



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



PERFORMANCE & IMPACT EVALUATION (P&IE)

Final Performance Evaluation Implementation Plan: School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)

NOVEMBER 2015

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by NORC at the University of Chicago.

PERFORMANCE & IMPACT EVALUATION (P&IE)

FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: SCHOOL HEALTH AND READING PROGRAM (SHRP)

November 2015

PN 7384; USAID Contract N0: AID-617-C-12-00006

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

Cover Photo: Owinyo Primary School, Lira, taken by Betsy Bassan

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
- BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND SCOPE..... 4
 - A. Background..... 4
 - B. Purpose..... 5
 - C. Scope and Focus 6
- EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 8
 - A. Proposed Approach and Methodology..... 8
 - A.1 Use of Best Practices..... 8
 - A.2 Evaluation Design 8
 - A.3 Data Collection Methods 9
 - B. Data Collection and Analysis Methods..... 10
 - B.1 Data Sources..... 10
 - B.2 Data Analysis 12
 - B.3 Design and Methodology Limitations 12
 - B.4 Performance Evaluation Framework..... 14
- EVALUATION TASKS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIMELINE 16
 - A. Tasks 16
 - B. Roles and Responsibilities 16
 - C. Work Plan Timeline and Outputs 17
 - D. Key Informants and Focus Discussion Groups..... 19
 - D.1 National Level Data Collection..... 19
 - D.2 District and School Level Data Collection..... 19
 - E. Work Plan Outputs..... 20
- STRUCTURE OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT 21
- PLAN FOR VALIDATION AND DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS 22
 - A. Vetting and Validation of Mid-Term Evaluation Plan..... 22
 - B. Dissemination of Findings 22
- Annex A. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS 23
 - A.1 Key Informant Interview Guide 23
 - A.2 Classroom Observation Guide – Draft..... 25
- Annex B. Preliminary Contact List..... 29

ACRONYMS

BTVET	Business, Technical, Vocational Education and Training
CCT	Coordinating Center Tutor
CLA	Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting
COR	Contracting Officers Represent
CSR	Center for Social Research
DEO	District Education Officer
DES	Directorate of Education Standards
DIS	District Inspector of Schools
EGR	Early Grade Reading
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoU	Government of Uganda
HDO	Human Development Objective
IRB	Institutional Review Board
KAP	knowledge, attitudes, and practice
KII	Key Informant Interview
LLB	Local Language Board
MEEPP	Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Plan Progress
MEO	Municipal Education Officer
MIS	Municipal Inspection of Schools
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MoGLSD	Ministry of Gender Labor and Social Development
NAPE	National Assessment of Progress in Education
NCDC	National Curriculum Development Center
NORC	National Opinion Research Center
P&IE	Performance and Impact Evaluation
PE	Performance Evaluation
PEPFAR	U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PIASCY	Presidential Initiative on Aids Strategy for Communication to Youth, Uganda
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PTC	Primary Teacher College
REM	Resident Evaluation Manager

SHRP	School Health and Reading Program
SIL LEAD	SIL Language Education and Development
TBD	To be determined
TIET	Teacher, Instructor Education and Training
TPM	Team Planning Meeting
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNEB	Ugandan National Examination Board
WEI	World Education Inc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document sets out the implementation plan for carrying out the final Performance Evaluation (PE) of the Uganda School Health and Reading Program (SHRP), a five-year USAID-funded cooperative agreement implemented by RTI International (May 2012 – May 2017). The overall objective of SHRP is to increase literacy and health-seeking behaviors, with two key results: improved early grade reading and transition to English, and improved HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP).

The Performance and Impact Evaluation (P&IE) contract embodies USAID’s evaluation policy and CLA (collaboration, learning, and adaptation) agenda. The P&IE contract provides parallel, independent, and multi-year evaluation information and feedback aimed at supporting learning and adaptive management (continuous improvement) by the implementing partner (IP) for improved program outcomes. P&IE evaluates SHRP program implementation and effectiveness, and the extent to which the program’s literacy and HIV/AIDS prevention activities result in measurable impact at the level of student learning. Towards this end, the P&IE contract undertakes:

- Mid-term and final PEs
- Annual impact evaluations
- “Continuous evaluation” -- ongoing performance monitoring through structured observation and performance feedback to the RTI program team

This report presents our plan for the Final Performance Evaluation (PE).

Performance Evaluation Objective. The main objective of the SHRP final PE is to assess the success of the program in achieving its five-year performance targets and results. As there will still be a year of implementation following this evaluation, it will also provide valuable recommendations for maximizing performance and results achievement in the final year. Given additional funding to scale up the reading methodology through USAID’s Literacy Achievement and Retention Program (LARA) and Global Partnership for Education (GPE), this evaluation will also provide useful lessons and best practices for these replication programs.

Performance Evaluation Approach. In the spirit of CLA, we will integrate a Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) approach into the final PE. UFE engages evaluation users throughout the evaluation process, on the premise that “intended users are more likely to use evaluations if they understand and feel ownership of the evaluation process and findings.”¹ This will be a cross-sectional descriptive and analytical PE, primarily based on qualitative data. We will use multiple sources of data for the PE, including information/data gathered throughout the P&IE contract through our continuous evaluation of SHRP activities; quantitative data gathered for the impact evaluation, namely Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) results to date; semi-structured key informant interviews (KIIs); classroom observations; and focus group discussions (FGDs). We will also draw upon data and analyses from our

¹ Utilization Focused Evaluation, 4th Edition, Michael Quinn Patton, 2008.

annual impact evaluations and continuous evaluation process. At this point in the implementation of SHRP, there is a treasure trove of data from activity observation reports and performance feedback memos, which we intend to use to their maximum effect.

Below, we explain our approach in detail, and include draft data collection instruments for KIIs and classroom observation in Annex A; and a list of contacts in Annex B.

Evaluation questions. The evaluation questions are aligned with the overall evaluation objectives – to assess the effectiveness of SHRP in achieving its expected results and to inform the implementation of current and future USAID/Uganda early grade reading and health projects. To ensure a rigorous performance evaluation within the allotted timeframe and resources, we propose to focus the final PE on four areas: implementation, design, sustainability, and learning and adaptation; as follows:

1. **Implementation:** Has the program been implemented according to plan (program and budget). Is it on track to achieve its overall targets and results by the end of the project? Is the program achieving positive impacts? What, if anything, should be done differently in the final year to optimize results?

R1 Reading Results: To what extent did the project achieve positive reading outcomes? What factors contributed to improvements in reading outcomes in high performing schools? What factors hindered improvements in reading skills in low performing schools?

R2 Health Results: To what extent did the project achieve positive health outcomes? What factors contributed to improved HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices? What factors, if any, impeded improvements in these areas??

