuracy <br> - Use in future teaching | ICT: Are you currently teaching a subject in addition to ICT? | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { - } & \text { Yes } \\ \text { - } & \text { No } \end{array}$ |
|  |  | ICT: If yes, what percentage of your teaching time is spent teaching ICT? | - $100 \%$ <br> - $75 \%$ <br> - $50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ |
|  |  | ICT: If yes, which other subject(s) are you teaching? | - [Open response] |

## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EFL: Are you currently teaching English only or other foreign languages or subject as well? | - English only <br> - English and another foreign language <br> - Other subject |
|  |  | EFL: What percentage of your teaching time is spent teaching English? | - $100 \%$ <br> - $75 \%$ <br> - $50 \%$ <br> - $25 \%$ |
|  |  | EFL: In addition to teaching English, do you have any other professional responsibilities in your school (e.g., administrative)? | - Yes (please indicate \%) <br> - No |
|  |  | EFL: Please select one answer: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. | - After each lesson I reflect on those aspects of a lesson that went well and which could be improved. <br> - I reflect on my teaching during official performance evaluation. <br> - I self-assess the effect of my teaching on student learning. <br> - I take notes on my lesson plan to record what went well and what needs to change. <br> - I consider new ways of teaching that can improve the quality of learning. <br> - I try new ideas in practice. <br> - Reflective practices are encouraged at my school. <br> - I observe other teachers and reflect how my teaching practice and experience compares to theirs. |
| 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records | - Student completion of assignments <br> - Student progress in learning <br> - Non-instructional records | EFL: I maintain reports of my students' progress. | - Yes - No |
|  |  | EFL: I help students create portfolios to track their work and progress. | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { - } & \text { Yes } \\ \text { - } & \text { No } \end{array}$ |

## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4c: Communicating with families | - Information about the instructional program <br> - Information about individual students <br> - Engagement of families in the instructional program | EFL: I share reports and communicate my students' progress with their families. | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { - } & \text { Yes } \\ \text { - } & \text { No } \end{array}$ |
| 4d: Participating in a Professional Community | - Relationships with colleagues <br> - Involvement in culture of professional inquiry <br> - Service to the school <br> - Participation in school and district projects | EFL: Please select one answer: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. | - I regularly meet and participate in joint planning sessions with my colleagues teaching English. <br> - I regularly meet with and participate in joint planning sessions with my colleagues teaching other subjects to enable interdisciplinary connections. <br> - I collaborate with the special education teacher to accommodate my special needs students. <br> - I contribute to/participate in school initiatives, projects, and events beyond the classroom. |
|  |  | EFL: I am engaged in my professional community by (select all that apply): | - Participating in continuous learning and ongoing professional development. <br> - Being a member of a professional English teaching organization. <br> - Being a member of a professional learning community. <br> - Attending local and regional conferences. <br> - Participating in online discussions. <br> - Developing leadership skills so I can be a resource at school and offer professional development workshops or act as a peer coach to a colleague. <br> - Presenting on topics and/or workshops on EFL topics. <br> - Presenting a "technique of the month" at faculty meetings. <br> - Organizing "lunch and learn" sessions. <br> - Observing and coaching or mentoring individual teachers. <br> - Modeling a lesson or technique for colleagues. |

## Table A-1. Survey Items

| Component | Subcomponents | Questions | Response Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - Inviting grade-level or content teachers to observe English language classes. <br> - Co-teaching and demonstrating techniques and debriefing afterwards. <br> - Making learning materials I develop to my colleagues. <br> - Establishing online communities for sharing ideas, techniques, and lesson plans. |
|  |  | EFL: I participate in continuous learning and ongoing professional development. | - Monthly <br> - Quarterly <br> - Once a year <br> - 2 times a year <br> - 3 or more times a year |
| 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally | - Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill <br> - Receptivity to feedback from colleagues <br> - Service to the profession | EFL: I further my professional knowledge and pedagogy related to the instruction and assessment by (select all that apply): | - Taking courses. <br> - Reading professional literature. <br> - Participating in professional communities. <br> - Participating at conferences. <br> - Participating in training. <br> - Seeking feedback from my peers and mentors. <br> - Observing master teachers and learning from them. |
| 4f: Showing Professionalism | - Integrity and ethical conduct <br> - Service to students <br> - Advocacy <br> - Decision-making <br> - Compliance with school and district regulations | EFL: Please select one answer: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree. | - I help organize professional development events. <br> - I am regularly available to support my colleagues and students. <br> - I advocate for my colleagues and students when possible. <br> - I participate in meetings where I provide input on decisions affecting my colleagues and students. <br> - I am aware of and comply with school and district regulations. |
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