

Performance & Impact Evaluation (P&IE) Semi-Annual Report, October 2013



at the UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO

PRESENTED TO:

USAID/Uganda
Joseph Mwangi

PRESENTED BY:

NORC at the University of Chicago
Jeffrey Telgarsky
Senior Vice President, International
Projects
4350 East-West Highway, 8th Floor
Bethesda, MD 20814
Telephone: (301) 634-9413
Fax: (301) 634-9301

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. HIGHLIGHTS 3

B. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES 4

 B.1 IMPACT EVALUATION ACTIVITIES 4

 B.2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND CLA ACTIVITIES 6

 B.3 REPLACEMENT OF KEY PERSONNEL POSITION 8

C. RISKS TO THE IMPACT EVALUATION 8

**D. PRELIMINARY LESSONS LEARNED FROM OPERATIONALIZING
 USAID’S CLA AGENDA 10**

**ANNEX 1: REVISED DATA COLLECTION PLAN (FROM SHRP’S
 SEPTEMBER 2013 PMP) 11**

**ANNEX 2: SHRP EVENTS, OBSERVATION TOOLS TO BE USED, AND
 OBSERVATION ASSIGNMENTS 13**

ANNEX 3: TWO NEW OBSERVATION TOOLS 24

**ANNEX 4: TEMPLATE FOR MONTHLY REPORTS PRAPARED BY LOCAL
 STAFF AS INPUTS TO FEEDBACK MEMOS 33**

**ANNEX 5: SAMPLE OF A MONTHLY FEEDBACK MEMO SUBMITTED TO
 SHRP TEAM 34**

ANNEX 6: SAMPLE OF A QUARTERLY MEMO SUBMITTED TO SHRP TEAM 37

PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT EVALUATION (P&IE) OF THE USAID/UGANDA SCHOOL HEALTH AND READING PROGRAM

NORC at the University of Chicago (NORC), in partnership with the Panagora Group, is pleased to submit to USAID/Uganda this Semi-Annual Report recording progress made on the P&IE project between July 1 and October 31, 2013. The first Semi-Annual Report for this project covered a full eight-month period for reasons laid out in that report. Therefore, this report covers activities and progress during a shorter four-month period.

In an accompanying report, we present a Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Report, which covers findings of ex-ante data quality review activities undertaken by NORC for the second rounds of the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and accompanying Learner Context Survey, as well as the KAP Survey, all of which are being fielded in October 2013. The DQA Report also presents findings of NORC's quality review of the Round 1 EGRA and KAP survey data for Cluster 1 schools.

A. HIGHLIGHTS

During this reporting period, NORC/Panagora team:

- Commenced analysis on the baseline Cluster 1 EGRA data.
- Provided the SHRP M&E teams for both Results 1 and 2 with critical support related to sampling – for both Cluster 1 Round 2 and Cluster 2 baseline (Round 1) surveys
- Systematized the process of third party performance feedback: prepared a SHRP activity tracker to ensure comprehensive monitoring, additional observation tools covering all types of SHRP events and activities, and routinized collection of documents
- Observed, on an ongoing basis, implementation activities, including training of trainers and teachers, language board meetings, and materials development workshops
- Accompanied SHRP team members on support supervision field visits to monitor implementation of Result 1 activities
- Recorded, using observation tool formats, information and observations on each activity for the mid-term and final SHRP performance evaluation; and noted appreciative and constructive comments to provide as monthly performance feedback to RTI within the context of the CLA process
- Conducted monthly performance feedback meetings with SHRP Chief of Party and M&E Director, as well as key Results 1 and 2 team members based on observations from SHRP events and activities; held a quarterly meeting (adjacent to every third monthly meeting) to discuss SHRP quarterly reports
- Conducted numerous data quality assessment (DQA) tasks including the following:
 - Conducted a data quality review of the Cluster 1 baseline EGRA and KAP datasets. Overall, we found the data to be of high quality.
 - Reviewed and provided feedback to the IP on data collection instruments for the Cluster 1 Round 2 EGRA and KAP surveys, both from the perspective of NORC's role as evaluator and data quality reviewer
 - Reviewed enumerator training manuals for the Cluster 1 Round 2 data collection

— Travelled to a selection of districts in various regions to observe data collection activities for KAP and EGRA data collections

- At the request of USAID, reviewed and provided comments on the latest version (September 2013) of the SHRP PMP document
- Identified and proposed to USAID a replacement for the key personnel position of Senior Literacy Evaluator

B. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

B.1 Impact Evaluation Activities

Sampling for EGRA and KAP Surveys

NORC's Evaluation Expert continued to work closely with the Results 1 and 2 teams on sampling matters.

EGRA Cluster 1, Round 2: Data collection in October/November 2013. For this round, NORC worked with SHRP to define the data collection strategy. In the original conception of the project, the Implementing Partner (IP) proposed to implement three different treatment arms; NORC calculated the sample size to allow us to measure the impact of each arm separately. In actual implementation, this multi-arm approach did not materialize, and all schools received the same treatment during the first year of the program. Therefore, it was possible to reduce the school sample size without compromising the statistical properties of the evaluation. Only 56 (out of 168) treatment schools were randomly selected to remain in the sample are currently being revisited for the second round of data collection. All in-district and out-of-district control schools remain in the sample.

EGRA Cluster 2, Round 1: Data collection planned for February 2014. NORC's Evaluation Expert has been working with the SHRP M&E expert to draw the school sample for the ten Cluster 2 districts. For this cluster, the IP hopes to have 3 different treatment arms and therefore 168 treatment schools will be sampled (56 in each treatment arm) and 56 in-district control schools will be included as well. As we communicated in our previous semi-annual report, for Cluster 2 and beyond, the IP is not collecting data on out-of-district schools. Hence, the scope of the evaluation findings will be reduced after Cluster 1.

KAP, Cluster 1, additional data for Round 1 (baseline) (referred to by IP as KAP2): Data collection in October 2013. The baseline for Cluster 1 was collected in June 2013. However, at that time, it was not possible to include boarding or partial boarding schools (common in post primary level) in the evaluation sample given that informed consent from parents was not obtained in time for the data collection by SHRP. A new round of data collection that aims to collect baseline data from boarding and partial-boarding schools is currently underway. NORC created a complementary random sample of those partial boarding and boarding schools based on information provided by the IP.

KAP, Cluster 2, Round 1 (referred to by IP as KAP2): Data collection in October 2013. NORC reviewed EMIS lists of primary schools in the new districts and created a random sample of schools in Cluster 2 districts. Cluster 2 only includes primary schools. SHRP significantly increased the number of primary schools in its intervention group, due to PEPFAR requirements; as a result, given budgetary constraints, USAID and the IP had to exclude post primary establishments from the Results 2 intervention in new districts (Cluster 2 and after).

Please see Annex 1 for the revised data collection plans for both EGRA and KAP surveys.

Data Quality Assessment

During this reporting period, NORC staff engaged in numerous data quality assessment (DQA) tasks related to Cluster 1 /Rounds 1 and 2 data collection for EGRA and KAP. They included the following activities:

- Conducted data quality reviews of the Cluster 1 baseline EGRA and KAP datasets. Overall, we found the data to be of high quality. Wherever questions and/or concerns about data structure or quality arose, NORC staff communicated in writing with SHRP data analysts, providing comments and questions on the datasets. The main issues NORC identified concerned some duplicate questionnaires and uncoded missing values (more details are presented in the DQA report). SHRP staff responded promptly to queries.
- Reviewed and provided feedback on all data collection instruments – EGRA and learner context instruments, teacher/head teacher survey, classroom observation tool, KAP survey – identifying instances where modifications to the baseline survey instruments were causes for concern. For example, we noted that several questions about asset ownership had been removed from the Learner Context survey, and requested that they be added back in to the Round 2 survey instrument, since these questions are important to determining socioeconomic status of respondent. While the IP attempted to comply with this request and add the questions back, it was not possible since the questionnaire had already been programmed into Tangerine.
- We also reviewed two important changes to the EGRA tool proposed by the IP: namely, (1) swapping of the reading passages; and (2) randomization of items in the other subtasks (e.g. letter sound knowledge, word and non-word decoding). Upon discussion with our Senior Literacy Expert, we concluded that both decisions by the IP were sound as swapping reading passages (using a passage of similar difficulty level previously vetted through the equating process done during Round 1) and re-randomizing items in other subtasks ensures that students are tested on actual literacy skills and not on memory skills.
- With the exception of a few changes/modifications that required some attention and feedback, we noted that the Round 2 questionnaires were largely similar to those used in Round 1.
- Reviewed training manual for the KAP survey, which is largely similar to Round 1
- Reviewed the field manual for the EGRA survey, which is also largely similar to Round 1
- Tested the tablet version of the questionnaires and provided feedback on glitches and missing skips. The IP agreed to address the issues.
- Participated in the enumerator training for the KAP Survey - NORC's local staff participated in the KAP enumerator training and pilot test. Overall, reports from NORC's local staff, who attended the training and pre-test, indicated that the training was of high quality. Trainers, many of who had participated in the previous KAP training, exhibited comprehensive knowledge in KAP survey data collection methodologies and were skilled in delivering the training course. The training was well structured and sequenced by modules covering the SHRP program, survey methodology, and instrument to be used for data collection.
- Given the one week timeframe available to collect data before school exams begin, the IP had to increase significantly the number of assessors for this round of the KAP survey. Therefore, the assessors consisted of veteran and new enumerators. We did not observe any notable concerns with the new assessors, many of who had previously participated in similar survey efforts.
- Conducted field observations during the first two weeks of data collection – NORC's Resident Evaluation Manager and Senior HIV/AIDS Specialist travelled to the field to observe field work

for both the KAP Cluster 1, supplemental and Cluster 2 Round 1 data collection and the EGRA Cluster 1, Round 2 data collection in October 2013 respectively. Due to the coincidence of Round 2 data collection and the delivery date for the present report, we will provide a full report on Round 2 data collection in the next Semi-Annual Report.