2. **Design.** Does the approach to (a) *capacity building* (cascade training, continuous professional development, and monitoring and supervision) for teachers (head and classroom teachers) and (b) *community mobilization* facilitate achievement of the targeted results and desired impacts?
3. **Sustainability:** To what extent will the reading and health program or its components continue without USAID assistance? (Sub-questions will include: What capacity and systems has SHRP established to ensure sustainability? What additional capacity and systems are necessary to fully institutionalize the program? What funding commitments exist?)
4. **Learning and adaptation:** What were the challenges, lessons learned, and adaptations throughout implementation? Are there effective mechanisms in place for learning and adaptation (performance improvement) as a result of the SHRP project?

To ensure maximum relevance and utilization by all SHRP stakeholders, we will vet these questions with USAID, the MoESTS, and RTI in advance; and, during the Team Planning Meeting (TPM), we will vet other elements of the final PE work plan.

Evaluation team. Panagora is providing a three-person team to carry out the SHRP PE:

- Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist, Betsy Bassan
- Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist, Brenda Sinclair
- Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator, Stella Neema

Country-based support will be provided by NORC's Resident Evaluation Manager (REM), Evelyn Namubiru, who will participate in district and school site visits to expand the number of schools visited. All four have been associated with P&IE from the outset and collaborated on the mid-term evaluation. In addition, the P&IE COP, Alicia Menendez, and NORC's home office P&IE director, Varuni Dayaratna, will provide ongoing oversight and support.

Timeline. By grouping all evaluation activities under one contract under P&IE, USAID has a team with a high level of familiarity with SHRP which has achieved an effective way to provide performance feedback to its senior staff, while maintaining objectivity and independence. In our P&IE work, we continuously review implementation documents and observe intervention activities and, therefore, are able to carry out the final evaluation in an efficient manner, per our detailed timeline below, which includes data collection at the national, district, and school levels.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

A. BACKGROUND

The *School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)* is a five-year USAID-funded cooperative agreement implemented by RTI International in collaboration with major partners, SIL Language Education and Development (SIL LEAD) in local language reading, World Education Inc. (WEI) in HIV/AIDS education, the Center for Social Research Uganda (CSR) in EGRA implementation, and Perkins International in Special Needs Education (SNE). Other partners include the International Book Bank and Books for Africa for cost share, and Volunteer Services Organization (VSO) for reading support.

The overall objective of the program “Increasing Literacy and Health Seeking Behaviors” mirrors USAID/Uganda’s Health Development Objective 3, through achievement of sub-objectives 3.1.1 “Health-Seeking Behaviors Increased” and 3.1.1.1 “Improved Literacy.” Underlying this is USAID’s goal to support the Government of Uganda (GoU) in developing, implementing, assessing, and bringing to scale a successful approach to reading instruction and to deliver the goal of the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports (MoESTS) toward achieving a Ugandan led “Literacy Policy.”

To this end, the program will build institutional capacity, support policy development, and help institutionalize the training, support structures, and policies necessary for sustainability. To achieve the stated objectives, the program has two key results:

1. Improved Early Grade Reading and Transition to English
2. Improved HIV/AIDS Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices

The development hypotheses in each result are:

Result 1 Reading: By focusing interventions on the nexus of language, pedagogy, and instructional materials, USAID can significantly improve students’ early grade reading and P3 literacy scores within targeted schools and districts.

Result 2 Health: By strengthening cross-sector coordination between USAID’s health and education partners, USAID can significantly improve teachers’ and students’ HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills within targeted schools and districts.

Over the life of the program, reading improvements will be directly supported in 3,300 schools by working through the established MoESTS systems to train Primary Teacher College (PTC) tutors, coordinating center tutors (CCTs), district and areas inspectors and head teachers to train and support teachers to effectively teach reading. The program aims to train over 12,000 teachers in early grade reading and provide effective reading instruction to approximately 1 million learners in P1-P4. Indirect beneficiaries from the scale up of the reading program through the MoESTS1 will add another 1.4 million learners to this total.

Another important component of the program is supporting the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) to develop language boards, reading instructional materials and pupil primers in both English and 12 local languages – almost 2 million reading primers will be in the hands of learners by the end of

the program. Under Result 2, 8,000 teachers will be trained and 500,000 learners across nearly 1,700 primary schools, secondary schools and Business, Technical, Vocational Education and Training (BTVET) institutions reached through learning activities designed to help them understand and practice healthy behaviors aimed at preventing HIV/AIDS. In total, the program will work in 4,148 primary schools – 810 schools will have both Result 1 Reading and Result 2 Health activities. The program will cover a total of 12 languages in 30 districts for Result 1 Reading. Result 2 Health activities will take place in 17 districts (SHRP – Performance Management Plan (PMP), Sept 2013)

The *Performance and Impact Evaluation* contract is a five-year effort implemented by prime contractor NORC and subcontractor Panagora Group. The primary purpose of the P&IE contract is to evaluate SHRP program implementation and effectiveness, and the extent to which the program’s literacy and HIV/AIDS prevention activities result in measurable impact at the level of student learning.

NORC leads overall contract management and implementation, annual impact evaluations, and workshops to disseminate results; and Panagora leads continuous evaluation (ongoing performance monitoring and feedback to the RTI program team to promote adaptive management and continuous improvement), performance evaluations, and supports dissemination. As a result of the continuous evaluation, the team has the benefit of a great deal of knowledge and information which it is bringing into the PE process.

In the final PE, we take this a step further by integrating a utilization-focused approach (UFE) through which we will vet, refine, and enrich our evaluation plan with stakeholders throughout the design and implementation of the PE. As excerpts in the text box indicate, UFE starts from the premise that PE should provide utility to all primary intended users, including, in this case, the MoESTS, USAID, and the IP and its partners; and evaluation findings should be tied to decision points of significance, e.g., current implementation, future designs, and policy. We will obtain input on the proposed evaluation design and key questions from primary evaluation users (USAID, MoESTS, and RTI) prior to field work; and hold a facilitated half-day workshop at the outset of the field work in which primary evaluation users from MoESTS, USAID, and RTI/SHPP will have an opportunity to refine, as needed, the evaluation design and work plan. During this process, we can also determine how to integrate MoESTS and USAID personnel into the evaluation process, such as site visits and reviews. This will result in an improved evaluation process that meaningfully contributes to adaptive learning and management.

Box 1: Promoting collaborative learning and adaptation through Utilization-Focused Evaluation (UFE)

“UFE begins with the premise that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use.”

“Intended users are more likely to use evaluations if they understand and feel ownership of the evaluation process and findings.”

“By actively involving primary intended users, the evaluator is preparing the groundwork for use.”

Source: Utilization Focused Evaluation: 4th Edition, Michael Quinn Patton, 2008

B. PURPOSE

The main objective of the SHRP final PE is to assess the effectiveness of the program in achieving its five-year performance targets and results. As there will still be a year of implementation following this evaluation, it will also provide valuable recommendations for maximizing performance and results achievement in the final year outcomes. Given additional funding to scale up the reading methodology

through USAID LARA and GPE, this evaluation will also provide useful lessons learned for these programs.

