



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP)

Sustainability of the Reading First + Math Intervention among Cohort I Government Primary Schools in Liberia

LTTP Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Team

September 12, 2014

This publication is produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by FHI 360.

This Report was made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the Liberia Teacher Training Program II and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Table of Contents

Background and Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Key findings.....	5
A. General characteristics of Reading First + Math schools	5
B. Implementation status of Reading First + Math Program.....	5
Plans for the teaching of reading and math.....	7
C. Availability of Reading First + Math Materials.....	9
Conclusion.....	10
References	12
Annex: Reading First + Math Cohort I School Monitoring Form	13

Background and Introduction

FHI 360 and its implementing partner, RTI International, are collaborating on the second phase of the USAID-funded Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP II). The program interventions target activities and policy reforms in three areas: 1) policies, systems, and capacity development of the central MoE and of lower levels of education administration; 2) pre- and in-service policies and teacher professional development; and 3) curriculum standards, materials, and testing for literacy and mathematics skills in primary school grades 1-3 and grades 4-6 (USAID, 2013). The LTTP Reading First + Math intervention aims to support this third area, enhancing students' learning, particularly their proficiency in reading and numeracy.

The Reading First + Math intervention draws on the EGRA [Early Grade Reading Assessment] Plus model and supports reading and math instruction in grades 1, 2, and 3 of primary schools. Starting in the middle of the 2011-12 school year, LTTP led the Reading First + Math intervention in the initial cohort of 679 schools [Cohort 1 schools] in seven counties – Bomi, Bong, Gbarpolu, Lofa, Montserrado, Nimba, and River Gee – as shown in Table 1. Consistent with the efforts to sustain the reading program in the Liberian school system, LTTP trained at least one teacher in each of the Cohort I schools to serve as Reading Support Teacher (RST) and has continued to provide reading and math books for teachers and students to support instruction, with the most recent book distribution occurring in early 2014.

As LTTP teams gradually reduce direct support for the Reading First + Math program in the Cohort I schools, LTTP is now investigating whether the program is still being implemented in those schools. As part of this effort, LTTP's Monitoring, Evaluation and Research (MER) team randomly sampled 97 Cohort I schools in the 4 counties with greatest numbers of schools involved in the intervention (Montserrado, Bong, Nimba and Lofa). The goal of the monitoring exercise was to examine the extent to which various aspects of the Reading First + Math program have been sustained in those schools.

Table 1: Cohort 1 schools, by county

Counties	No. of Schools
Bomi	12
Bong	160
Gbarpolu	9
Lofa	124
Montserrado	117
Nimba	239
River Gee	36
Total	679

Methodology

In May and June 2014, the MER team ultimately monitored 89 of the 97 sampled schools in Bong, Lofa, Montserrado, and Nimba. The sample was decreased because the MER team was unable to

visit 8 of the original 97 schools for logistical reasons. For the monitoring exercise, the MER team designed a monitoring form (see Annex) together with LTTP’s Teacher Development team to collect information about the implementation of the Reading First + Math program. During data collection, the MER team completed the monitoring form by drawing information from conversations with principals and school staff and through observation of the school environment. The results from the monitoring exercise are summarized in this report.

Five MER Technical Assistants based in LTTP satellite offices served as the data collectors in this monitoring exercise. Three MER Technical Officers based in the country office in Monrovia supervised the exercise and analyzed the data, and the report was developed by a Monrovia-based MER Technical Officer and a DC-based MER Research Specialist, with technical oversight provided by the MER Technical Advisor and the Director of Teacher Development. The team considered three general themes that speak to whether a foundation is in place for continued reading and math instruction: a) characteristics of Cohort I schools, b) ongoing implementation of the reading and math program, and c) availability of the 2014 LTTP-developed reading and math books in schools.