B.2 Performance Evaluation and CLA Activities

Systematic observation and documentation of project implementation activities as inputs for the performance evaluations.

During the reporting period, the NORC/Panagora team refined its processes for systematically monitoring and documenting progress on SHRP implementation activities, as part of the performance evaluation. We also fine-tuned our system for carrying out the CLA elements of our contract and providing RTI with performance feedback on an ongoing basis. Towards that end we have routinized actions and coordination mechanisms related to third party monitoring, documentation, and performance feedback into a monthly calendar of activities. Monthly activities consist of:

- Preparation and submission of a monthly activities report and draft SHRP performance feedback memo by P&IE country staff to U.S.-based P&IE team
- Monthly in-person meetings between P&IE country staff and relevant SHRP team members to review and discuss the prior month's work and upcoming activities/events
- Full P&IE team meeting to discuss performance feedback memo and monthly in-country activities (U.S.-based and in-country staff)
- Monthly performance feedback meeting with SHRP project staff
- Performance Evaluation/CLA coordination meeting (Panagora, in-country staff)

Box 1: Tools and reports used by the P&IE team for observing & documenting implementation activities

SHRP Events and Assignment Tracker. Serves as a management tool to ensure coverage of events by our P&IE local staff and to track submission of all observation reports (see Annex 2). The tracker is updated regularly, based on updated activity plans provided to us by the SHRP team, and utilized for forward planning.

Observation tools. To ensure uniform and comprehensive information and reporting about all events attended by our country staff. To date we have developed six different observation tools: Materials Development Observation Tool (new, developed this period); Monitoring and Support Supervision Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP (new, developed this period); Training Development Observation Tool; Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1; Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS - R2; Data Collection Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP. (The two new tools are appended in Annex 3; older tools were presented in the first SAR.)

P&IE document binder. To facilitate access and review of implementation progress, in particular in anticipation of the performance evaluations, all reports generated have been systematically organized as hard copies into a binder. This includes reports based on the observation tools, monthly reports produced by our local staff, and monthly and quarterly feedback memo sent to the SHRP team.

Monthly report. Our in-country staff prepares monthly reports due on the first Monday of each month following their monthly P&IE country staff meeting, where they review the previous month's SHRP activities, generate a first draft of the feedback memo to RTI and plan for the month ahead. The monthly reports follow a template which includes a summary of SHRP's activities observed; overall progress against the work plan & PMP; planned activities for the following month; and items/concerns for discussion/resolution/action (please see Annex 4 for template for internal monthly reports).

The memos, meetings and feedback activities listed above have the end goal of accurately documenting the P&IE team's observations of implementation activities and providing appreciative and constructive feedback to the SHRP team, so they can use our observations and suggestions to improve implementation in real time.

During this reporting period, the P&IE team observed and provided feedback on the following activities:

- Monitoring and Support Supervision Orientation Workshop for District Education Officials, Kabale district – 7/15/13
- Monitoring and Support Supervision for EGR activities, Kabale district – 7/15 – 7/19

- Implementing Partners Meeting and Joint Planning Meeting with MoEs Year 2 – 7/23 – 7/24
- Result 2 rapid monitoring and data collection – Ongoing activity
- Result 2 data management, assessment, and M&E workshop – 8/16
- Cluster 2 P.1 material development workshop – 8/27 – 9/4
- Finalize KAP survey instruments and consent forms – 9/23 – 9/27
- KAP data collection – 9/29 – 10/11
- EGRA data collection Cluster 1 follow-up – 10/14 – 11/1

Collaboration, Learning and Adaptation (CLA) Activities

To implement the CLA component of the P&IE contract, we provide performance feedback, drawn from the observation activities and tools discussed above, to the SHRP team on a monthly basis. The purpose of the monthly performance feedback session is to provide both appreciative and constructive feedback particularly on elements of performance where real-time feedback will help to strengthen performance and lead to better outcomes.

The performance feedback is drawn directly from the reports of events and activities observed by P&IE in-country staff. Our in-country staff collates their observations and comments into a draft performance feedback memo, which the full P&IE team reviews, comments on and discusses. The PE Team Leader finalizes and sends the memo in advance to the SHRP team, following which she leads a feedback session with the SHRP project’s leadership and the full P&IE team participating. All discussions are incorporated into the final feedback memo and provided to the IP within a week of the feedback session (see Annex 5 for samples of monthly feedback memos).

During this reporting period, the P&IE team organized four monthly feedback sessions. The SHRP team has found the third party perspective on performance very informative and useful. The NORC P&IE team has obtained useful clarifications during the feedback sessions. We are pleased that this somewhat sensitive exercise is perceived as a valued and welcome opportunity to achieve its underlying purpose of improving performance and results achievement in real time.

Quarterly Meetings. The P&IE and SHRP teams meet on a quarterly basis (after the feedback session every third month), following the submission of the SHRP quarterly progress report to USAID. The purpose of this meeting is to provide commentary on the contents of the quarterly report to help the implementing partner strengthen performance, and also to obtain information that will improve the quality and utility of P&IE’s third party monitoring and performance evaluations. Prior to the meeting, P&IE team prepares and sends to the SHRP team a memo with comments and questions on the quarterly report (See Annex 6 for sample memo). While this process is still evolving, we anticipate that our comments will generally fall into the following areas:

- Overall comments and questions on the quarterly report
- Questions on progress toward overall achievement of results
- Comments on progress against detailed elements of the work plan
- Review of progress on PMP indicators

Box 2: Examples of appreciative and constructive feedback provided to the SHRP team

Appreciative Feedback.

- Use of collaborative and participatory training approaches
- Use of skilled, well-trained enumerators
- Extending reach through use of interns for data collection
- Adapting support supervision approach to EGRA
- Proactive orientation of MoEs and DEO officials to SHRP EGR in August

Constructive Feedback

- Effect of delays in availability/distribution of EGRA instructional materials
- Administrative issues associated with registration and allowances at meetings/workshops
- Need for more effective communications outreach to parents on the new program and consent forms
- Need for effective allocation of time to different topics within training sessions
- Utility of aligning reports to the work plan and PMP

We held our first quarterly meeting with the SHRP Chief of Party and M&E Director in August 2013. They appreciated the opportunity to have a third party perspective and noted that it made them aware of the need, in future quarterly reports, to clarify the relationship of the report to the work plan and PMP.

Performance Evaluation Planning

During this reporting period, the P&IE team started planning for the mid-term Performance Evaluation, which is scheduled to occur in the second quarter of 2014, with the PE report due on August 31, 2014. The PE team, comprised of the PE Leader, Senior HIV and AIDS Evaluator, and Literacy/Education Specialist, is primarily responsible for the two performance evaluations, and will take the lead in preparing a detailed mid-term Performance Evaluation Plan, due in April 2014. The PE Team will consult closely with the full P&IE team and use the performance evaluation design presented in the Evaluation Design Report (January 31, 2012) as the foundation for the plan. The mid-term evaluation will most likely commence in June 2014, when schools are in session and can be visited, and to ensure sufficient time for all steps in the performance evaluation process. While the PE team will bring the enhanced understanding afforded through the third party monitoring, it will still carry out the usual steps in the PE process, from finalizing the team's schedule; holding a team planning meeting in country; carrying out key informant interviews and focus group discussions, and analyzing reports and data; preparing and vetting key findings, conclusions, and recommendations; and writing and vetting the final report.