To assess program effectiveness, the final PE will:

- Assess whether the program been implemented according to plan (program and budget) and the extent to which program components have achieved stated objectives, targets, and impact per key results stated in the cooperative agreement, results framework, work plans, PMP, and reports, and findings of the impact evaluation.
- Probe key implementation approaches and designs related to building local capacity (training, continuous professional development, and monitoring and supervision) and mobilizing community support.
- Examine whether the ground has been laid for sustainability in terms of engagement and ownership in the program at all levels, existence of systems and procedures to underpin and guide continued implementation, and identification of the needed financial resources
- Identify mechanisms for learning and adaptation and well as specific lessons learned and best practices surfaced through implementation and learning

C. SCOPE AND FOCUS

The Final Performance Evaluation will hone in on four questions, which will best inform improvements in the current program and future implementation of similar programs in Uganda and elsewhere. These four areas are: program implementation, design, sustainability, and learning and adaptation:

1. **Implementation:** Has the program been implemented according to plan (program and budget)? Is it on track to achieve its overall targets and results by the end of the project? Is the program achieving positive impacts? What, if anything, should be implemented differently in the final year to optimize results?

R1 Reading Results: To what extent did the project achieve positive reading outcomes? What factors contributed to improvements in reading outcomes in high performing schools? What factors hindered improvements in reading skills in low performing schools?

R2 Health Results: To what extent did the project achieve positive health outcomes? What factors contributed to improved HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices? What factors, if any, impeded improvements in these areas??

2. **Design.** Does the approach to (a) *capacity building* (training of trainers, training, continuous professional development, and monitoring and supervision) for teachers (head and classroom teachers) and (b) *community mobilization* facilitate achievement of the desired results?
3. **Sustainability:** To what extent will the reading and health program or its components continue without USAID assistance? (Sub-questions will include: What capacity and systems has SHRP established to ensure sustainability? What additional capacity and systems are necessary to fully institutionalize the program? What funding commitments exist?)

4. Learning and adaptation: What were the challenges, lessons learned, and adaptations throughout implementation? Are there effective mechanisms in place for learning and adaptation (performance improvement) as a result of the SHRP project?

Questions 1 will assess SHRP's success in achieving targets and results as stated in the PMP and other program documents, as well as its achievement of impacts as measured through P&IE's impact evaluation. It will identify strengths and deficiencies in the program that facilitated or hindered its success, and flag actions that can be taken in the final year of implementation to maximize achievements.

Question 2 delves into two key design elements of SHRP -- training and community mobilization -- and will surface insights of value stakeholders and other interested parties in Uganda and elsewhere seeking to implement similar programs.

Question 3 will examine whether the basic capacity and systems have been built and institutionalized within the GoU, and whether the necessary financial commitments are being made by the GoU, to carry the program forward?

Question 4 will address the degree to which the process of learning and change to improve performance based on learning (adaptation) exists within the program at all levels and across stakeholders and, specifically, whether and how it has influenced the replication of school reading activities under USAID's Literacy Achievement and Retention Program (LARA) and Global Partnership for Education (GPE).

Initial sub-questions for each of these key questions are included in the draft interview guide in Annex A. These will be further fleshed out and tailored to each audience, whether central government officials, USAID, RTI, district officials, schools, or IPs.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. PROPOSED APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

A.1 Use of Best Practices

The Mid-Term Performance evaluation is designed and will be implemented using best practices in evaluation, which includes:

- Using subject matter specialists in literacy and health
- Having the evaluation specialists participate in identifying questions for baseline data collection and the implementing team provide input on the PE methodology and questions (achieved during P&IE start-up in October 2012)
- Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative information
- Reinforcing local capacity by having local specialists on the performance evaluation team
- Being transparent in the evaluation design and dissemination of evaluation findings

A.2 Evaluation Design

This will be a cross-sectional descriptive and analytical PE, primarily based on qualitative data. We will use multiple sources of data for the PE, including information/data gathered throughout the P&IE contract through our continuous evaluation of SHRP activities; quantitative data gathered for the impact evaluation, namely Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) results to date; semi-structured key informant interviews (KIIs); classroom observations; and focus group discussions (FGDs). We will draw on data and analyses from annual impact evaluations and continuous evaluation. By this point in SHRP implementation, this represents a treasure trove of data from control areas, activity observation reports, and performance feedback memos, from which we will extensively draw for the PE analysis.

Sampling. The matrix below shows SHRP target program districts and languages. We will use purposeful sampling to select districts and schools, aiming at a blend of regions, local languages, urban and rural areas, and high-to-low performing schools, primarily based on impact evaluation and EGRA data while taking into account SHRP categorization based on intermediate outcomes such as signage, register completion, etc. School receiving both R1 Reading and R2 Health interventions will be prioritized. We will be alert to possibilities for including schools already visited during the mid-term evaluation.

SHRP Program Districts				
Cluster	Local language	Region	Districts	Result area
1	Luganda	Central	Wakiso, Gomba	Result 1 and 2
1	Runyankore/ Rukiga	South West	Kiruhura, Bushenyi, Kabale	
1	Ateso	Eastern	Kumi, Katakwi, Serere	
1	Leblango	Northern	Apac, Lira, Kole	
2	Runyoro/Rutoro	Mid-Western	Masindi, Kyenjojo, Kabarole	
2	Acholi	Mid-Northern	Gulu, Pader, Kitgum	
2	Lugbarati	West Nile	Arua	Result 1 only
2	Lumasaba	Mid-Eastern	Mbale, Sironko, Manafwa	
3	Lugwere	Mid -Eastern	Budaka, Pallisa, Kibuku	
3	Ngakarimojong	North East	Nakapiripirit, Napak, Abim, Kaabong	
3	Lukhonzon	Mid-Eastern	Kasese	
3	Lusoga	East Central	Iganga and Kamuli	

Source: USAID/Uganda SHRP PMP. Version September 19, 2013
(Bold = sites visited during mid-term PE)

A.3 Data Collection Methods

Document review. The goal of our document review is to obtain information to answer the key evaluation questions and determine which evaluation questions need detailed primary data collection and verification in the field. While we will continue to be alert to additional documents that may shed light on the evaluation questions (which may be surfaced in the stakeholder workshop during the TPM), we anticipate reviewing the following documents:

- SHRP reports: EGRA reports; KAP survey; 2014-2015 work plan, PMP, and quarterly and annual report (narrative and financial); and any internal assessments or case studies
- USAID: CDCS, LARA program description, SHRP cooperative agreement and amendments
- GoU: MoESTS program strategy, policies, systems, and tools reflecting/supporting the methodology (including exit strategy); Government budget information on education; Uganda National Examination Board (UNEB) data on student performance; Education Management Information System (EMIS) data including HIV/AIDS indicator data
- P&IE:
 - ▶ Continuous evaluation reports, monthly activity reports, and monthly feedback memos
 - ▶ Annual impact evaluation reports
 - ▶ Mid-term PE
- SHRP program materials: instructional materials, district and school level monitoring and supervision registers and reports, SHRP EGRA reports; internal and external information and knowledge sharing materials (including virtual), presentations; KAP survey reports