Table 2: Sample distribution of Cohort I schools monitored, by county and district¹

County/District	No. of Schools	County/District	No. of Schools
Bong County	24	Nimba County	29
Fuamah District	1	Bain-Garr District	4
Gbarnga District	2	Gbehlay-Geh District	4
Kokoyah District	3	Saclapea 1 District	7
Panta Kpahi District	6	Saclapea 2 District	2
Salala District	3	Sanniqueellie-Mahn District	3
Sanoyea District ²	3	Yarpea-Mah District	1
Suakoko District	3	Yarwein-Mensonoh District	1
Zota District	3	Zoe-geh District	3
Lofa County	18	Tappita 1 District	4
Foya District	4	Montserrado County	18
Kolahun District	2	Right Bank St. Paul District	4
Salayea District	6	Greater Monrovia II District ³	4
Vahun District	2	Todee District	2
Voinjama District	2	Left Bank St. Paul District	3
Zorzor District	2	Careysburg District	2
		Greater Monrovia I District	3
			Total = 89

¹ Please note that 8 additional schools from the original sample were not surveyed due to logistical difficulties.

² One school in Sanoyea has grade 1 classes only, not grades 2 or 3. Where indicators are presented as proportions by grade, this school is included in the denominator of calculations for grade 1 and excluded from the denominator for grades 2 and 3.

³ One school from Greater Monrovia II now only offers early childhood education and no longer offers classes in early primary grades. This school was monitored and still has an RST employed but is excluded from analysis in subsequent sections, given the focus of the Reading First + Math program on early primary grades.

Of the 89 schools monitored, 1 school in Montserrado no longer has Grade 1-3 classes and now only offers an early childhood program. While this school reported that they still had an RST employed, the school is excluded from analysis because the focus of the Reading First + Math program is on support in early primary grades. Of the 88 schools ultimately included in the analysis, 71 (81%) were in session during MER visits; though this should not be taken as indication of a school's operating status. MER staff made every effort to visit schools during normal operating hours, but some visits were conducted outside of normal hours due to logistical challenges. The MER team was able to collect data even when schools were not in session through discussion with principals and other staff and through observation of the school premises.

Key findings

A. General characteristics of Reading First + Math schools

The sustainability of the Reading First + Math program is partly dependent on the presence of supportive, functioning school environments that include facilities and basic school staff. The MER team investigated general characteristics of the sampled Reading First + Math schools, with results presented in Table 3.

Across all 88 schools, 170 teachers work with Grade 1 classes, 180 teachers are involved with Grade 2 classes, and 189 teachers are assigned to Grade 3, though in some Cohort I schools early grade teachers teach multi-grade classes. In total, the schools had 94 classrooms with Grade 1 students, 90 classrooms with Grade 2 students, and 90 classrooms with Grade 3 students. This means that there is approximately 1 classroom per school to accommodate each grade, though in some cases this may mean that a classroom accommodates multiple grades.

B. Implementation status of Reading First + Math Program

In order to provide a sense of whether implementation of the Reading First + Math program was ongoing at the time of the monitoring exercise, the areas the MER team considered include a) the presence of Reading Support Teachers (RSTs), who are meant to provide key reading instruction in order to sustain the reading program; b) plans for the teaching of reading; and c) examples of recent reading activities. Indicators relating to the implementation of the Reading First + Math Program are provided in Table 4.

Of the 88 schools visited, 9 schools (10%) reported that they no longer had RSTs. RST attrition had the lowest impact on schools in Montserrado and Bong, where all schools surveyed still had an RST at the school, and the greatest impact in Lofa, where roughly 33% of schools surveyed no longer benefited from RST support. Comments solicited during the school visits suggested that one school had already been without an RST for a year. The explanations offered for RST attrition included that one RST had sought alternative employment having not received payment for work as an RST.

Table 3. Characteristics of monitored schools

Indicators	Overall	Bong	Lofa	Montserrado	Nimba
Number of schools monitored	88	24	18	17	29
Number of teachers in the school assigned to:					
<i>teach grade 1</i>	170	52	25	32	61
<i>teach grade 2</i>	180	55	25	34	66
<i>teach grade 3</i>	189	59	28	34	68
Number of Grade 1-3 classrooms in the schools:					
<i>classrooms for grade 1</i>	94	24	19	18	33
<i>classrooms for grade 2</i>	90	23	19	19	29
<i>classrooms for grade 3</i>	90	23	19	19	29
Number of Grade 1-3 classes in session during the monitoring visit:					
<i>grade 1 classes in session</i>	76	18	13	20	25
<i>grade 2 classes in session</i>	75	17	12	21	25
<i>grade 3 classes in session</i>	76	17	13	21	25

Among the schools in this study that still have an RST, in approximately 80% of the schools RSTs are involved with Grade 1 instruction, 83% of schools have RSTs involved in teaching Grade 2, and in 78% of RSTs are involved with teaching Grade 3, though 1 school in Montserrado was missing data in grade 3 for the question that informed this indicator.