B.3 Replacement of Key Personnel Position

NORC's Senior Literacy Evaluator recently left her faculty position at American University and joined a consulting company as a fulltime employee. As such, she became unavailable to consult with NORC on the Performance & Impact Evaluation Project. During the past month, NORC identified a highly qualified replacement for her. In September 2013, we submitted to USAID / Uganda's procurement office a request for approval for a key personnel change. We propose to fill the currently vacant Key Personnel position with an education specialist, who has extensive experience designing and managing program evaluations, quantitative (experimental and quasi-experimental design) impact evaluations, Early Grade Reading and Math Assessments (EGRA and EGMA), large-scale assessments of student learning, and mixed methods situational analyses and program evaluation research in a wide range of countries. At present, we are awaiting approval from USAID for this Key Personnel change.

C. RISKS TO THE IMPACT EVALUATION

Below we present an assessment of risks/challenges to the impact evaluation design that have emerged during the course of the project. The list consist of challenges identified during the current reporting period (items 1-6), as well as issues presented in the first semi-annual report, which are still relevant (items 7 & 8).

- (1) Result 1: Delays in the implementation of Result 1 continued through this reporting period. Although all the trainings have taken place, including refresher TOT and teacher training on Cluster 1 P1 materials (teacher guides and primers), these instructional materials were still being distributed to Cluster 1 schools as late as September/October 2013. Our understanding is that materials have not reached all schools at the time of writing this report. In addition, the original plans that included three different treatment arms were modified and treatment was uniform across all schools. Baseline data collection for Cluster 1 was completed successfully in February, and follow-on data collection for Cluster 1 is being fielded among a sub-sample of primary schools. These delays and modifications to the implementation do not pose serious risks to the evaluation at this juncture. We plan to evaluate the impact of the program as it was implemented.

While the implementation changes/delays are not a risk to the evaluation design, an important fact to keep in mind, however, is that we do not expect to see the impacts of the full Result 1 intervention (teacher training and instructional materials) during this first impact analysis, using Oct/Nov 2013 data. However, the Oct/Nov 2013 data will provide us with an opportunity to measure the impact of multiple rounds of teacher training.

- (2) Result 1: The most recent version of the SHRP PMP indicates that no data will be collected from Cohort 2 in 2016. Going forward with this decision would imply that the impact evaluation for Cohort 2 would only be possible for P1 and P2 but not for P3. Given that Cohort 1 did not receive the full intervention in 2013, Cohort 2 will be the only group that will have a chance to receive three years of full treatment from the beginning of their primary education. The Evaluation Expert already mentioned this omission as a concern to USAID and to the IP as well.
- (3) Result 1: Data for the second EGRA wave are being collected as we write this report. Initial information from the field indicates low response rates (i.e. low numbers of students are being found) in the schools in the Central Region compared to baseline. We are currently working with the IP to try to address this problem and minimize the risks of having a small sample.
- (4) Result 2: There are several issues related to sample that have surfaced during the ongoing KAP data collection, which are likely to pose threats to the evaluation of Result 2 activities.

We noted in our first Semi-Annual Report that, it was not possible to include boarding or partial boarding schools -very common among post-primary establishments- in the evaluation sample, given delays in obtaining parental consent for the KAP Survey during the school year. We decided, however, to use the second round of the KAP survey (KAP2) to collect additional baseline data from Cluster 1 boarding and partial boarding post-primary schools by distributing parental consent forms to students before the school break. The idea was to ensure that the baseline survey consisted of a representative sample of post-primary schools, thereby allowing us to generalize the results of the impact evaluation to all such schools in the districts.

We recently learned of several problems that the IP is encountering with the supplemental boarding school component of the second round of KAP surveys. These problems could potentially have serious implications for sample size and the representativeness of the post-primary school sample:

- The IP faced resistance to data collection activities from some schools, where principals cited concerns that the survey would take away from exam preparation time (national exams in post-primary schools begin in the 2nd week of October) and some head teachers did not distribute consent forms to students at all. These schools could not be interviewed.
- Some schools closed before the end of the term and consent forms were not distributed on time. These schools could not be interviewed.
- Other programs related to HIV/AIDS have interacted with some of the schools and, therefore, head teachers decided not to participate in KAP. This is particularly the case of private secondary schools. These schools could not be interviewed.
- The sample frame that the IP provided NORC for selection of the school sample for the KAP2 contained errors; it included schools that already participated in the first round of KAP. In cases where these schools were randomly selected for the KAP2 sample, they had to be removed from the sample and, where possible, replaced.

NORC has requested from the IP a list of all schools in the KAP2 sample with disposition comments for each of the schools. After evaluating the situation we will have a clearer impression of the effect that these problems can have on the evaluation. At a minimum, we expect a reduction in sample size.

- (5) Result 2: As mentioned above, SHRP decided not to include post primary establishments in new treatment districts (Cluster 2 and after). Therefore, we will only be able to assess the impact of the Result 2 intervention on post-primary educational facilities for Cluster 1 schools.
- (6) Result 2: Based on the most recent PMP, we note that the Result 2 intervention will no longer be conducted in Cluster 3 districts and schools. As a result, NORC will focus its evaluation of Result 2 on Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 schools.
- (7) Result 1: Given program implementation delays in Year 1, the academic term was delayed for one week in the 11 districts of Cluster 1 where the IP is working in order to build in time to prepare and have teacher guides ready for the second training of teachers. Additional classes to compensate for the one week delay are not currently planned. An equivalent delay did not occur in the control district schools; therefore, the academic year in those schools will be one week longer. We do not anticipate a visible effect, but it is worth mentioning how the reality of the program may affect the evaluation.
- (8) Result 2: After NORC selected the samples for the impact evaluation of the School Health activity, the focus of the intervention underwent some changes in order to align with PEPFAR priorities. We were informed that the intervention would target large schools (with over 150 students) in high HIV prevalence districts; this brought into question the external validity of the impact evaluation and the ability to include non-intervention districts with similar characteristics to treatment districts in the design. However, these new criteria do not seem to have affected the actual selection of districts and we will proceed with the original evaluation design. However the number of treatment schools increased. The IP went ahead with the selection of schools for treatment and control before NORC could approve the selection. As a consequence no replacements for control schools were selected. This can result in a smaller sample than needed. The Evaluation Expert discussed this issue with the IP and USAID.

D. PRELIMINARY LESSONS LEARNED FROM OPERATIONALIZING USAID'S CLAGENDA

Our goal during the first year of the project was to design and implement an effective process for third party observation/monitoring and performance feedback that helps enhance performance in real time. This is a very new concept and USAID/Uganda is pioneering it. We have developed an approach that the implementing partner views positively as one that offers them something of value and use. The feedback, provided within two weeks following each month's observed activities, allows the SHRP team to integrate the feedback quickly in terms of performance timelines (months not the years which has been the norm in third party performance feedback).

We have noted that an appreciative approach to the feedback is critical to success, so that the implementing partner hears positive feedback as well as constructive criticism. Providing the feedback in writing but also taking the time to have a conversation about it is important. While the in-country staff articulate the performance feedback based on their observations, having the whole P&IE team involved in the discussion of the feedback memo with the SHRP leadership helps elevate the importance of the process, and maintain focus on content and integration of the feedback into SHRP activities.

The ongoing observation of project implementation and discussion of implementation progress and performance with the implementing partner has also been critical for identifying possible threats and risks to the impact evaluation, allowing us to make adjustments to the sampling and evaluation designs, as needed, to mitigate these risks.

ANNEX 1: REVISED DATA COLLECTION PLAN (FROM SHRP'S SEPTEMBER 2013 PMP)

Result 1 – Reading Program

Adjusted Early Grade Reading Assessment Data Collection Plan: 2013-2016

This table only includes data collection that is relevant to the impact evaluation.

	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	FEB	NOV	FEB	NOV	FEB	NOV	FEB	NOV
Cluster 1 A (4 LANGUAGES)								
Treatment	P1:30	P1:30		P2:30		P3:30		P4:30
Control w/in district	P1:30	P1:30		P2:30		P3:30		P4:30
Control out district	P1:30	P1:30		P2:30		P3:30		P4:30
# of schools	280	168		TBD		TBD		TBD
Cluster 2 * (8 LANGUAGES)								
Treatment			P1: 30	P1: 30		P2:30		P3:30
Control w/in district			P1:30	P1:30		P2:30		P3:30
Control out district			----	----		----		----
# of schools			TBD	TBD		TBD		TBD
Cohort 3 (12 LANGUAGES)								
Treatment					P1:30	P1:30		P2:30
Control w/in district					P1:30	P1:30		P2:30
Control out district					----	----		----
# of schools					TBD	TBD		TBD

* As noted before, the IP no longer intends to collect data in 2016 for Cluster 2.