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). The purpose of these interviews will be to assess: program achievement for reading and health outcomes and factors affecting progress toward achieving life of

project targets; implementation effectiveness specifically related to the critical areas of capacity building and community mobilization; ability of the methodology to continue without USAID assistance; and the presence and effectiveness of mechanisms for learning and adaptation for performance improvement. We will conduct KIIs with stakeholders at national, district school/community levels, including with USAID, MoESTS and related entities, World Bank, and RTI and their partners. See Section B below for the full list of interviewees. Annex B includes the preliminary contact list, based on the mid-term PE, which will be updated after confirming with USAID that all the contacts are still involved in the project and available to participate in the final performance evaluation. Any additional stakeholders who are crucial to the future implementation of USAID programming will be consulted.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). FGDs will be conducted with:

- School management committees (SMCs) regarding implementation (community mobilization) and sustainability (Q2, Q3)
- Classroom teachers regarding implementation (training and community mobilization), sustainability, and learning and adaptation (Q2, Q3, Q4)
- Secondary School Students regarding implementation (community mobilization), sustainability, and learning and adaptation (Q2, Q3, Q4)

Based on the mid-term evaluation, we anticipate 12 or fewer participants per FGD, all to be held on school premises. We will work with each school to obtain gender representation. We will follow standard Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval requirements, led by NORC.

Classroom observations. We will conduct classroom observations in P1-P3 to examine the extent to which teachers are applying the reading methodologies learned during SRHP workshops. The team will also assess the reading materials in the classroom, learner participation in reading activities, and the teacher lesson plans to ensure consistency with the curriculum and teacher's guide.

B. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS METHODS

B.1 Data Sources

The **sources of data** for the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation will include:

- Program documents
 - ▶ Cooperative agreement and amendments
 - ▶ SHRP reports: work plans, PMP, quarterly and annual reports (narrative and financial)
 - ▶ SHRP materials related to instruction, district and school monitoring and supervision registers and reports, EGRA reports, internal and external information and knowledge sharing materials (including virtual), presentations, KAP survey reports
- MoESTS program strategy, policies, systems, and tools reflecting/supporting the methodology (including exit strategy); Government budget information on education; UNEB data on student performance; EMIS data including HIV/AIDS indicator data

- Continuous evaluation observation reports, monthly activity reports, and monthly feedback memos
- Qualitative information via:
 - ▶ KIIs and FGDs with stakeholders, implementing partners, and beneficiaries
 - ▶ Classroom observation
- Quantitative data:
 - ▶ SHRP EGRA reports
 - ▶ UNEB data on student performance
 - ▶ KAP survey and other HIV/AIDS information
 - ▶ P&IE annual impact evaluations

Individuals and groups to be interviewed include:

USAID

- Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for P&IE
- Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR) for SHRP
- USAID HIV/AIDS Prevention Specialist (U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) point of contact)
- Organizational Learning Advisor

World Bank

- Education Officer

National Level/GoU

- SHRP counterparts (Commissioner of SNE and commissioners for R1 Reading and R2 Health)
- HIV/AIDS Unit/Technical Working Group (TWG)
- National Curriculum Development Center (NCDC)
- Uganda National Examination Board (UNEB)
- Directorate of Education Standards (DES)
- Teacher and Instructor Education and Training

District level/GoU

- District Inspector of Schools (DIS)
- District and/or Municipal Education Officer (DEO, MEOs)
- Primary Teacher College (PTC) Principal
- Coordinating Centre Tutor (CCT)
- Local Language Board (LLB) members
- Civic and political leaders

School and community level

- Head teacher
- Teachers trained in R1 or R2
- Secondary school learners

- SMCs (composed of parents, teachers, and community leaders)

RTI

- COP
- Deputy Chief of Party (D/COP)
- M&E Advisor
- Result Team Leaders and Teams
- Field Assistants (in districts visited)

RTI partners: WEI, SIL LEAD, CSR, Perkins International

This results in approximately 20-25 interviews in Kampala, or 4-5 interviews per day during the week dedicated to national level interviews. Each district will be visited for two days, with one day dedicated to school-based interviews, observation, and FGDs; and one day to interviews with district officials.

B.2 Data Analysis

The documents, KIIs, FGDs, and site visits/observations will be analyzed to identify key themes in each of these areas and in particular in response to each of the evaluation questions. To the extent possible, data will be disaggregated by gender, age, geographic location, income level, and other important characteristics.

We will use standard data collection tools, protocols, and templates to ensure consistency in data collection and analysis. Raw data collected from KIIs and FGDs will initially be documented in the instrument template on a daily basis. At the end of each week in the field, the team will begin to consolidate findings by key questions and themes.

At the end of fieldwork, the responses will then be entered into an Excel spreadsheet and coded, consolidated and calculated to determine frequencies and percentages per evaluation question. Descriptive data collected from classroom observations will be recorded in a Word document and key findings will be consolidated into themes and tabulated in a separate Excel spreadsheet. The findings from document review and analysis of the student achievement data will be recorded in a table organized by key question and data source. This will be done prior to, during, and after fieldwork, as new insights can be gleaned from document review after the fieldwork and data can be triangulated. Each team member will crosscheck the questions and responses for accuracy and consistency.

All team members will be responsible for entering the data for their particular question or area of focus. Once all data has been consolidated into a summary spreadsheet, the data will be analyzed and findings, conclusions and recommendations will be developed using the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (FCR) table.

B.3 Design and Methodology Limitations

We recognize the inherent limitations and challenges associated with a non-experimental evaluation design and with collecting and analyzing information for a program that is both national and local in its scope. Fortunately, we have the benefit of collecting a large amount of information over a long period of time covering a great deal of the activities underway. We also have a strong understanding of the work,

and will not have to spend a large amount of time simply orienting ourselves to the basic fundamentals of the program. Panagora and NORC are also taking advantage of the time in advance of the final evaluation to analyze available data, including continuous evaluation data, and the SHRP work plan and PMP against the progress as stated in the quarterly reports, which will additionally increase the foundation of our understanding and knowledge coming into the evaluation. To minimize the degree of bias in the evaluation and increase the validity of the findings, we will triangulate results from the document review with other data sources from interviews, classroom observations and focus groups.

While recognizing the limits of this evaluation regarding generalizability, we will attempt to assess a cross-section of the population that cuts across both project components, high and low-performing schools, and across multiple districts and regions in order to provide a snapshot into the results and lessons learned that may inform future projects with similar conditions and target populations. This is the most cost-effective approach for achieving the results within the timeframe and resources available.

