USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

April 2014

DQA Report on Result 1, Cluster 1 , Round 2 data

Directions: Use the following worksheet to complete an assessment of data for indicators against the 5 data quality standards outlined in the ADS. A comprehensive discussion of each criterion is included in TIPS 12 Data Quality Standards.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

USAID/Uganda Mission

Development Objective (DO): Increased Literacy and Health Seeking Behavior

Intermediate Result (IR): *Improved Early Grade Reading and Transition to English*

Indicators: *1a:Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text in local languages 1.1: Proportion of learners reading at agreed upon benchmark of words per minute (P2,P4) in English and local language, compared to control;1:2: Proportion of learners comprehending at 80% or higher (P2, P4) English and Local Language, compared to control;*

Is this a Standard or Custom Indicator? (Mark "X") Standard **X** Custom__**X**_____

If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.

Both EGRA-specific (custom) and Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators are included

Name of Implementing Partner: Implementing Partner: *RTI. Data Quality Assessor: NORC*

Assessment Team Members: *NORC Performance and Impact Evaluation team: Varuni Dayaratna, Alicia Menendez, Sarah Hughes, Yvonne Cao, with input from Stella Neema, Evelyn Namubiru, StacyAnn Forrester, Betsy Bassan*

Date (s) of Assessment: *April 28, 2014*

Data Quality Assessment Methodology: *To assess the quality of data collected for Result 1, NORC's US and Uganda-based team carried out the following activities:*

> Reviewed data collection plans and procedures

> Reviewed questionnaire content, layout and CAPI functioning

> Reviewed interviewer training agendas, manuals and planned training pedagogy

> Observed interviewer training, piloting and data collection

> Attended data collection debriefing

> Reviewed raw response datasets for errors in student assessments, teacher and head teacher survey and classroom observation

> Reviewed cleaned response datasets for errors in student assessments, teacher/head teacher survey and school inventory

> Performed impact evaluation analysis using Cluster 1 Baseline and Cluster 1 Round 2 combined response dataset

> Reviewed IP's baseline report

Data & Data Source(s): *The data assessed in this DQA consist of baseline and end of school year data ("Round 2") for schools included in the sample designated as "Cluster 1" in NORC's impact evaluation of the USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program. Cluster 1 includes schools in 11 districts that cover four language groups (Luganda, Runyankore/Rukiga, Ateso, and Leblano). The data were collected using EGRA student assessment instruments, head teacher questionnaires, teacher questionnaires, and classroom observations. In this and in each subsequent data quality assessment carried out under the Performance and Impact Evaluation (P&IE) of the USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program, the annual dataset will include both the baseline data and the end of year data.*

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes, via first year impact evaluation report.

Rating:	X	Acceptable		Acceptable if Corrections are Made		Not Acceptable

Assessment against the 5 data Quality Standards:

Criterion	Definition	Yes or No	Explanation (Overall Summary)
1. Validity	Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are: **Face Validity**: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? **Attribution**: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? **Measurement Error**. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed.	**Unclear**	***Notes:*** **Face Validity:** *Literacy and reading skill measures included in the EGRA tool have been used to assess Early Grade Reading in a number of other countries prior to implementation in Uganda. The data collection instruments were adapted to Ugandan language and context via adaptation workshops and pretesting. The implementing partner (IP) has not provided comprehensive information on tests of reliability and validity of this instrument in the current context.* **Attribution:** *The indicator is intended to measure the contribution of the project. The data evaluated in the DQR consists of the baseline and end of year data collected in schools in Cluster 1.* **Measurement Error (Sampling):** *Cluster 1 Baseline (February 2013): A total of 296 schools were included in the baseline data collection. NORC's impact evaluation uses a subsample of the schools in which data are collected by RTI. Two schools selected in the original NORC impact evaluation sample were replaced during data collection. The final number of schools used in NORC's impact evaluation baseline is 204 out of the 296 schools for which data were collected at baseline. At the learner level, RTI reported anecdotally that some replacements were made, but they did not document the number or cause of replacements, therefore we are unable to calculate learner response rates for Cluster 1 Baseline.* *Cluster 1 2013 End of Year (November 2013:) A total of 350 schools were included in the end of year data collection. NORC's impact evaluation uses a subsample of the data* *Learner Response Rates: Of the target of assessing 4,620 P1 learners, 4,092 students from the sampled schools were actually assessed (88.5% of plan). An additional 255 students were assessed in 12 additional schools that were not part of the original sample. 4 schools in the original sample were found to be inaccessible due to rain and were replaced. An additional 8 schools were selected for assessments by the field or implementation team without reference to the impact evaluation plan.* *Data collection procedures for EGRA were standardized and included in-person training as well as piloting of the EGRA instruments prior to data collection among the sample schools. Assessors were monitored*