Result 2 – School Health Program

HIV and AIDS Assessment Data Collection Plan: 2013-2016

	2013		2015	2016
	BASELINE		MIDLINE	ENDLINE
	JUNE	OCT	OCT	OCT
Cluster 1				
Treatment	P4-P7 S1-S5 (partial)	S1-S5 (supplement)	P6-P7 S1-S5	P7 S1-S5
Control w/in district				
Control out district				
# of schools	Under revision		TBD	TBD
Cluster 2				
Treatment	[REDACTED]	P4-P7	P5-P7	P6-P7
Control w/in district				
Control out district				
# of schools	Under revision		TBD	TBD
Cluster 3				
In reviewing the data collection timeline in the September 2013 PMP, we note that the Result 2 intervention no longer occurs in the Cluster 3 districts/schools. This is a significant change in the implementation plans.				

**ANNEX 2: SHRP EVENTS, OBSERVATION TOOLS TO BE USED, AND OBSERVATION
ASSIGNMENTS**

LAST UPDATED OCT. 9, 2013

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
November							
Rapid Assessment of existing EMIS data reporting system in Education and Sports Sector (ESS)	Nov. 14 – 16, 2012	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
Meeting of key district leaders to introduce the School Health and Reading Program	Nov. 20, 2012	Meeting: to introduce SHRP to district leaders, familiarize them with planned activities for implementation, & clarify roles and responsibilities of district leaders in implementation	1 day	Training Observation Tool	Evelyn	Mar. 30, 2013	
School Health and Reading Program Planning Workshop	Nov. 22 – 23, 2012	Meeting: to review Y1 work plan, share result framework & PMP indicators, activity timelines, & clarify roles & responsibilities for SHRP staff & MOES counterparts	2 days	NA	Evelyn	Nov. 26, 2012	
Envisioning workshop for HIV reporting and assessment system in Education and Sports sector	Nov. 27-28, 2012	Workshop: to facilitate discussion among stakeholders to develop a reporting and assessment vision and strategy for HIV/AIDS education data and to identify priorities and create an action plan for achieving the vision	2 days	Training Development Observation Tool	Evelyn	Mar. 30, 2013	
Orientation of National HIV/AIDS Counseling Trainers	Nov. 29-30, 2012	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
December							
First EGRA Adaptation Workshop (Leblango & Ateso)	Dec. 3 -7, 2012	Workshop: to provide an overview of SHRP, EGRA, & review English EGRA tools in Leblango & Luganda languages	5 days	Training Observation Tool	Evelyn	Dec. 17, 2012	
Local Language Board Workshop cluster 1 languages: Leblango, Luganda, R/R and Ateso	Dec. 12-14, 2012	Training: introduction to the SHRP, share early grade reading implementation plan, key components and skills of early grade reading, and introduce pre-reading and reading demonstration lessons for P1 children	3 days	Activity not observed			
Lead Facilitator Orientation in EGR	Dec. 19-21, 2012	Training: training of national level trainers selected from MoES, NCDC, college tutors, & others	2 ½ days	Training Observation Tool	Evelyn	Jan. 2,2012	

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
January							
Second EGRA Adaptation workshop (Ateso & Runyakore /Rukiga)	Jan 7-11, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
CCT orientation/TOT on early grade reading	Jan. 3-5, 2012	Workshop: to introduce SHRP, EGR implementation plans, key components of EGR, demonstrate P1 pre-reading & reading micro lessons, & engage participants in material production	3 days	Training Development Observation Tool & Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn	Mar. 30, 2013	
HIV /AIDS counseling training for Teachers and School Nurses (Central Region)	Jan. 7-11, 2013	Training: training covered the following: HIV/AIDS, counseling and communication skills for students with HIV/AIDS and students with special needs	5 days	Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS/R2	Evelyn		
HIV /AIDS counseling training for Teachers and School Nurses (Western Region)	Jan. 6-12, 2013	Training: training covered the following: HIV/AIDS, counseling and communication skills for students with HIV/AIDS and students with special needs		Not attended due to concurrence w/ another training			
HIV /AIDS counseling training for Teachers and School Nurses (Eastern Region)	Jan. 13-18, 2013	Training: training covered the following: HIV/AIDS, counseling and communication skills for students with HIV/AIDS and students with special needs		Not attended due to concurrence w/ another training			
HIV /AIDS Counseling Training for Teachers and School Nurses (Northern Region)	Jan. 14-18, 2013	Training: training covered the following: HIV/AIDS, counseling and communication skills for students with HIV/AIDS and students with special needs	5 days	Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS/R2	Stella	Mar. 25, 2013	Yes
Teachers EGR training in different regions (I attended one for central region, but activity was in all SHRP regions and different CCs)	Jan. 14-18, 2013	Training: Training for teachers in different SHRP regions about EGR skills and preparation of micro lessons/demonstrations.	5 days	Narrative report	Evelyn		
P.1 Instructional and reading framework design meeting at NCDC	Jan. 15, 2013	Meeting: Orienting LLB members and writers about SHRP Instructional and Reading framework that was to be used in design of P.1 materials.	½ day	Submitted Minutes. Find them attached	Evelyn		

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
Stakeholder Consultative meeting on the Formation of LLBs	Jan. 22, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
Materials Writing Workshop (Primary 1 in for 4 cluster 1 Languages and English)	Jan. 28 – Feb. 22, 2013	Workshop: to provide overview of SHRP, share P1 material development methodology, develop P1 reading materials in Cohort 1 languages (Luganda, Ateso, Leblago, & Runyankore/Rukiga) & English	1 month	Training Development Observation Tool & Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn		Yes
February							
National HIV Education Indicators workshop	Feb. 6-8, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
EGRA Assessor Training	Feb. 11-20, 2013	The training time included pilot testing for the survey protocols.	8 ½ days	Training Development Observation Tool & Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn		
EGRA Field Work /Data Collection	Feb. 21-Mar. 20, 2013	Data Collection: EGR baseline data collection in SHRP cohort one districts and non-intervention districts. Interviews were conducted with learners (P.1 & P.3), teachers and school administrators.	Varied for each region	Data Collection Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP	Evelyn	Apr. 11, 2013 Gomba (4 schools), Kumi(2 schools), Ngora(1 school)	
Follow up support supervision for the G and C teachers in program schools	Feb 23-Mar. 15, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
March							
ESS HIV Education Indicators Development Reference Guide Workshop	Mar. 4-6, 2013	Meeting: to review literature on HIV/AIDS, objectives & methodology Note: Activity not observed however in-country staff attended the dissemination for ESS HIV Indicators Development Reference Guide, which was a half day meeting at MoES. held on Apr 17, 2013			Activity not observed		
Reviewing and approving cluster 2 and 3 Languages and Districts	Mar. 13, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
Sensitizing communities on formation of Language Boards for Clusters 2 Languages	Mar. 25-27, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
April							
P2 materials development workshop (Cluster 1 Languages)	Apr. 8-24, 2013	In-country staff were not made aware of this event					
EGRA data analysis and report compilation	Apr. 19, 2013				Activity not observed		
Dissemination of EGRA Report to stakeholders within MoES structures (Basic Education, TIET, EPPD)	Not yet conducted						
TOT PIASCY (Primary and Secondary)	Apr. 22-26, 2013	Training: to strengthen knowledge and skills of participants on HIV/AIDS, new approaches, select appropriate activities for PIASCY, demonstrate training skills/methods, strengthen capacities of participants to design HIV/AIDS activities for effective implementation, create awareness and importance for data management, share concept of school family initiative, draw-up program for 2013	5 days	Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS - R2 & Training Development Observation Tool	Evelyn & Stella	May 3, 2013 (three reports)	
Review Meeting to plan integration of Special Needs Education in the Program	Not yet conducted						
May							
Meeting of key cluster 2 district leaders to introduce the School Health and Reading Program	May 3, 2013	Meeting: to introduce the USAID/SHRP to key district leaders to facilitate the roll-out of activities to target districts	1 day	Narrative Report	Evelyn	May 7, 2013	
Training PIASCY Primary and	May 6-18, 2013	Training: to prepare teachers to deliver enhanced PIASCY HIV/AIDS content in and outside of the classroom using	2 weeks	Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS - R2	Evelyn (Ateso)	May 23, 2013	