B.4 Performance Evaluation Framework

Our PE Planning Framework links each evaluation question with data collection methods and sources.

SHRP Final Performance Evaluation: Key Questions and Data Sources		
Key Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	
	Document Review	KIIs, FGDs, Classroom Observation
IMPLEMENTATION		
<p><i>Key question:</i> Has the program been implemented according to plan (program and budget) and is it on track to achieve its overall objectives and results? What should be done in the final year to optimize results? [Address each result and factors affecting achievement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PMP, monitoring data, detailed program and financial reports ▪ EGRA reports ▪ KAP survey data ▪ UNEB/NAPE data ▪ EMIS data 	<p>KII:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GoU: MoESTS, DES, DEO/MEO, PTC, CCT, UNEB, NCDC ▪ USAID (including PEPFAR POC) ▪ RTI and its sub-awardees ▪ Head teachers <p>FGD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trained teachers
DESIGN		
<p>Key question: Does the approach to (a) capacity building (training, continuous professional development, and monitoring and supervision) for teachers (head and classroom teachers) and (b) community mobilization facilitate achievement of the desired results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CA and amendments ▪ SHRP reports: PMP, quarterly, annual, ad hoc reports, work plans and presentations, minutes ▪ Ministry/USAID/program strategy documents ▪ P&IE Continuous Evaluation reports (observed events, monthly reports, performance feedback memos) 	<p>KII:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GoU: MoESTS, DES, DEO/MEO, PTC, CCT, UNEB, NCDC ▪ USAID (including PEPFAR POC) ▪ RTI and its sub-awardees ▪ Head teachers ▪ Civic/political leaders(s) <p>Classroom observation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary and secondary schools <p>FGD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Classroom teachers ▪ Secondary school learners ▪ SMCs
SUSTAINABILITY		
<p><i>Key question:</i> To what extent will the reading and health program continue without USAID assistance? Examine capacity, systems, financing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government policies, systems, and tools reflecting/supporting the methodology (including exit strategy) ▪ Government budget information ▪ Instructional materials ▪ District and school level monitoring and supervision registers and report ▪ P&IE Continuous Evaluation reports (observed events, monthly reports, performance feedback 	<p>KII:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GoU: MoESTS, DES, DEO/MEO, PTC, CCT, UNEB, NCDC ▪ USAID ▪ World Bank GPE personnel ▪ RTI and its sub-awardees ▪ Head teachers ▪ Civic/political leader(s) <p>FGD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary school learners • Classroom teachers

SHRP Final Performance Evaluation: Key Questions and Data Sources		
Key Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	
	Document Review	KIIs, FGDs, Classroom Observation
	memos)	• SMCs
LEARNING AND ADAPTATION		
<p><i>Key question:</i> What were the challenges, lessons learned, and adaptations throughout implementation? Are there effective mechanisms in place for learning and adaptation (performance improvement) as a result of the SHRP project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SHRP reports: quarterly and annual reports, work plans, PMP ▪ SHRP internal and external information and knowledge sharing materials (including virtual) ▪ P&IE Continuous Evaluation reports (observed events, monthly reports, performance feedback memos); and PE 	<p>KII:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GoU: MoESTS, DES, DEO/MEO, PTC, CCT, UNEB, NCDC ▪ USAID (including PEPFAR POC) ▪ World Bank GPE personnel ▪ RTI and its sub-awardees ▪ Head teachers <p>FGD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Classroom teachers

EVALUATION TASKS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIMELINE

A. TASKS

The key tasks include the following:

- Prepare final Mid-Term Evaluation report
- Finalize tools including tailoring them to each audience
- Finalize schedule and logistics
- Plan TPM for first two days in-country
- Carry out desk review and analyses
- Carry out Kampala-based interviews
- Carry out site visits to regions/districts/schools
- Analyze information collected
- Develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- Prepare PowerPoint presentation summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- Vet PowerPoint presentation summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations with RTI and USAID
- Prepare final evaluation report

B. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Staffing. The final PE will be undertaken by staff provided by Panagora Group, specifically:

- Team Leader, Betsy Bassan
- Literacy/Education Specialist, Brenda Sinclair
- Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator, Stella Neema

NORC's COP, Alicia Menendez, and home office director, Varuni Dayaratna, will provide ongoing oversight and support; country-based support will be provided by NORC's REM, Evelyn Namubiru, who will also participate in the field visits to schools to expand the number of site visits.

The team leader will be responsible for the overall quality and completeness of the final PE, implementation of the PE work plan, and day-to-day supervision of the PE team, which will be managed in a collaborative manner. Via prior planning and communication to prepare for the PE, the team planning meeting at the outset of the assignment in country, and continuing communication and meetings throughout the PE, the team leader will ensure clear understanding among team members on respective roles and responsibilities, the work plan, and the final product. The team leader will ensure data collection instruments are aligned with the evaluation questions, and that the schedule, logistics, and interview protocol (alternating responsibility for leading meetings and note-taking) are clearly set out and

commonly understood. She will ensure that the evaluation team maintains its time schedule, including the timeline for data collection, analysis, report development, report vetting, and finalization.

The Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist will provide specialized expertise in all element of the evaluation related to Result 1, including input on data collection instruments, the development of the data collection plan and its implementation, analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, and development of findings, conclusions, and recommendations on early grade reading and education. The Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator will play a similar role for Result 2. In addition, she will support the Team Leader in advance and in-country scheduling and logistics. Both specialists will fully participate in drafting the evaluation report and in supporting the team leader to finalize the report. The REM will provide ongoing support to the PE team with scheduling, logistics, and participation in district visits.

C. WORK PLAN TIMELINE AND OUTPUTS

SHRP Final Evaluation Activity and Outputs Timeline		
Timeline (Period, Location)	Activity	Outcome
<p>Planning and preparation (virtual)</p> <p>Mid-Jan to end- Feb 2016</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review and document analyses ▪ Determine KII and FGD list, and districts/school selection ▪ Develop data collection instruments ▪ Schedule KIIs, FGDs, and site visits and complete all related logistics ▪ Prepare detailed outline for Final PE ▪ Vet and finalize key questions with SHRP stakeholders (USAID, MoESTS, RTI) ▪ Conduct thorough analysis of continuous monitoring data ▪ Prepare agenda for TPM ▪ Team Leader and Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist arrive in Kampala on Sunday, March 6; joined by Ugandan Sr. HIV/AIDS Evaluator and REM 	<p>Highly developed data collection instrument, PE implementation plan including design, schedule, logistics, etc.</p>
<p>March 4-5 and 7</p> <p>Launch of Uganda-based field work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-briefing with USAID ▪ Stakeholder workshop (half day) to share evaluation design and work plan, and discuss any final refinements ▪ P&IE Evaluation team Team Planning Meeting (TPM) to finalize data collection plans and instruments, clarify roles and responsibilities, review/confirm PE implementation plan including approach to ongoing analysis and writing. 	<p>Final data collection instruments, and PE implementation plan</p>
<p>March 8-11</p> <p>Kampala-based data collection (divide up interviews)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ March 8-11 (4 days): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KIIs with USAID (COR, AOR, HIV/AIDS Prevention Specialist, and Organizational Learning Advisor) – 4 interviews (1 day) ▶ KIIs with MoESTS counterparts other GoU education entities – 8 interviews (2 days) ▶ KIIs with RTI – 5 interviews + 2 Result Teams (1.5 days) ▶ KIIs with RTI sub-awardees (some by Skype) – 3-4 	

