

Stage 1 –Entry collection and processing

The Varkey Foundation	PwC
The Varkey Foundation ("The Foundation") announced the award and specified the form and timetable for public nominations. The Foundation was responsible for collecting all nominations and entries through their website.	N/A
The Varkey Foundation exported the entries from the website and uploaded all completed applications to the heuristic analysis application for initial filtering.	PwC checked whether a complete set of entries had been passed between systems and that no manual manipulation had taken place by reconciling the export file from the Varkey Foundation's third-party website provider to the heuristic analysis application.
The Varkey Foundation used a bespoke application to filter the entries based on word count and keyword matches chosen by the Varkey Foundation.	PwC oversaw the word limit and keyword rules that are applied to the entries, checking for consistency and that no manual manipulation had occurred.
The remaining entries were read by the Varkey Foundation who made a decision as to whether the entry should pass to Stage 2. The final decision was made by the Varkey Foundation.	N/A

Stage 2 - Online judging and pre-Prize Committee evaluation

The Varkey Foundation	PwC
The Varkey Foundation formed an online judging panel comprised of Varkey Foundation staff and a selection of business and education experts from around the world. The objective of this stage was to have each entry independently scored by suitably qualified evaluators to narrow the entries down to a list of Top 50 candidates for the Prize Committee's consideration.	PwC allocated each entry at random to at least two online judges, save for allocating entries to judges who are fluent in the language the entry is written in.
<p>The Varkey Foundation used a browser-based web portal to capture the online judging scores submitted by the judges. Within the online judging portal, the Varkey Foundation shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria sheet including an explanation behind each criterion and how to interpret them; • A system for evaluators to share problems and issues; • Instructions on the scoring process; and • An example application that was considered to be worthy of maximum scores across the criteria <p>The Varkey Foundation were responsible for the online judging portal's design and maintenance, including appropriate user access.</p>	<p>PwC checked the online judging portal, testing for user access, ability to only vote once and accurate recording of scores. This was achieved by creating 'Dummy' judges and scoring a sample of randomly selected applications. In addition, PwC was given admin user access to see and export all scores.</p> <p>PwC exported the results directly from the online judging portal. The results were modelled to show a ranking of the entries based on the online judging scoring.</p>
The Varkey Foundation formed a sub-committee comprising their Executive Director, Head of Marketing, Head of Programmes, Chief Operating Officer, Marketing Manager and Head PR Consultant, to review the online	PwC attended this sub-committee meeting to observe the conversation and process for any obvious signs of bias. None were noted.

judging results and select a shortlist of entries for interview.	
The Varkey Foundation held Skype interviews with the shortlisted nominees. Based on the results of the interviews the Varkey Foundation selected their Top 50 candidates.	PwC checked that the finalised Top 50 are selected from those discussed at the sub-committee meeting. PwC reviewed all instances where the Varkey Foundation has overridden the online judges to ensure they have a reasonable rationale for doing so.
The Varkey Foundation ensured that there are minimum representations across candidate details such as gender, age of pupils taught, state vs private school, subjects taught and geography of where the teacher is based, to ensure the Top 50 represented a diverse pool of individuals.	N/A

Stage 3: Prize Committee selection of the Top 10 candidates

The Varkey Foundation	PwC
<p>The Varkey Foundation formed a Prize Committee comprised of Varkey Foundation Trustees who met to select the Top 10 from the Top 50 entries.</p> <p>The Prize Committee voted on who should be selected as the Top 10 finalists (plus three reserve finalists).</p>	<p>PwC hosted this meeting and observed the selection process for any obvious signs of bias. None were noted.</p>

Stage 4: Background checks

The Varkey Foundation	PwC
<p>The Varkey Foundation requested that the Top 10 finalists share criminal record checks from their local jurisdiction.</p> <p>The Varkey Foundation were responsible for checking the summary provided by PwC and made any decisions on exclusion of entries from the process.</p>	<p>PwC performed background checks on the Top 10 finalists (plus two reserves). These checks comprised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online open source research, including searches of a global civil litigation databases and global sanctions and politically exposed persons databases; • Employment reference-taking <p>PwC provided a summary of the checks performed and results to the Varkey Foundation.</p>

Stage 5: Voting by the Global Teacher Prize Academy

The Varkey Foundation	PwC
<p>The Varkey Foundation formed a 'Global Teacher Prize Academy' comprised of prominent figures in their respective fields from around the world.</p> <p>Academy members included head teachers, education experts, sector commentators, journalists, public officials, technology entrepreneurs, company directors and scientists.</p>	<p>PwC hosted the Academy voting platform to collect and count the votes.</p> <p>PwC designed the platform as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PwC provided Academy members with an information pack covering all Top 10 candidates and reminded them to check this before voting; • Access to the platform was subject to confirming understanding and agreement to relevant terms; • Academy members were able to award no more than 10 votes to valid candidates; • Each Academy member was only be able to vote once during the voting window; • Access was controlled via passwords issued to Academy members directly by PwC; • The Varkey Foundation was not given access rights during the voting period; and • Voting Academy members were not able to see votes submitted by other Academy members. Votes were strictly confidential with access to cumulative totals restricted to PwC. <p>PwC closed the voting at the end of the agreed voting period.</p>
<p>The Varkey Foundation announced the winner in line with the voting above.</p>	<p>PwC confirmed that the announced winner was the individual that had the highest number of votes from the Voting Academy.</p>