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
Secondary School Teachers		participatory methods		Narrative Report	region two reports) Stella (Western & Central region)		
P1 Early Grade Literacy Instruction for Master trainers	May 20-21, '2013	Training: to utilize SHRP instructional materials to improve classroom literacy instruction, acquire skills in teaching EGR, identify ways of assessing learner's ability to read and write in large classes, make action plan to guide teaching	2 days	Training development checklist Training Observation Tool for EGRA/R1	Evelyn	May 27, 2013	EGR Master trainer workshop
P1 Early Grade Literacy Instruction for TOTs	May 22-25 2013	Training: to utilize SHRP instructional materials to improve classroom literacy instruction, acquire skills in teaching EGR, identify ways of assessing learner's ability to read and write in large classes, make action plan to guide teaching	4 days	Training development checklist Training observation checklist	Stella Evelyn	May 27, 2013	
Orienting / Training teachers to use PI materials at 7 centers	May 27-June 1, 2013	Training for teachers on P1 materials under Shimon CPTC: Wakiso district & Luganda local language group. Under Kabulasoke CPTC: Gomba district, Luganda local language group)	4 days	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn	Jun. 11, 2013 (2 reports)	
Cluster 2 Languages Orthography Review	May 27-Jun. 14, 2013				Activity not observed		
June							
KAP Assessor Training	June 4-8, 2013	Training to orient researchers to SHRP, KAP survey, & data collection tools & guidelines	5 days	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn Stella	Jun. 11, 2013	
KAP Data collection in schools	Jun. 12-28, 2013	Data collection		Data Collection Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP	Evelyn	July 5, 2013 (8 reports)	
					Stella	July 17, 2013 (5 reports)	
Consultative meetings for approval of Cluster 2 Language Orthographies	Jun. 24-29, 2013 Are these dates correct?						
Alpha testing of C1 P 2 materials	TBD						

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
July							
KAP data analysis and report compilation	No dates provided on RTI tracker						
Monitoring and Support Supervision Orientation Workshop for District Education Officials in Kabale District	Jul. 15, 2013	Workshop: To share monitoring support supervision tools with head teachers, CCTs, and District officials.	½ day	NA	Evelyn	Jul. 15, 2013	
Monitoring and Support Supervision for EGR activities in R/R region, Kabale district	Jul. 15-19, 2013		5 days		Evelyn		
Implementing Partners Meeting and Joint Planning Meeting with MoEs Year 2	Jul. 23-24, 2013	Meeting: To review SHRP implementation status, discuss Y2 work plan Oct 2013-Sept 2014, and review roles and responsibilities of MoEs partners in Y2	2 days	NA	Evelyn & Stella	Jul. 29, 2013	
Monitoring and Support Supervision for EGR activities in Ateso region, Serere/Kole districts	Jul 29-31, 2013		3 days		Evelyn		
August							
Result 2 rapid Monitoring and data collection	Ongoing activity	School visits: data collection on learners reached with HIV education through SHRP activities such as SFIs and HIV clubs.	ongoing	Support supervision tool	Stella	Aug. 5, 2013	
Result 2 Data Management, Assessment and M&E workshop	Aug 14 – 16' 2013	Training: Training MoEs staff in data management, Assessment and M&E	2 ½ days	Training delivery tool	Evelyn	Sept. 2, 2013	
Material development for cluster 2 P.1 materials	Aug 15 – Sept 13, 2013	Training and writing: Training in SHRP EGR methodology and writing approaches	22 days	Material development tool	Evelyn		
Revision of cluster 1 P.2 materials	English books: Aug 15–	Reviewing process: Revising cluster 1 P.2 primers and teachers guides	15 days		Activity not observed		

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
	19, 2013 Local language books: Aug 19 – 30, 2013						
Debrief meeting on outcomes of EGR Support Supervisions in schools	Aug 18, 2013	Meeting: To discuss findings from the EGR support supervisions with MoES	½ day		Activity not observed		
Early Grade Reading methodology training for MoES and DEOs	Aug 29-30, 2013	Training: Orientation on SHRP reading methodology, teacher training approaches and roles of education officers in SHRP	2 days	Training delivery tool	Evelyn	Sept. 2, 2013	
Orthography training for cluster 2 language writing panels	Aug 4-9, 2013	Training: Affirm orthographies developed, gather texts, scoping and sequencing to support upcoming material development activities.	6 days		Activity not observed		
Printing of cluster 1 P.1 materials		RTI expected to have first batch delivery of books on 12 th August, 2013	n/a		Activity not observed		
Early Grade Reading support supervision in Kole, Serere, Katakwi districts	July 29– Aug 2, 2013	A half day orientation meeting: District education leaders, CCTs, Tutors about EGR supervision tools. School visits: To provide support to the teachers to teach reading in the classroom and to support head teachers, CCTs and inspectors in their role to provide support to teachers and schools. And provide direct feedback to teachers and head teachers in areas that need improvement – include specific action plans. Provide practical guidance on lesson planning and materials development	½ day 4 days	Support supervision tool	Evelyn		
Early Grade Reading support supervision in Kumi, Wakiso and Lira districts	Aug 5-9, 2013	As above	½ day 4 days	Support supervision tool	Evelyn		
Quality Assurance checks for cluster 1 P.1 printed materials		Ongoing for all batches delivered at SHRP offices by the printers			Activity not observed		

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
EGRA adaptation workshops for cluster 2 languages; Lugbarati, Leb Acoli, Runyoro-Rutooro	Aug 14-16, 2013	Training: Translate EGRA tool in cluster 2 local languages using the developed orthography	5 days	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn		
EGRA adaptation workshops for cluster 2 languages; Lugbarati, Leb Acoli, Runyoro-Rutooro	Aug 12-16, 2013	Training: SHRP EGR methodology, and translation of EGRA tool in the respective local languages Pretest: Field pretesting for the EGRA tools translated. Debrief meeting: Discuss outcomes from the pretest.	2 1/2 days 1 day 1 day	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn		
EGRA adaptation workshops for cluster 2 languages; Lugbarati, Leb Acoli, Runyoro-Rutooro	Aug19-23, 2013	Training: SHRP EGR methodology, and translation of EGRA tool in the respective local languages Pretest: Field pretesting for the EGRA tools translated. Debrief meeting: Discuss outcomes from the pretest.	2 1/2 days 1 day 1 day	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn		
September							
Cluster 2 P.1 material development workshop	Aug 27 – Sept 4, 2013	Materials development		Materials development observation tool	Evelyn	Sept. 29, 2013	
Cluster 1 P.1 readers and teachers guide delivery to schools	No clear date given	Distribution of cluster 1 P.1 printed materials to schools					
Annual National Stakeholders meeting on HIV ins ESS	Did not happen	Meeting of SHRP stakeholders. Participants include MoES, District leaders, schools, NGOs, UAC, HDPs, EDPs, MoH Did not happen, awaiting dissemination of the KAP survey report					
Support holding of MoES HIV/AIDS Technical Working Group meetings	On-going				Not observed; Meetings ongoing		
Dissemination of HIV/AIDS education text messages to teachers to reinforce HIV and AIDS prevention knowledge and skills	On-going				Not observable		

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
Finalize Institutional Gap Analysis study	Sept 2-13, 2013						
Refresher training on Cluster 1 P.1 Instruction materials for TOTs	Sept 3-5, 2013	Training: Share experiences on implementation of SHRP EGR methodology, read through cluster 1 P.1 printed materials, review letter sounds, conduct micro teaching of lit 1, lit 2, oral lit, news and English lessons, orient them on use of support supervision books, discuss CCT roles, take CCTs and inspectors through continuous support supervision plan, review common difficult aspects and lay strategies of handling them.	3 days	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn (Sept. 5 observed)	Sept. 20, 2013	
Refresher training on Cluster 1 P.1 Instruction materials for Teachers	Sept 10-12, 2013	Training: Share experiences on implementation of SHRP EGR methodology, read through cluster 1 P.1 printed materials, review letter sounds, review continuous assessment matrix, micro teaching of lit 1, lit 2, oral lit, news and English lessons, orient them on head teachers' roles in supporting teachers teach reading, orient them on use of support supervision books.	3 days	Training Observation Tool: EGRA - R1	Evelyn	Sept. 20, 2013	
Distribute parental consent forms to participating schools (KAP survey).	Sept. 16–20, 2013		5 days		Not observable		
Sensitization meeting with head teachers on KAP survey	Sept 16-20, 2013	Meeting	5 days		Not observed		
Approval, printing, dissemination and distribution of Indicator technical Reference Guide	Sept. 16-27, 2013	Meeting: Participants include MoES, District leaders, schools, NGOs, UAC, HDPs, EDPs, MoH Approval still pending as of Oct. 9, 2013	10 days		Not observable		
Monitoring and data collection for HIV activities	Sept 16 – 27, 2013	Data collection: To be carried out in schools where data verification is needed, and schools that were closed at the time of data collection	10 days		Not observed; Similar activity previously observed		
HIV baseline report dissemination meeting	Sept. 24, 2013	Meeting to disseminate findings of the HIV/AIDS baseline report	1 day		Did not happen		