Even where schools benefit from the presence of an RST, open-ended responses from principals suggested that implementation of the Reading + Math program was sometimes limited by other factors. In one school, challenges to full implementation of the Reading + Math program were linked to teacher absenteeism.

Plans for the teaching of reading and math

An important indicator of whether the Reading First + Math program was being implemented concerned whether the RST had a written plan for teaching reading the week of the monitoring visit.⁴ The monitoring study identified that the RST had a written plan for the teaching of reading in 85% of schools with an RST. It is important to note that of the 79 schools with an RST, 5 schools (6%) had no written plan for that week while 7 schools (9%) were missing responses, making it possible that a higher percentage of RSTs have written plans. Of the 7 schools missing data, 1 was in Nimba and 6 were in Bong, making figures for Bong less certain than other counties for this indicator.

As another indication of planning for reading and math instruction, the MER team observed class schedules and noted the number of days each week reading was supposed to be taught. For Grades 1, 2, and 3 on average reading was scheduled to be taught 4.5 days per week. Similarly, math was scheduled to be taught on average 4.5 days per week in the first three grades of primary school, suggesting that Cohort I schools continue to plan for reading and math instruction.

In Cohort 1 schools, the expectation is that reading will be taught daily. Notably, approximately two thirds of schools named a reading activity that had been conducted at the school recently, including one reading activity named at a school without an RST currently employed. This suggests that *at least* two thirds of schools offered learning activities related to reading skills recently, though we caution that the time period implied by “recent” was undefined in the questionnaire and therefore carries some ambiguity. The remaining one third of schools *may* have offered recent reading activities, but many responses were missing for this question and it is also possible that the timing of the MER team’s visit at a school impacted whether an activity was documented or not.

The figures in this section on RSTs at schools, their activities at school, and school plans for teaching reading suggest that some Cohort I schools are no longer implementing or no longer *fully* implementing the Reading First + Math program, but that the majority of Cohort I schools continue to benefit from at least basic support for reading instruction from RSTs and from reading lessons.

⁴ As part of the Reading First + Math program, LTTP issued a manual with guidance on instructional support and scripted lesson plans to RSTs. Responses about written plans during the monitoring exercise likely refer to these documents, though the monitoring questionnaire didn’t explicitly mention them.

Table 4. Indicators of reading and math program implementation

Indicators	Overall	Bong	Lofa	Montserrado	Nimba
Number of schools monitored	88	24	18	17	29
Number of schools who no longer have an RST at the school	9 (10.2%)	0 (00.0%)	6 (33.3%)	0 (00.0%)	3 (10.3%)
Number of schools with a designated RST still at the schools	79 (89.8%)	24 (100.0%)	12 (66.7%)	17 (100.0%)	26 (89.7%)
Of schools with an RST, the number of schools where the RST ⁵ :					
<i>teaches grade 1</i>	63 (79.7%)	15 (62.5%)	9 (75.0%)	13 (76.5%)	26 (100.0%)
<i>teaches grade 2</i>	65 (83.3%)	16 (69.6%)	9 (75.0%)	14 (82.4%)	26 (100.0%)
<i>teaches grade 3</i>	61 (78.2%)	19 (82.6%)	9 (75.0%)	14 (82.4%)	19 (73.1%)
Of schools with an RST, the number of schools where the RST has a written plan for the teaching of reading	67 (84.8%)	16 (66.7%)	10 (83.3%)	16 (94.1%)	25 (96.2%)
Number of schools with a <i>posted</i> all-school teaching schedule	76 (86.4%)	19 (79.2%)	15 (83.3%)	15 (88.2%)	27 (93.1%)
Number of schools with all-school teaching schedule that includes reading	75 (85.2%)	19 (79.2%)	15 (83.3%)	15 (88.2%)	26 (89.7%)
According to the class schedule, the average number of days each week Reading is supposed to be taught in ⁶ :					
<i>grade 1</i>	4.5	5	3	5	5
<i>grade 2</i>	4.5	5	3.4	5	5
<i>grade 3</i>	4.5	5	3.4	5	5
According to the class schedule, the average number of days each week Math is supposed to be taught in ⁷ :					
<i>grade 1</i>	4.5	5	3.6	4.6	4.4
<i>grade 2</i>	4.5	5	3.6	4.6	4.4
<i>grade 3</i>	4.5	5	3.6	4.6	4.4