SHRP Final Evaluation Activity and Outputs Timeline		
Timeline (Period, Location)	Activity	Outcome
	<p>interviews (0.5 day)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KII with World Bank – 1 interview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ March 12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Draft notes and discuss data analysis (Saturday) 	
<p>Mar 14-19</p> <p>District/school site visits and data collection</p> <p>2 days each: districts TBD</p>	<p>Split into two teams for two district visits; and into four teams for four districts each, covering total of six districts and 12 schools; with 2 days/district</p> <p>Travel between districts on Wednesday, March 16; and travel back to Kampala on Saturday, March 19</p>	<p>Visit a total of 12 schools in mix of regions, types of districts, rural/urban, high/medium/low performing</p>
<p>March 21 – 26</p> <p>Kampala-based</p>	<p>March 21 – March 24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Debrief on district visits, finalize notes ▪ Enter data into spreadsheet per stakeholder ▪ Consolidate data into summary data ▪ Review, triangulate and tabulate data ▪ Analyze data and develop initial findings, conclusions, and recommendations (FCRs) ▪ Prepare presentation for USAID and other stakeholders <p>March 24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vet initial FCRs with RTI <p>March 25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide presentation to USAID (morning) ▪ Provide presentation to MoESTS (midday) <p>March 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Populate the detailed outline of PE report (bullet-point content for each section and agree on writing responsibilities and timetable for final report ▪ March 27: international experts depart country 	<p>FCRs developed</p> <p>Presentation for stakeholders</p> <p>Detailed report outline with bullet-point content for each section and identified writing responsibilities and timetable</p>
<p>March 28 – April 22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finalize drafting of PE report ▪ Vet PE report with RTI for factual accuracy (one week) 	<p>Draft PE Report; RTI comments</p>
<p>April 25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NORC submits Mid-Term PE to USAID on October 31 (two weeks for USAID’s review) 	<p>USAID’s PE comments</p>
<p>May 2-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments integrated and final PE report submitted to USAID 	<p>Final PE report</p>

D. KEY INFORMANTS AND FOCUS DISCUSSION GROUPS

We will collect information at the national level and at the district and school level, focusing on the entities and individuals cited below. An initial contact list is provided in Annex B.

D.1 National Level Data Collection

The detailed list of KIIs in Kampala by category of interviews and time allocated to each is as follows:

- Government – 2 days
 - ▶ MoESTS (three counterparts and HIV/AIDS TWG)
 - ▶ DES
 - ▶ NCDC
 - ▶ UNEB
 - ▶ TIET
- USAID – COR for P&IE, COA for SHRP, HIV/AIDS Prevention Specialist, Organizational Learning Advisor – 1 day
- RTI – 1.5 days
 - ▶ COP
 - ▶ D/COP
 - ▶ M&E Advisor
 - ▶ R1 Reading Manager
 - ▶ R2 Health Lead
 - ▶ R1 Reading Team
 - ▶ R2 Health Team
- SHRP NGO partners: 0.5 day
 - ▶ CSR/Kampala
 - ▶ WEI/Boston
 - ▶ SIL LEAD
 - ▶ Perkins International

By dividing responsibility for these interviews among the team, we will be able to complete them within 5 days.

D.2 District and School Level Data Collection

KIIs and FGDs at the district and school level will include:

- Districts: DEO, DIS, LLB, PTC, CCT- 1 day
- Schools: 2 schools per day, primary in the morning, and secondary in the afternoon
 - ▶ Classroom observation
 - ▶ FGDs with :
 - SMCs
 - Secondary School learners
 - ▶ KIIs with trained teachers (head and classroom for R1 Reading and R2 Health)

E. WORK PLAN OUTPUTS

The key outputs are the:

1. PE Implementation Work Plan, completed by March 7 at the TPM in Kampala
2. Stakeholder PE Presentation, March 25
3. Draft PE report submitted for review to USAID on April 25 (includes opportunity for RTI review for accuracy prior to submission to USAID)
4. Final PE report with comments integrated and submitted to USAID, May 6

STRUCTURE OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Following USAID's Evaluation Report Template (and its page allocations, where indicated), and taking into account the mid-term PE, the structure of the SHRP final PE report will be as follows:

Cover (incorporating Marking and Branding Plan requirements)

Acknowledgements and cover photo caption from evaluation site visits

Title Page

TOC

Acronyms

Executive Summary (3-4 pp)

I. Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions (1-2 pp)

II. Program Background (1-3 pp)

III. Evaluation Design, Methods and Limitations (1-3 pp with details in annex)

IV. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (page length not prescribed; typically 20 pages) – presented by evaluation question

Annexes

Annex A: Evaluation Statement of work

Annex B: Evaluation Timeline

Annex C: Data Collection Instruments

Annex D: Program Description

Annex E: Summary of Performance Evaluation Feedback Memos

Annex D: Sources of Information (documents reviewed, sites visited, key informants, FGD (type and number participants)

Annex E: Summary of SHRP Budget Projections and Annual Expenditures

Annex F: Disclosures

PLAN FOR VALIDATION AND DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

A. VETTING AND VALIDATION OF MID-TERM EVALUATION PLAN

During the start-up of P&IE in October 2012, Panagora vetted a “Plan for Conducting the PEs of Uganda SHRP,” with USAID and with RTI. Panagora has maintained communication with RTI on evaluation timing, interviews, and site visits. Per the Utilization Focused Approach, SHRP stakeholders will be included throughout the evaluation process, providing input on the evaluation design at the initial TPM;; vetting the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations; and reviewing and providing comments on the draft report.

B. DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

We recognize the significance of the P&IE as a pioneering effort to implement USAID’s relatively new Evaluation Policy and SHRP as an innovative and cross-disciplinary effort. As with the mid-term PE, we will hold a dissemination workshop on the final PE in Uganda. Given the heightened level of participation in the final PE and the fact that it is a final, we anticipate being able to focus discussion in the dissemination workshop on lessons learned and best practices applicable to such programs in Uganda and elsewhere. We also stand ready to explore other avenues for sharing the results with the broader international development community, whether through a presentation at USAID/W, or an event with the Society for International Development or another relevant professional association.

In addition, the Final PE report will be made available in digital form in the through the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse website (dec.usaid.gov) so that it is can be accessed publicly.