Event	Date	Description & Type of event	Duration	Observation tool*	Observer	Date report submitted	RTI report obtained
Finalize KAP survey instruments and consent forms	Sept 23–27 2013	Training: To introduce researchers to SHRP and train them on KAP survey and data collection tools	5 days	Training Observation Tool: HIV/AIDS– R2	Evelyn & Stella	Sept. 29, 2013	
October							
KAP data collection	Sept. 29–Oct. 11, 2013	Data collection:		Data Collection Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP	Stella		
Cluster 2 EGRA adaptation workshop	Oct. 7-?	Training:					
EGRA data collection Cluster 1 follow-up	Oct. 14-?	Data collection:		Data Collection Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP			
November							
EGRA assessor training (cluster 2 Languages)							
Training of cluster 2 teachers in using P 1 materials							
December							

ANNEX 3: TWO NEW OBSERVATION TOOLS
(1) Materials Development Observation Tool
(2) Monitoring and Support Supervision Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP

Process Evaluation

Monitoring and Support Supervision Observation Tool: EGRA and KAP

I. Observation Profile

District: _____
 Coordinating Centre: _____
 School name: _____
 EMIS number: _____
 School type (circle all that apply): 1. Government 2. Private 3. Day 4. Boarding
 Number of learners: 1. Girls____ 2. Boys____
 Grade level (circle one): 1. Primary 2. Secondary 3. BVET
 Date of observation: _____
 Name of observer: _____
 Profile of supervisors: (tick all that apply)
 SHRP/RTI _____ SHRP interns____ MoES _____ DES _____ NCDC _____
 Headteacher____ Deputy headteacher _____ District officials (e.g., DEO) _____
 Principal/college tutors _____ CCT _____ Inspector schools_____
 Others, specify: _____

Activities observed:
 1 _____
 2 _____
 3 _____

Supervision objectives: _____

II. Observation Checklist*

In order to evaluate the supervision sessions, check the boxes for the items you have observed, using Section A for EGRA - Result 1; and Section B for KAP – Result 1. Use the “Answers and Notes” column to record interpretations and recommendations for future workshops.

A. EGRA - Result 1

Questions and considerations	Yes 	Needs more work 	Notes & Follow up (provide comments/feedback)
Did the supervisor have the right support supervision tools/manuals?			
Did the supervisor introduce the support supervision exercise to the school administrators & teachers undergoing supervision?			
Did the supervisor conduct a planning meeting with the teacher/supervisee before teaching a reading lesson?			
Did the supervisor ask the teacher to present a lesson plan for a reading lesson to be observed?			
Did the supervisor review the lesson plan together with the teacher following SHRP methodology?			
Did the supervisor take notes during observation			

Questions and considerations	Yes 	Needs more work 	Notes & Follow up (provide comments/feedback)
of the lesson? Was the SHRP lesson observation tool used?			
Did the supervisor check some of the learners' books?			
Did the supervisor assess learners' attendance on that day? How was this done?			
Did the supervisor conduct a post conference meeting with the teacher/supervisee?			
Did the supervisor and teacher/supervisee take notes during the post conference meeting?			
Did the supervisor provide appreciative and constructive feedback to the teacher/supervisee during the post conference?			
Did the supervisor and supervisee discuss/identify a way forward/action plan?			
Did the supervisor provide a written way forward to the teacher observed?			
Were the administrators informed about the teacher/supervisee's way forward/action plan to be followed up?			
Did the supervisor hold a meeting with other SHRP trained teachers not observed?			
Did the supervisor give an opportunity to the trained teachers/school administrators to give feedback about SHRP materials supplied? Mention the feedback forwarded by teachers/school administrators?			
Apart from classroom lesson observation, what other monitoring assessments did the supervisor conduct in the school?			
Please provide any additional observations:			

B. KAP- Result 2

Questions and considerations	Yes 	Needs more work 	Notes & Follow up (provide comments/feedback)
Did the supervisor have the right support supervision tools/manuals?			
Did the supervisor create rapport with the supervisee?			
Did the supervisor assess the School Family Initiative (SFI)? (in primary schools only)			
Did the supervisor review the SFI supporting documentation for completeness? (e.g., Workplans, SFI Registers, details of family members in all SFI membership forms' Maintenance of registers during school family activities, updated "remarks/lessons learnt" column of workplan)			
Did the supervisor assess school HIV clubs? (for post-primary institutions only)			
Did the supervisor review school club supporting documentation (e.g., club register & other school club registers)?			
Did the supervisor assess guidance and counselling activities (e.g. records/documents)?			
Did the supervisor assess the talking environment?			
Did the school supervisor provide feedback on program materials: 1. Enhanced PIASCY supplement handbooks for PET/PPET 2. Participatory Methodology Manual			
Did the supervisor take notes during the different activities observed?			
Did the supervisor provide appreciative and constructive feedback to the teacher/supervisee?			
Were the supervision objectives met?			
Were there follow-up actions/activities?			
Please provide any additional observations:			

**Developed using information from: Result 2 Rapid Monitoring Tool for HIV and AIDS activities implemented at School (RTI); Instructional Mentor Observation Tool (Supervision of Supervision Tool (RTI))*

III. General Progress

Please write a narrative on the progress of the SHRP project activities implemented in the schools to date:

IV. Areas to raise with RTI

- A. Strengths:
- B. Areas of improvement:

**Process Evaluation
Materials Development Observation Tool**

Process Evaluation (or Formative Evaluation) — occurs over the time period during which the materials development workshop is delivered. The materials development workshops take place over a period of three to four weeks, starting with an orientation session to ensure that all participants understand the project and the objectives. The tool should be used to present consolidated observations of the entire workshop.

MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP DATA

Date (s) of the observation: _____

Location: _____

Name of observer: _____

Overall workshop length: _____

Workshop objectives: _____

Name of facilitator 1: _____

Title: _____ Sex: _____

Affiliation/organization: _____

Name of facilitator 2: _____

Title: _____ Sex: _____

Affiliation/organization: _____

Number of participants: _____ (Male: _____ Female: _____)

Participants profile: Teachers: Primary _____ Post primary _____
School administrators (HT/DpHT) _____
Principals/college tutors _____ Coordinating Centre tutors _____
Education leaders _____ Language board member _____
External writers _____ NCDC _____ MoES _____
Others (specify) _____

Local language group	Number of writers
1. _____	Expected: ___ Actual: ___
2. _____	Expected: ___ Actual: ___
3. _____	Expected: ___ Actual: ___
4. _____	Expected: ___ Actual: ___

OBSERVATION QUESTIONS

In order to evaluate the materials development workshop, check the boxes for the items you have observed. Use the “Answers and Notes” column to record interpretations and recommendations for future workshops.

Questions and considerations	Yes [✓]	Needs more work [✓]	Notes & Follow up (provide comments/feedback)
Was there enough time allotted for the orientation?			
Did participants appear engaged during the orientation? Did they ask a lot of questions?			
Was the orientation effective in equipping participants to engage in developing materials?			
Was the methodology used for materials development appropriate? (describe the methods in the notes column)			
Were the writers for the different local language groups present? And actively involved in material writing?			
Were the content experts and language experts present? And supporting the writers?			
Did all participants work together collaboratively?			
Was the activity monitored by NCDC/MoES/RTI?			
Did the writers have the required materials they needed to accomplish their assignments (e.g. guiding templates, curriculum books, etc.)? Did they refer to them?			
Did activities progress as planned against the timeline? Provide details on any observed delays?			
Was there enough time allotted in the plan timeline?			
Where there any challenges expressed by content experts/writers about the writing processes? And what steps have been taken to address them? (Observer finds out this from the content experts/RTI officials)			

*Developed using information from: Levels of evaluation based on Kirkpatrick, D., 1994, *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Ratings of Key Indicators

	Not at all				To a great extent	Don't know	N/A
1. The orientation was appropriate for orienting participant's to accomplish the workshop's objective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The workshop effectively built on participants' knowledge and expertise in accomplishing workshop objectives?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Facilitation of the workshop was effective in completing the development of materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The workshop's design encouraged a collaborative and participatory approach to materials development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Participants appeared engaged in group work and discussions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The workshop design provided opportunities for consideration of classroom application of resources, strategies, and techniques	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Adequate time and structure were provided for participants to share experiences and insights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Adequate time and structure were provided for reflection on the overall process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Overall achievement of workshop objectives	1	2	3	4	5		

GENERAL COMMENTS

Please provide your overall comments on the materials development workshop in this section.