⁵ One school in Sanoyea, Bong has no grade 2 or 3 classes, and the proportions of schools where the RST teaches grade 2 or grade 3 are calculated accordingly, using 23 instead of 24 schools as the denominator of the calculations for Bong and 78 instead of 79 schools as the denominator for the overall estimates.

⁶ As noted above, one school in Sanoyea, Bong doesn't have grade 2 or grade 3 classes. That school is excluded from the overall and Bong estimates for these two grades.

⁷ As previously noted, one school in Sanoyea, Bong doesn't have grade 2 or grade 3 classes. That school is excluded from the overall and Bong estimates for these two grades.

C. Availability of Reading First + Math Materials

The MER team collected information on whether a) schools received the teacher and pupil versions of the LTTP-developed reading and math books and b) schools distributed these reading and math books to teachers and pupils. Below we discuss the findings from this part of the monitoring exercise, addressing these two questions and referencing the situation overall in the four counties surveyed as well as differences across counties.

Books received by schools

As shown in the Table 5 overall, 75 of 88 (85%) schools visited had received the teacher and pupil versions of the 2014 LTTP-developed *reading* books.⁸ Almost the same number, 74 of 88 (84%) of the schools had received the teacher and pupil versions of the 2014 LTTP-developed *math* books. It is noteworthy that in Bong, Lofa, and Montserrado all or almost all (94%-100%) of the schools had received the teacher and pupil versions of LTTP-developed books for both subject areas, while in Nimba only 17 of 29 (59%) had received these books.

Books distributed to teachers and students⁹

Table 5 also indicates that, overall, 80%, 81%, and 77% of schools that reported receiving the 2014 LTTP-developed *reading* books had distributed the books to first, second, and third grade teachers, respectively. Similarly, we can see that 81%, 80%, and 76% of schools that reported receiving the pupil version of the 2014 LTTP-developed *reading* books had distributed the books to first, second, and third grade pupils, respectively. With respect to differences across counties, in Lofa only about 50% of the books that arrived at schools had been distributed to teachers and students.

Table 5 also reports that, overall, 81%, 84%, and 78% of schools that reported receiving the 2014 LTTP-developed *math* books had distributed the books to first, second, and third grade teachers, respectively. We can also note that that 81%, 84%, and 78% of schools that reported receiving the pupil version of the 2014 LTTP-developed *math* books had distributed the books to first, second, and third grade pupils, respectively. Regarding differences across counties, in Lofa only about 50% of schools that received books had distributed them to teachers and pupils.

⁸ Though we present statistics by grades at a school, we assume schools either received the full shipment of books at one time or no shipment. The data suggest that schools that received reading texts also received math texts except for one school in Bong that reported receiving reading but no math texts.

⁹ Percentages are reported from the number of schools that reported receiving books, in order to provide a sense of the gap between distribution to schools and distribution to intended beneficiaries, teachers and students.

