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Quick Recap: What have we learned so far?

• Children, who are 8 and older and have been in school for a few years, can “pick up” quickly.

• Teaching needs to start at the level of the child. This is what is meant by “Teaching at the Right level”.

• Focus on helping children with basic reading, understanding, expressing as well as arithmetic skills – these are foundational building blocks that help a child to move forward.

• Intensive & effective strategies are needed to enable children to “catch up” in a short period of time.
Quick Recap: What is Teaching at the Right Level?

Simple one-on-one assessment done to group Grade III, IV & V children by level rather than by grade.

For each group there are a set of simple activities and materials appropriate for their level.

Children learn in groups and also individually. Teachers or instructors do activities with groups.

As children make progress they move into the next group.

Children’s groups are made according to the basic assessment. Available teachers or instructors allocated to facilitate easy to do group activities and to guide children’s work.

Similar assessment used for tracking children’s progress.
What are the key elements of our solution?

1. Identify the problem
2. Set achievable goals
3. Devise an implementation plan and set team structure
4. Capacity building and training of leaders and instructors
5. Ensure daily “practice” time for at least 15-20 days even for leaders
6. Implement complete approach including assessment with instructors
7. Monitor and support implementation via leaders
8. Periodic review and assessment of impact
9. Course correction and future planning
Building a Team to Lead

1. Pratham team train block and cluster teams

2. Practice class (daily for 15-20 days) are conducted by the Govt teams

3. Govt. Master Trainers (who have been trained & themselves conducted practice classes) train Govt. school teachers

4. Govt. school teacher teach students as per Pratham methodology
Mentoring & Monitoring: How does this work?

- Multi-stakeholder teams to support implementation with clear definition of roles and responsibilities

- Systematic plan for monitoring support including:
  - Movement plan for mentors at all levels
  - Monitoring guidelines for all mentors
  - Review schedules, at all levels
  - Agenda for reviews -> example

- Ensure process is participatory and supportive, and not detached and inspective

- Continuous feedback and stock-take mechanisms up to the highest level of authority

EXAMPLE OF REVIEW AGENDA

- Attendance – status and suggestions for improvement
- Assessment – status and sense of how much teachers understand assessment data and are guided by it
- Grouping of children – status and appropriateness as well as how much change in groups since last visit
- Teaching learning materials – status and appropriateness – what did mentor do to demonstrate better use of materials
- Activities – what did mentor see, what did mentor demonstrate, challenges faced
- Progress – status, change. Challenges faced by teachers and suggestions for helping children at different levels to move to the next level
- Other items for discussion
Does this approach to monitoring work?

The above graphs show the improvement between BL & EL by the number of visits for a partnership program in an Indian state. The visits were thoughtfully planned, such that the schools having lower BL levels received maximum visits.
What is essential to make this work?

• **Bottom-up alignment to the program:** Across all program stakeholders – Pratham, Government, Community (as the case may be)

• **First hand experiences from the practice classes/ program implementation:** Having first-hand experience of implementation allows mentors to identify and subsequently have the ability to solve major instructional and logistical challenges. Personal observations and reflections lead to a stronger belief in the activities and that learning levels can be improved.

• **Timely data entry and reporting:** Ensuring data is available at all levels to support mentoring process.

• **Setting priorities/ focus areas based on results:** Using data and to prioritize support areas including particular schools/ instructors.

• **Continuous feedback/review mechanisms:** Structured reviews at all levels of authority, ensuring feedback loop is closed, input to program and future planning.
Coaching, accountability, and evidence in a large scale instructional reform:
The case of the Tusome national literacy program

Dr. Benjamin Piper
RTI International
Literacy Programs in Kenya

- **PRIMR** – 2011-2015
  - 1384 schools
  - 250,000 children
  - Through GoK
  - Medium scale pilot
  - Compared coaching ratios

- **Tusome** – 2015-2019
  - All 23,800 schools
  - 6.4 million children
  - 23.5 million books
  - 106,000 teachers
  - PRIEDE numeracy
National Tusome Early Literacy Programme
Look at the picture. Read the story.