			(observed) by independent data quality assessors as well as members of Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) and NORC. On the occasions when an assessor was found to be veering from established protocols, the data collection supervisory team was alerted to correct the errant behavior. *NORC has raised concerns about the narrow interpretation of correct letter sounds, nonword pronunciation and real-word pronunciation for some items in the pupil assessment instrument. The interpretation may result in biased measurement of pupils' literacy. NORC continues to explore this issue with the data collection team, which is also the implementation team, with assistance from USAID.*
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription? ***Note**: This criterion requires the reviewer to understand what mechanisms are in place to reduce the possibility of manipulation or transcription error.*	**Yes**	***Notes:** The data collection tool is programmed as a computer-assisted interview. This mode has been shown to minimize data transcription errors, and NORC's review of the raw and cleaned data show that there are few errors from transcription.* *Data collection is carried out by the implementing partner, which, prima fascia, has the potential for manipulation. However, NORC evaluation staff have attended interviewer and supervisor training and observed data collection in the field, providing a level of independent oversight of the data collection that leads us to conclude that manipulation has not occurred and is very unlikely to occur.*
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	**unclear**	***Notes:*** *NORC estimated the sample required to detect a double-difference measure of impact of magnitude D = 0.20 with a power of 90%. The final sample for Round 1 was lower than expected as the data collection team could not always assess 30 students per grade; it was even lower for Round 2 since low numbers of students were being found at the schools. It is therefore unclear at this stage whether the sample size will be sufficiently large to detect impacts.*
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time? ***Note:** This criterion requires the reviewer to ensure that the indicator definition is operationally precise (i.e. it clearly defines the exact data to be collected) and to verify that the data is, in fact, collected according to that standard definition consistently over time.*	**Yes**	***Notes**: The EGRA student assessment tool is programmed as an in-person computer-assisted interview (CAPI) using software that enforces skip patterns and reduces interviewer error (compared to Paper and Pencil). As part of its assessor training, the data collection trainers administer an inter-rater reliability test which is shared and discussed with the field team and independent observers. The data collection partner invites more assessors to training than will be hired and selected the best assessors from among those trained.* *The data collection processes and analysis methods are documented in writing and are being used to ensure the same procedures are followed in a standardized fashion. Observations by data quality assessors, members of MOeS and NORC's team support ensuring consistency in application of data collection protocols.*
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	**unclear**	***Notes:*** *The response data from Result 1, Cluster 1 2013 Round 2 was collected in October-November, 2013. Supporting field reports were provided in late November, 2013. The raw and cleaned data were received by NORC analysts in January 2014. The data were received with adequate time for NORC to carry out data quality review and cleaning tasks and*

			to conduct descriptive and impact analysis within the timeframe required by USAID.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Limitations/Key Issues:
Actions Needed to address Limitations/Key Recommendations:

Approvals:

	Assessment Team members:	**Name:** Sarah Hughes **Position:** Survey Specialist, NORC **Name :** Yvonne Cao **Position:** Evaluation Analyst, NORC

For Office Use Only:

Team Leader Officer Approval (Office Chief)
Name_____**Date**_____
M&E Specialist/SI Advisor/Quality Assurance Specialist (clearance): Name _____
Date_____