ANNEX A. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

A.1 KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

SHRP Key Evaluation Questions and Sub-Questions. Each guide draws as appropriate on the following key evaluation and sub-questions:

1. Implementation

Has the project been implemented according to plan (program and budget) and is it on track to achieve its overall objectives and results?

R1 Reading Results: To what extent did the project achieve its reading outcomes? What factors contributed to reading outcomes in high performing schools?

R2 Health Results: To what extent did the project achieve its health outcomes? What factors contributed to improved HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices?

- a. Overall opinion Y ____ N ____
- b. Supporting evidence: key activities, reading performance data (EGRA, KAP, NAPE, EMIS)
- c. Factors affecting outcomes?
- d. What should be done in the final year to optimize results?

2. Design

Does the implementation approach to (a) *capacity building* (training, continuous professional development, and monitoring and supervision) for teachers (head and classroom teachers) and (b) *community mobilization* facilitate achievement of the desired results?

- a. Capacity Building
 - Overall opinion: Y ____ N ____
 - How many have been trained?
 - What is the uptake of the teachers on the methodology?
 - How is uptake assessed? What is the efficacy of tools used (continuous professional development (CPD) and monitoring, support and supervision (MSS))
 - Given data on reading improvement (impact evaluation and EGRA data), how can uptake be improved for better reading performance?
 - What should be done in the final year to optimize results
- b. Community mobilization
 - Overall opinion: Y ____ N ____

- Supporting evidence, e.g., elements of community targeted, approaches for mobilizing, participation elicited, concrete support that resulted
- What should be done in the final year to optimize results?

3. Sustainability

To what extent will the reading and health program continue without USAID assistance?

- a. Will programs continue without USAID assistance? Y ____ N ____
- b. What capacity and systems (policies, procedures, and tools) have been SHRP established?
- c. What additional capacity and systems are necessary to fully institutionalize the program?
- d. Do the financing commitments exist to sustain the program?
- e. What recommendations for strengthening program sustainability in the final year?

4. Learning and Adaptation

What were the challenges, lessons learned, and adaptations throughout implementation? Are there effective mechanisms in place for learning and adaptation (performance improvement) as a result of the SHRP project?

- a. Overall opinion regarding whether there are effective mechanisms for learning and adaptation: Y ____ N ____
- b. What are the mechanisms for learning and adaptation and frequency of use, at all levels?
- c. What are concrete examples of learning and adaptation? Cite challenges, lessons learned, and adaptations.
- d. What recommendations for strengthening learning and adaptation in this and other USAID activities?
- e. Given lessons learned through SHRP's results on reading and P&IE impact evaluation data, what concrete recommendations would you make for other countries?

A.2 CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE – DRAFT



USAID/Uganda MoESTS School Health and Reading Program -Lesson Observation

District _____	CC _____
School Name: _____	
Teacher Name: _____ Male/Female _____	
Name and title of Monitor: _____	
Date of Monitoring Visit (and day of the week): _____	

Teacher Identification Information (<i>complete this before the lesson begins with information from the head teacher and/or teacher</i>)	
1	Grade level of Lesson to be observed: a. <input type="checkbox"/> P1 : b. <input type="checkbox"/> P2 : c. <input type="checkbox"/> P3 : d. <input type="checkbox"/> P4
2	How many streams of the grade level being observed does the school have? _____ If more than one stream, which does the teacher teach?: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ other: _____
3	Lesson/learning area to be observed: a. <input type="checkbox"/> Reading (literacy 1) b. <input type="checkbox"/> writing (literacy 2) c. <input type="checkbox"/> English d. <input type="checkbox"/> oral literature c. <input type="checkbox"/> news
4	Number of learners registered in Class (from class register): Total _____ Boys _____ Girls _____ Teacher has class register <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Register is up to date <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5	Language school uses for instruction in P1-P3: a. <input type="checkbox"/> Ateso b. <input type="checkbox"/> Luganda c. <input type="checkbox"/> Runyankore/Rukiga d. <input type="checkbox"/> Leblango e. <input type="checkbox"/> English f. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (specify) g. <input type="checkbox"/> Leb Acoli h. <input type="checkbox"/> Lugbarati i. <input type="checkbox"/> Runyoro/Rutooro j. <input type="checkbox"/> Lumasaaba
Pre-observation	
	Teacher attended USAID/SHRP/RTI early grade reading training in: January 2013: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No May 2013: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No September 2013: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No January 2014: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No May 2014: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If answer is no, If they are the appropriate class teacher, why didn't they attend training?
6	Does the Teacher have? Thematic curriculum teachers' guide <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No : SHRP teachers' guide <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No : MoESTS Primary school curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No : Teachers' resource book <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No:
7	Teacher has class timetable? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Teacher is following the timetable <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Ask to see the teacher's lesson plan and scheme of work	
8	Lesson follows the thematic curriculum (includes theme/sub-theme corresponding to school term). <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	Notes:
9	Lesson plan includes aspects of appropriate reading methodology and follows the teaching reading guide <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Notes:
10	(Page through the teacher’s planning book). Does it appear that teacher consistently develops lesson plans? (Plans have dates and are in a logical sequence). Notes:
Classroom Environment	
11	Fewer than half of the learners have seats <input type="checkbox"/> OR More than half have seats <input type="checkbox"/> OR ALL Have Seats <input type="checkbox"/> OR NO Seats <input type="checkbox"/> Notes:
12	Learners’ work is displayed in the room/space or on the walls. a. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes b. <input type="checkbox"/> No c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (or no walls) Notes:
13	Are there reading displays in class? a. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes b. <input type="checkbox"/> No

NOTE: Remember to record the time when the lesson started and when it ended in the section on top of this page

Lesson Observation: It may be possible to observe more than one lesson.

Class Start-up (tick “observed” only once as the action first occurs. At end of observation, tick actions that were not observed)

Lesson 1 _____ starts: ____:____	lesson ends: ____:____	length of lesson _____ minutes
Lesson 2 _____ starts: ____:____	lesson ends: ____:____	length of lesson _____ minutes

	Observed	Not observed
--	-----------------	---------------------

Instructional Content:

13	Followed the steps in the SHRP teachers’ guide Notes:		
	Teacher guides learners to.... (Tick what is relevant for Lit 1 and 2, Oral literature, News and English.		
14	Read words from printed material or book (individual reading of printed material)		
15	Read words/texts from the chalkboard		
16	Make correct letter sounds		
17	Differentiate between letter name and the correct letter sound		
18	See words as made up of syllables (writes words by syllable on board e.g. “ki-tten”).		
19	“beat the word” – clap/beat/tap/stamp the syllables of words		
20	Blend letter sounds to make words		
21	Write a letter pattern in the air		
22	Hold the pen/pencil correctly		
23	Recite a traditional text from memory		
24	Answer questions related to the oral traditional text/story		

25	Write/tell their own news stories		
26	Use sentence structure		
	Learner assessment		
27	Teacher assesses some learners during class (checks exercise books, gets them to read/write individually) Notes (Specify the type of assessment(s) observed);		
28	Is there evidence that the teacher keeps regular records to track learners' performance in reading/writing? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If "yes" please note what method is used to track learner performance in reading /writing		
Teaching Learning Material Use: Teacher uses... (note how used if relevant)			
29	Blackboard/Chalkboard		
30	Textbook		
31	Supplementary reading materials		
32	Work sheets		
33	Poster/wall charts (with letters, words, pictures)		
34	Flash cards		
35	Slates		
36	Learners books		
37	Manipulatives (e.g. real objects, bottle caps, clay, sand, cut out words, etc.)		
38	Girls and boys were given equal chances to answer questions <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
39	Teacher taught lesson in local language (not applicable for English lesson): a. <input type="checkbox"/> All the time b. <input type="checkbox"/> some of time c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		

Please provide any other observations about the lesson or classroom. If useful, you can even draw what the teacher has written on the board.