There is a huge ape. Its face too.
Sam went to the lake. He can swim.

Sam went to the lake. He can swim.
Key Elements of Tusome

• 1:1 learner books in English and Kiswahili
• Homework books and supplementary readers
• Structured teachers’ guides
• Termly training focused on modeling and practice
• Classroom support by coaches
• Tablet-based tools for coaches
• Tablet-based classroom data on the cloud
• Data used for accountability
Coaches using tablets
Tablet Based Observation Tools

Lesson Observation A - 
Kiswahili/English - Full PRIMR

Lesson observation

As soon as the teacher has finished the lesson, hit NEXT below to capture the end time of the lesson, and to move to the general lesson follow-up questions, lesson review, and student assessments.

What Phonemic Awareness activities were modeled?
- Thumbs up/thumbs down
- Blending
- Segmenting
- This section was skipped

Did the teacher pronounce the sound correctly?
- Yes
- No

Was the activity oral only (nothing on the board)?
- Yes
- No

Tap this button
Tablet Based Pupil Assessments
Kibera Silanga Ushirika Group Primary School

Tablet Based Teacher Feedback

Based on your classroom observations and student assessment, the following are some of the areas the teacher needs to work on. You may focus your discussion on the top 3 items.

PA: Sound Recognition - Thumbs up / Thumbs down

Say the sound clearly. Say the word clearly. Show thumbs up for each word that has the sound. Show thumbs down for each word that does not have the sound. The activity order should be “I do, We do, You do”. It is not written on the board.

Watch: Sound Recognition with Teacher Kazungu. If the teacher is having issues with the sounds, watch “English Sound Video with teacher Sarah”. If the teacher is having issues with Kiswahili sounds, watch “Kiswahili Sounds with teacher Kazungu”

Vocabulary

The teacher did not support the children to make sentences that explain the words.

1. Say the word 2. Ask the pupils if they know the word. 3. Show or define the word in simple language. 4. Have pupils use the word in a sentence that shows the meaning.
Uploading Tablet Data