AREAS TO RAISE WITH RTI

- Strengths:
- Areas of improvement:

ANNEX

Participants registration sheet (name, sex, designation, district, school, and telephone contact) and materials development timeline

**ANNEX 4: TEMPLATE FOR MONTHLY REPORTS PREPARED BY LOCAL STAFF AS
INPUTS TO FEEDBACK MEMOS**

(approximately 2 pages)

Prepared by: Resident Evaluation Manager and Sr. HIV/AIDS Evaluator

Date submitted: _____

Time period covered: _____

I. Summary of key activities undertaken during this period, i.e., meetings, workshops, site visits, etc.

II. SHRP's overall progress against the workplan & PMP

III. Planned activities for the following period

IV. Items/concerns for discussion/resolution/action

ANNEX 5: SAMPLE OF A MONTHLY FEEDBACK MEMO SUBMITTED TO SHRP TEAM

TO: RTI/School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)
FROM: NORC/Panagora Performance and Impact Evaluation (P&IE) Team
DATE: 16 September 2013
SUBJECT: Feedback on SHRP activities with responses from RTI

In the spirit of providing useful feedback to RTI on NORC’s observations of ongoing SHRP activities, this memo contains both appreciative and constructive comments. By appreciative, we mean providing feedback on what went well. By constructive, we mean flagging areas that can be strengthened. In providing this feedback, we recognize that some challenges are beyond an implementer’s control and are trying to focus attention on elements of performance where real-time feedback will help you to strengthen performance and lead to optimal outcomes. We want this to be of use to RTI and anticipate that we will both learn from these regular exchanges.

Activities observed in August 2013:

- Early Grade Reading Support Supervision, Kole and Wakiso districts, 1-2 August
- Result 2/HIV Data Management, Assessment, and M&E workshop, 14-16 August
- EGRA Adaptation Workshop for Lumasaba local language, 21 August
- NCDC visit to observe Cluster 2 P1 material writing activities, 27 August
- Orientation meeting for MoES and District Education Officers (DEOs) on SHRP EGR methodology, teacher training approaches, and material development approaches, 29-30 August

Appreciative Feedback

1. Early Grade Reading Support Supervisions, Kole and Wakiso districts

RTI personnel leading the teams responsible for support supervision activities were very effective. It was apparent that they were prepared and had also oriented the supervisors from the district(s) and MoES. All supervisors were conversant with the support supervision process, and exhibited good teamwork in accomplishing their tasks and effective time management. Supervisors arrived at the schools on time and made an effort not to disrupt school timetables.

The MoES and local government officials on the supervision teams showed great commitment and interest in participating in efforts that would lead to development of Early Grade Reading competences in schools. They actively contributed to pre-conference, post-conference and other related dialogues held with teachers and school administrators. This level of interest, enthusiasm, and participation should be maintained.

2. Result 2/HIV Data Management, Assessment, and M&E

Cost-sharing by the MoES in this knowledge-sharing and skills-building activity was very beneficial. Cost-sharing, which was identified early on in partner discussions, is should be employed as much as possible since it maximizes investment and commitment to SHRP strategies and activities and frees up project resources for additional areas of strategic importance.

From the discussions between the trainers and the participants (Focal Point Officers, FPOs), it was clear that the training was very timely and useful.

3. EGRA Adaptation Workshop-Lumasaba

The training had strong participation from language experts/local language board members who were able to lead the discussion and foster? Agreement among participants on challenging dialect issues that had not yet been resolved in the developed orthography. There were lengthy and valuable debates aimed at building consensus on how to cater to learners from the five dialects in the region. Following this agreement, the pace picked up.

Having EGRA Quality Assurance Supervisors helping with facilitation in the training was an added value. They easily led participants in the different EGRA subtasks, and were able to respond competently to participants’ questions, concerns and fears.

4. Cluster 2 P1 Material Development

The different local language groups appeared to be progressing well with their writing activities. [Note: By the time of the second visit to NCDC on 4 September, all local language groups were at same stage, i.e., they had finished developing materials for pupils' books for the three terms. The materials for two terms were completed, and the third term materials awaited trainer approval. The group members showed great commitment and interest in the assignments given.]

In addition, the trainers supported the different groups, helping them move faster with the tasks assigned. They made themselves available to the groups to respond to questions and challenges expressed. Each local language group had a group leader who brought a trainer in, as needed, to provide the support needed to maintain momentum.

5. MoES and DEO orientation on SHRP EGR methodology, teacher training approaches, and material development process

This orientation was well organised with good attendance by many important officials who are critical to the process. The literacy team was well prepared for the meeting, and they competently responded to participants' questions and concerns regarding SHRP literacy activities. Although many participants had concerns initially, they came away from the training with positive views regarding the SHRP reading methodology. It would be good to maintain communication with these officials so they can be enlisted in helping roll out the program.

Constructive Feedback on Areas that Can Be Strengthened

1. Early Grade Reading Support Supervisions in Kole and Wakiso

Teachers seem to be challenged by the extent to which they are currently involved in lesson plan development. We do not know if this will be resolved when the instructional materials become available. We have seen many errors in lessons, both by native and non-native speakers of the local language. For example, we observed many teachers presenting lessons with spelling errors, in some cases with as many as five out of six vocabulary words in a list spelled incorrectly. While this problem may be substantially resolved when schools receive printed instructional materials, it presents as something that needs to be addressed in the interim. What is the updated estimate of when teaching materials will be distributed to schools? Will the instructional materials include sufficient content for lessons so as to eliminate or at least reduce errors in lesson plans?

RTI response: RTI agreed that teachers are challenged in preparing lessons in their respective local languages. They believe this problem will be reduced when the instructional materials reach schools which include most of the content teachers need to prepare lessons, e.g., vocabulary words, sentence structure, etc. Teachers received a lesson plan template that guides lesson preparation in line with SHRP methodology and national curriculum requirements. Teachers will continuously receive further support from CCTs/School Inspectors trained in providing technical support supervision. Inconsistencies in the newly developed orthographies will be corrected as teachers provide feedback on the instructional materials.

Some instructional materials are ready but can't be distributed until the teacher strike is over. RTI expects the remainder of the materials will be printed the week of 18 Sept. 2013.

Again this period, we identified issues during the post-observation feedback sessions. The interaction during the pre-conference sessions seems ultimately to weaken the effectiveness of the clinical support supervision approach. We observed that supervisors supported teachers in preparing lesson plans, following steps and methods illustrated in SHRP instructional materials. However, this intervention seemed to overly influence the post-conference feedback and reporting in that supervisors focussed less on gaps identified during the pre-conference and more on assessing the abilities of a teacher to deliver the lesson that was prepared by the supervisors. Is this the desired outcome? And how reliable are the reports in helping RTI make informed decisions about gaps identified in school based reading activities?

RTI response: RTI plans both support supervision and monitoring in schools, as two mostly distinct activities. The recently concluded school visits were mainly for support supervision, not monitoring. The clinical support supervision approach is recognised by MoES as Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for teachers. In CPD, supervisors visit schools to enhance teachers' skills to deliver lessons (versus

fault-finding). In this support supervision model, supervisors help teachers prepare lessons, in line with SHRP reading methodology, and then observe the teachers in the classroom. During the monitoring, teachers will not be assisted beforehand with lesson preparation but will be observed delivering classroom reading lessons they have prepared.

2. Result 2/HIV Data Management, Assessment, and M&E

The scope of the training was too wide to be covered in 2.5 days. Some major topics were short shrifted as a result. The training included a relatively long presentation on FPO job descriptions, orientation to SHRP result 2 activities, and corresponding data collection needs. These consumed a great deal of time and even so did not appear to conclude to the satisfaction of participants. Perhaps only obvious in hindsight, but such large issues/topics should be the focus of separate sessions, and each session organized to focus on fewer and related topics that can be covered in the allocated training timeframe.

RTI response: RTI recognized this and will apply this learning to future workshops.

3. Cluster 2 P1 Writing Sessions

No officials from NCDC/MOES were observed supporting the material writing activities. Are they not needed at this stage?

In addition, one language group had fewer members. It would be good to have equal teams to ease the work of trainers to allocate tasks to the different pairs within a language group. It was observed that members in the group work in pairs. But groups with fewer writers seem to have individuals working on a task alone in order to achieve the same output at end of the day.

RTI: NCDC is responsible for recruiting the panel of writers for SHRP materials, and it is understood that NCDC officials will be checking into the sessions but not attending full-time. RTI will discuss this further with the Literacy Advisor and also inquire as to whether there were individuals in the different local language groups who worked alone (writers are expected to perform the tasks in groups).

ANNEX 6: SAMPLE OF A QUARTERLY MEMO SUBMITTED TO SHRP TEAM

TO: RTI/School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)
FROM: NORC/Panagora Performance and Impact Evaluation (P&IE) Team
DATE: 26 August 2013
SUBJECT: Questions/Comments on Quarterly Report for April 1 – June 30, 2013 with responses from RTI

As with our monthly feedback sessions to share observations from attending SHRP activities, we want the sessions to discuss quarterly reports to be constructive and of mutual value. As always, the intent is to provide commentary that can help RTI strengthen performance, and also to obtain information that will improve the quality and utility of our third party monitoring and performance evaluations.