The following questions are asked/answered at the end of the lesson.

1	Number of learners attending class: total_____ boys ____ girls_____ [Ask boys to stand, count, then girls]
2	(Comparing learners registered and attending) Number of learners absent today: total_____ boys ____ girls_____
	<i>For Questions 3-6 ask children to hold up book, exercise book/paper/slate, and pencil for the lesson. Count.</i>
3	How many learners have reading or printed material? <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Half or more than half <input type="checkbox"/> Less than half <input type="checkbox"/> None
4	<i>The language of the reading or printed material is</i> <input type="checkbox"/> local language being used by teacher <input type="checkbox"/> English <input type="checkbox"/> other language
5	How many learners have a pen and exercise book? <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Half or more than half <input type="checkbox"/> Less than half <input type="checkbox"/> None

DRAFT

6	Are there other books accessible for children to read in the class? a. <input type="checkbox"/> none b. <input type="checkbox"/> less than 20 books c. <input type="checkbox"/> more than 20
	For questions 8-9 randomly select 2-3 exercise books (from learners or a stack if they are all in one place).
7	What is the date of the last exercise? Are there regular exercise? Notes:
8	Has the teacher marked them in the last week? Notes:
9	Teacher taught the lesson as indicated in the lesson plan a. <input type="checkbox"/>Yes b. <input type="checkbox"/>Partly c. <input type="checkbox"/>Not at all d. <input type="checkbox"/>No lesson plan

ANNEX B. PRELIMINARY CONTACT LIST

USAID				
Organization	Title	Contact Name	Contact Number (Mobile)	Contact Email
USAID	Education Specialist	Sarah B. Mayanja	Office: 414-306-001	smayanja@usaid.gov
USAID	Office Director, Education, Youth and Child Development	Mariella Ruiz-Rodriquez	414-306-001 ext. 6580	mruiz-rodriquez@usaid.gov
USAID	Strategic Information Unit, Director Support Office of Health and Education	Joseph Mwangi	0772-138506	jmmwangi@usaid.gov
USAID/Health PEPFAR Point of Contact	HIV/AIDS Prevention Specialist	Rhobbinah Ssempebwa	0772-138526	rsempebw@usaid.gov

MOES and Affiliated Institutions				
Organization/Unit/ Department	Title	Contact Name	Contact Number (Mobile)	Contact Email
Special Needs Education	Commissioner of Special Needs SHRP Focal Point Officer	Martin Omagor	041250681	mlomagor2006@yahoo.com
Guidance and Counselling	Commissioner, Guidance and Counselling, SHRP R2 Component Manager	George Opiro	0772-977100	Opiro66@yahoo.co.uk
Guidance and Counselling	Education Officer, MoESTS HIV TWG- Technical Working Group	Harriet Ajilog	0772695895	
Secondary Education	Education Officer, Contact person for secondary schools	Santa Ateng	0777155563	
Basic Education	Commissioner, R1 Component Manager	Daniel Nkaada	0772361395, 0783896428	nkaadadaniel@yahoo.com
Basic Education	Assistant Commissioner, Basic Education	Mukasa Lusambu	0782830114	
MOES HIV Unit	Officers in the unit	Kasule Mohammed, Henry Semakula	0782805424	
Teacher Instruction and Educational Training (TIET)	Pre-primary and Primary Teacher Education	Elizabeth Kisakye	0772-411548	
Directorate of Education Standards	Director, also on MoESTS HIV TWG	Ha Mutazindwa	0752611438	Hzyfa2008@yahoo.com

Directorate of Education Standards	Senior Inspector of Schools, Desk Officer for Special Needs Education	Sarah Ayesiga	0772-453354	Sarah_ayesiga@yahoo.com
National Curriculum Development Centre	Deputy Director, NCDC	Angela Kyagaba	0772-196666	akyagaba@yahoo.com
National Curriculum Development Centre	Curriculum Specialist, Pre-primary and Primary	Sarah Natunga	0789-756889, 0772-683585	sarahnatunga@gmail.com
Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB)	Senior Evaluation Officer, NAPE	Opaman Amos	0772-601726, 0702-601726	opamos@yahoo.com
Uganda National Examinations Board	NAPE Officer	Harriet	0776655995	

RTI Staff				
Title	Contact Name	Location	Contact Number (Mobile)	Contact Email
Chief of Party	Saeeda Prew	Kampala	0791-252525 Office: 0312-202884	sprew@rti.org
Deputy Chief of Party	Derek Nkata	Kampala	0772-799970	dnkata@shrp.rti.org
M&E Director	Tracy Brunette	Kampala	0791-252526	tbrunette@shrp.rti.org
R1 Component Manager	Robinah Kyeyune	Kampala	0772-766006	rkyeyune@shrp.rti.org
Social and Community Mobiliser	Charity Baguma	Kampala	0782-340495, 0771013428	
Professional Development Specialist	Scholastica Tiguryera (Schola)	Kampala	0772-766011	stigurjera@shrp.rti.org
Finance Manager	Justus Noowe	Kampala	0776766635	

SHRP Implementing Partners					
Organization	Title	Contact Name	Location	Contact Number (Mobile)	Contact Email
Center for Social Research	Director	Wilson Asiimwe	Kampala	0772-685728	wilasatmisr@yahoo.com
Perkins International	Program Contact Person	Angela Affran	Kampala		Angela.Affran@Perkins.org
SIL LEAD Uganda	Uganda Project Manager	Susan Mubbala	Kampala	0772-411882	susan_mubbala@sil-lead.org
SIL LEAD Uganda	Project Support Specialist	Stacey Maresco	Washington, DC	202-466-0552	Stacey_maresco@sil-lead.org
World Education	Result 2 Component Manager Health Advisor	Sarah Kyobe	Kampala	0772-492200, 0772-205796	skyobe@shrp.rti.org
World Education	Vice President/Africa	Shirley Burchfield	Boston, MA	617-482-9485 ext. 3825	sburchfield@worlded.org