Tap this button
## CSO Report (2017 Sep)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>21102 (86%)</td>
<td>25 (57%)</td>
<td>40 (45%)</td>
<td>70 (0%)</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>26 (39%)</td>
<td>49 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baringo</td>
<td>264 (39%)</td>
<td>25 (65%)</td>
<td>43 (30%)</td>
<td>69 (0%)</td>
<td>24 (77%)</td>
<td>29 (36%)</td>
<td>49 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomet</td>
<td>386 (62%)</td>
<td>17 (25%)</td>
<td>32 (24%)</td>
<td>62 (0%)</td>
<td>16 (59%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>34 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungoma</td>
<td>410 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>38 (44%)</td>
<td>60 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (60%)</td>
<td>26 (30%)</td>
<td>43 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busia</td>
<td>270 (61%)</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>38 (44%)</td>
<td>56 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (63%)</td>
<td>24 (35%)</td>
<td>56 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegeyo Marakwet</td>
<td>260 (66%)</td>
<td>21 (50%)</td>
<td>41 (42%)</td>
<td>69 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (61%)</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
<td>46 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embu</td>
<td>217 (56%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>36 (31%)</td>
<td>60 (0%)</td>
<td>19 (67%)</td>
<td>20 (23%)</td>
<td>42 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garissa</td>
<td>41 (19%)</td>
<td>12 (47%)</td>
<td>30 (23%)</td>
<td>48 (0%)</td>
<td>31 (88%)</td>
<td>22 (8%)</td>
<td>36 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homa Bay</td>
<td>978 (109%)</td>
<td>23 (60%)</td>
<td>38 (43%)</td>
<td>74 (0%)</td>
<td>21 (76%)</td>
<td>25 (39%)</td>
<td>50 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiolo</td>
<td>108 (97%)</td>
<td>19 (26%)</td>
<td>31 (22%)</td>
<td>75 (0%)</td>
<td>21 (65%)</td>
<td>23 (18%)</td>
<td>44 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>121 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (69%)</td>
<td>37 (33%)</td>
<td>68 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>28 (40%)</td>
<td>51 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakamega</td>
<td>503 (50%)</td>
<td>19 (42%)</td>
<td>32 (39%)</td>
<td>61 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>24 (30%)</td>
<td>42 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kericho</td>
<td>387 (73%)</td>
<td>22 (51%)</td>
<td>39 (45%)</td>
<td>70 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (66%)</td>
<td>22 (37%)</td>
<td>43 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## County Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of classroom visits (Percentage of Target Visits)</th>
<th>English - Class 1 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>English - Class 2 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>English - Class 3 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 1 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 2 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 3 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chania</td>
<td><strong>43 (238%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (34%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 (35%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>58 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (56%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 (28%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatamaiyu</td>
<td><strong>17 (130%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 (46%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 (50%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>77 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 (62%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatamayaga</td>
<td><strong>25 (192%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 (33%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 (12%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 (60%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (12%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgia</td>
<td><strong>9 (315%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>64 (47%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>87 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (64%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (53%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Githobokoni</td>
<td><strong>9 (36%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>35 (80%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Githunguny</td>
<td><strong>29 (223%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>84 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 (81%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (26%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Githurai</td>
<td><strong>12 (80%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 (87%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>55 (33%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 (75%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>76 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamhuri</td>
<td><strong>11 (157%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (60%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (38%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juja</td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabete</td>
<td><strong>44 (258%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 (87%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53 (78%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>72 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (87%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 (30%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiru</td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameni</td>
<td><strong>2 (33%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 (66%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td><strong>9 (64%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>83 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>39 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karui</td>
<td><strong>60 (461%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (55%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>71 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (83%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 (53%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>71 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenvatatu</td>
<td><strong>0 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
<td><strong>no data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgangso</td>
<td><strong>30 (150%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (16%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>80 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 (28%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihara</td>
<td><strong>17 (154%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 (42%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>82 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (66%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 (20%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>39 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kipake</td>
<td><strong>8 (42%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (55%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>46 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 (60%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komothai</td>
<td><strong>26 (173%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (80%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 (75%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>26 (50%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limuru</td>
<td><strong>7 (40%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 (75%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>75 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madaraka</td>
<td><strong>19 (211%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 (28%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>98 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (71%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 (45%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>64 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangu</td>
<td><strong>27 (103%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 (27%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>64 (0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 (50%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (40%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>35 (0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: www.google-analytics.com*
GPS data
Local level data
School Level Data

4. Percentage at KNEC benchmark is the percentage of those students that have met the KNEC benchmark for either Kiswahili or English, and for either class 1, class 2 or class 3, out of all of the students assessed for those subjects. The benchmarks for class 3 are yet to be defined.
## Tusome English Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Midline</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoneme segmentation</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter sound knowledge</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>11.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invented/non-word decoding</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage reading (A)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>11.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension (A)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage reading (B)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>12.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension (B)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Tusome on English Benchmarks

- **Fluent 65+ CWPM**
  - Baseline:
    - Class 1: 2%
    - Class 2: 10%
  - Midline:
    - Class 1: 18%
    - Class 2: 12%

- **Emergent 30-64 CWPM**
  - Baseline:
    - Class 1: 35%
    - Class 2: 22%
  - Midline:
    - Class 1: 30%
    - Class 2: 28%

- **Beginning 1-29 CWPM**
  - Baseline:
    - Class 1: 53%
    - Class 2: 29%
  - Midline:
    - Class 1: 29%
    - Class 2: 38%

- **Zero Reader 0 CWPM**
  - Baseline:
    - Class 1: 23%
    - Class 2: 47%
  - Midline:
    - Class 1: 11%
    - Class 2: 12%
Reflections