In organizing for this first discussion, we realize that our comments could be better framed with some initial discussion aimed at helping us understand the quarterly report format and how best to compare the quarterly reports to the work plan and the PMP. We suggest tackling these as the first part of the discussion, and also offer the some specific comments and questions. We realize that there will not be time to discuss all the points below, some of which can be handled via email, and **plan to focus the discussion tomorrow on the first two sections.** We feel confident that through this initial discussion, we will develop the understanding that will make our future comments and questions on the quarterly reports more targeted.

1. Overarching comments/questions

- a. What is the status of the Year 2 work plan and how does it relate to this quarterly report, some of which is part of Year 2?

RTI's response: Year 1 was extended to September 20, 2013 and RTI has prepared an extension Year 1 work plan which they will send to the P&IE team (received). [Note: a number of questions in this memo will be addressed when the extension work plan is reviewed and this was taken into account during the subsequent discussion on some of the details.] The Year 2 work plan is due to USAID on September 10; Year 2 begins on October 1, 2013.

- b. What is your guidance on how best to compare the quarterly reports to the work plan and PMP?

RTI's response: Our comments brought to light for RTI the disconnect between the quarterly reports, PMP, and work plan, and they plan to address this issue.

- c. How do we compare planned staff to actual staff?

RTI's response: RTI discussed some of the staffing challenges, in particular having a Kampala-based office but activities in 30 districts, and their use of interns to fill in on tasks that require extensive travel such as data collection. RTI agreed that it would be useful to find ways to clarify staffing (e.g., through an organizational chart) challenges and the strategies used to maintain momentum.

Saeeda wrote: "Program implementation requires people on the ground. 4 Additional program staff (Ed officers) were hired for R1. We are also considering hiring field level assistants to conduct site visits and collect information needed on an on-going basis. We are also beefing up our admin side by hiring a shared HR manager; 1 ast finance assistant (new positions) + 1 procurement specialist (in org chart)."

- d. This quarterly report was missing the financial summary for comparing planned expenditures to actual; what is the overall status?

RTI's response:

Saeeda wrote: "We have a considerable pipeline in year 1. Given the delays, USAID extended year 1 by 4 months. But this late in the year, we had to prioritize our activities. We will spend approximately 70% of its year 1 allocation."

Financial information was subsequently provided.

- e. How is the MOES move affecting implementation?

RTI's response: The move has not taken place.

f. Is cost share proceeding as planned?

RTI's response: While there are not detailed cost share targets, Saeeda wrote: "SHRP will not meet CS in Year 1. Reduction in PEPFAR funds for R2 activities meant that CS portion from partner WE will also reduce proportionately. Also due to Ministry's issues with having numerous subs on the project, on-boarding of major cost share contributors (e.g. books) donors were delayed. We expect to be up to date with CS by end of Year 2."

g. Do the additional resources accessed via the Peace Corps initiative make it possible to increase targets?

RTI's response: Peace Corps was always part of the cost share plan.

Saeeda wrote: "USAID is finalizing Peace Corps' involvement with the program. We have shared all necessary information with USAID to expedite the process. The onboard of Peace Corps is expected to take place in February 2014."

2. Questions on progress toward overall achievement of results

Result 1

IR 1.1 National policies to support reading developed

Quarterly reports mention several consultation meetings held with the relevant authorities to push for development/review of policies and strategies that would support reading activities in schools. What has SHRP been able to achieve regarding the development/review of reading policies?

RTI's response: RTI has done work mostly on the language board policies and will focus more on the literacy strategy in Year 2. They will highlight this in the PMP and quarterly reports.

Saeeda wrote: "SHRP has also initiated coordination with other providers through DES."

IR 1.2 Materials developed to support Early Grade Reading

Have SHRP produced reading materials undergone the required approval process?

Have the activities related to development and review of local language orthographies involved representatives from all local language speaking districts?

RTI's response: Reading materials are still going through an approval process. Materials will be delivered in mid-September and a follow-up baseline is planned for mid-October.

IR 1.4 Advocacy and support for reading increased

The quarterly reports indicate that there have been some advocacy activities conducted with MoES, local language boards and local government. What strategies is the program using for outreach to communities and for involving parents?

RTI's response: RTI has not done enough in this area. They have done more with local governments.

Saeeda wrote: "Plans are underway to boost already existing SMC and PTA meetings at schools and record keeping of these meetings."

Result 2

IR 2.1 HIV/AIDS education assessment and reporting systems developed and implemented.

Has the HIV indicator technical reference guide been approved? And disseminated to users?

RTI's response: The HIV indicator technical reference guide has not been approved. The HIV working group is responsible for moving it forward in the approval process. From the SHRP team, Moses Bagyendera and Lorna Muhirwe are overseeing this process.

IR 2.2 Improved coordination between MoES and other actors in HIV education

The report on this IR has few activities to date; are more coordination activities in Year 2 to improve on performance related to this?

RTI's response: RTI has been working under a revised Results 2 for the last 2-5 months. The revision is pending approval from USAID. In the revision the 3 IRs on improved coordination will be removed.

Action: RTI will send NORC/Panagora the revision to Results 2 (received).

IR 2.4 Improved sustainability of HIV/AIDS education

We did not see activities related to this IR in the reports. What activities have been conducted to improve sustainability of HIV education in schools?

RTI's response: Improved sustainability is not included as an IR, although it is integrated across IRs.

Saeeda wrote: "We will work through the system e.g. TWG, CCT and the districts to ensure sustainability of good practice."

P&IE response: NORC/Panagora suggested that quarterly reports describe sustainability in order to convey the cross-cutting approach being used.

3. Comments on progress against detailed elements of the work plan (Nov. 2012 version)

Initially we expected to use this quarterly as an opportunity to compare SHRP accomplishments with the Year 1 Work Plan. Given the planning events held by RTI in late July and the detail provided in RTI's Year One Implementation Status report presented at that time, we have just a few clarification requests in areas where there have been delays. Can you please comments on plans to address these and what impact the delays will have on achievement of results?

Result 1

1.2.1. Printing and publishing of pupils' books and teacher's guides. When will the Cluster 2 materials be completed?

Saeeda wrote: "Cluster 2 P1 drafts have been developed awaiting other processes (alpha test and QAC approval) before they are finalized for piloting in schools in February 2014."

1.4.2. – Dissemination of baseline assessment data (moved to next quarter) although listed as completed in the implementation status report. Can you please clarify timing?

RTI's response: This is the Ministry's responsibility.

Result 2

Many activities (especially under IRs 2.1 and 2.2) have been re-programmed in concert with the MoES. How certain is the timing at this point?

2.5.1. Training of KAP survey data collectors. Has the training report been completed?

RTI's response: Answer to be provided.

4. Review of progress on PMP indicators (May 2013 version)

Indicators 2a-2c: when are baseline data expected to be available?

1.1.1. Number of laws, etc. Value is 0. It would be useful to provide an explanation.

1.2.2. Number of textbooks. Again value is 0. It would be useful to provide an explanation.

1.3.1. Number of teachers. Actual breakouts are very different from expected numbers (more teachers than expected, and fewer CCTs). Is there a reason for that? Or does this not matter? No target is given for 2013, so why are data now being collected? Should there be a target?

1.4.1. Number of PTAs or structures supported. Target was 410, actual is zero. Is there a reason?

No actual values were provided for a number of indicators (e.g., 1.4.2, 1.5.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.5 among others). If these are not relevant because, for example, components have been postponed and redesigned, should probably indicate “n/a”.

RTI’s response: RTI agrees they need to do a better job of telling the story behind the numbers.

5. Format comments/questions

Some of these may be answered in the initial discussion.

Work Plan

1. The activities and the activity numbers in the quarterly report don’t quite line up with those in the work plan or the implementation status report. Could you give us some suggestions on how to most easily compare them? It appears that the light blue cells in the quarterly report are the original planned dates for completion, while the dark blue is future activities. Are those the original plans, or your current, updated, plans?
2. If we could have these documents in word it would be easier to highlight areas of focus.
3. We have not received financial information along with the work plan. It would be good to have some means of comparing financial performance, particularly at the one year mark.

PMP

It might be useful to have an extra column in the quarterly report to provide an explanation where actual values diverge significantly (either positive or negative) from targets:

Indicator	Data Source	Frequency	Actual 2012	Target 2013	Actual 2013	Explanation where significant variance

RTI response: RTI was very responsive to these requests and suggestions and said that in the next quarterly report they will seek to provide more clarity on the relationship of the reporting to the work plan and PMP.