- External evaluation results .7 SD
- Plan research with key stakeholders
- Test in real world conditions
- Test at medium to large scale
- Simple coaching tools
- Coaching for teacher change
- Quality of education can improve
Thank you!
bpiper@rti.org
Points of departure

• “Find the long levers”
• “Don’t despise the place of small beginnings”
• “There’s no limit to what you can achieve if you don’t care who gets the credit”
• “Work ourselves out of a job”
National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP)

• Gov. programme, est. 1994 by Pres. Nelson Mandela
• Aims to feed 9 million school children in 20 000 schools a nutritious mid-morning meal every school-day
• $517m per annum
• Funded through ring-fenced mechanism directly by Treasury
• Administered by Department of Education officials at National, Provincial & District levels
• Implementation at school level (responsibility of school principal)
Supplier appointed

- Province issues tender and appoints suppliers (sometimes as many as 1200 suppliers per Province)

Delivers food to school

- Dry goods (rice, etc) delivered once a month
- Fresh goods (vegetables, fruit, etc) delivered weekly

Food prepared / cooked

- Meals prepared daily at each school by cooks (food handlers)
- A teacher normally allocates the stock for the day

Food served to children

- Meal ideally served by 10:00am
- Meals served under teacher supervision in classes

Money paid to school directly

- Province deposits funds for feeding, cooking fuel and cook payment directly to the school (school accounts for expenditure monthly)

School purchases food

- School finds a local supplier, orders and buys food directly (either off the shelf or delivered)

Food prepared / cooked

- Meals prepared daily at each school by cooks (food handlers)
- A teacher normally allocates the stock for the day

Food served to children

- Meal ideally served by 10:00am
- Meals served under teacher supervision in classes

Centralised Procurement

Decentralised Procurement
Programme monitoring before intervention

- Monitoring was taking place in 2 primary ways:
  - Visits to schools by District-based NSNP officials (wildly varying ratios – from 1:30 to 1:200 in some cases)
  - Self-reporting by schools

- Key metric being tracked was “number of learners eating”
  - Hides a multitude of sins

- Provincial monitoring tools (for site visits) were inconsistent, unfocused, subjective
Monitoring, Reporting and Response (MRR)

• FUEL started developing a methodology for programme performance improvement centred on a cycle:
What are the key steps?

**Step 1:**
Develop tool with simple indicators to measure NSNP performance at school level.

**Step 2:**
Capacitate existing resource to collect these indicators at school level.

**Step 3:**
Empower officials at all levels to consolidate and report on these indicators...

**Step 4:**
Thereby allowing officials at all levels to respond to the findings.
Score out of 100 which measures how well a school is serving a nutritious meal on time.
Key learnings

• Prioritise buy-in and ownership
  • Co-created tools, processes, close policy links
  • Not just a once-off “on-boarding” session – ongoing and integrated

• Invest in supportive relationships
  • Low ego, patient
  • One size does not fit all
  • Boost the champions

• Develop & use metrics that are:
  • Objective
  • Clear
  • Easy to consolidate
  • Useful to the primary users
Key learnings (continued)

• Invest in capacitation, support
  • Early hand-holding and scaffolding often necessary
  • Includes guides, templates, materials, etc

• (Evolving) metrics at different levels
  • Everyone likes to know how they are doing
  • BUT only if it’s done supportively

• Rituals & routines more NB than complete accuracy and analysis in first phase

• Build (and recruit for) resilience in the team

• Remember your context:
  • Politically
  • Bureaucratically
Status now

• Reporting against MRR metrics now a legislated requirement in the NSNP, with 8 of 9 Provinces effectively reporting on programme performance (with consolidated national performance review quarterly)

• FUEL on track to be on skeleton support for MRR by March 2019

• Methodology and approach adopted and being implemented by other public/private partnerships (in curriculum coverage improvement, early childhood development, etc)