Table 5. Availability of 2014 reading and math books in schools

Indicators	Overall	Bong	Lofa	Montserrado	Nimba
4.a) Number of schools monitored	88	24	18	17	29
4.b) Schools that <i>received</i> the most recent (2014) LTTP <i>reading</i> books for grade 1-3 <i>teachers</i>	75 (85.2%)	24 (100.0%)	18 (100.0%)	16 (94.1%)	17 (58.6%)
4.c) Schools that <i>received</i> the most recent (2014) LTTP <i>reading</i> books for grade 1-3 <i>pupils</i>	75 (85.2%)	24 (100.0%)	18 (100.0%)	16 (94.1%)	17 (58.6%)
4.d) Schools that <i>received</i> the most recent (2014) LTTP <i>math</i> books for grade 1-3 <i>teachers</i>	74 (84.1%)	23 (95.8%)	18 (100.0%)	16 (94.1%)	17 (58.6%)
4.e) Schools that <i>received</i> the most recent (2014) LTTP <i>math</i> books for grade 1-3 <i>pupils</i>	74 (84.1%)	23 (95.8%)	18 (100.0%)	16 (94.1%)	17 (58.6%)
Of schools from 4.b. that reported receiving books, schools that have distributed the LTTP <i>reading</i> books to ¹⁰ :					
<i>grade 1 teachers</i>	60 (80.0%)	22 (91.7%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 2 teachers</i>	60 (81.1%)	22 (95.7%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 3 teachers</i>	57 (77.0%)	19 (82.6%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	14 (82.4%)
Of schools from 4.c. that reported receiving books, schools that have distributed the LTTP <i>reading</i> books to ¹¹ :					
<i>grade 1 pupils</i>	61 (81.3%)	22 (91.7%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 2 pupils</i>	59 (79.7%)	21 (91.3%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	13 (76.5%)
<i>grade 3 pupils</i>	56 (75.7%)	19 (82.6%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	13 (76.5%)
Of schools from 4.d. that reported receiving books, schools that have distributed the LTTP <i>math</i> books to ¹² :					
<i>grade 1 teachers</i>	60 (81.1%)	21 (91.3%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 2 teachers</i>	61 (83.6%)	22 (100.0%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 3 teachers</i>	57 (78.1%)	19 (86.4%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	14 (82.4%)
Of schools from 4.e. that reported receiving books, schools that have distributed the LTTP <i>math</i> books to ¹³ :					
<i>grade 1 pupils</i>	60 (81.1%)	21 (91.3%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 2 pupils</i>	61 (83.6%)	22 (100.0%)	9 (50.0%)	16 (100.0%)	14 (82.4%)
<i>grade 3 pupils</i>	57 (78.1%)	19 (86.4%)	9 (50.0%)	15 (93.8%)	14 (82.4%)

Conclusion

In considering school contexts, implementation factors, and reading and math support materials, we found that most, though not all, Reading First + Math Cohort I schools in the four counties examined

¹⁰ Because one school in Sanoyea, Bong does not have classes for grades 2 or 3, that school is not included estimates for those two grades. This means the denominator

¹¹ See footnote 10.

¹² See footnote 10.

¹³ See footnote 10.

in this report continue to implement reading and math programming in at least limited ways. These schools are largely equipped with the basic materials, staff, and facilities to sustain the reading and math program into the future.

Considering the school environment, the majority of Reading First + Math Schools remain at least partly operational: Most schools are staffed with teachers and have some classroom space. Qualitative notes collected during interviews at schools suggest that normal school sessions are sometimes impeded in a subset of schools for reasons that included that a school building was in need of repairs or that students were occupied with farm activities and not in school.

Regarding the engagement of reading support teachers and planning for reading and math instruction, approximately 90% of schools still have an RST, and that RST teaches/supports instructional activities in approximately two thirds of all grade 1, grade 2, and grade 3 classes. In 85% of schools with an RST, the RST has a written plan for teaching reading, and reading and math lessons are each scheduled on average 4.5 days each week.

Sustained implementation of the Reading First + Math program relies on support materials, and so it is important to consider to what extent the 2014 reading and math books developed by LTTP have reached teachers and students in Cohort I schools. Figures show that about 85% of schools have received teacher and pupil reading books and 84% of schools have received teacher and pupil math books. However, not all these books have been distributed. The distribution issue pertains particularly in Lofa, where books only reached teachers and students in half of the schools that reported receiving them. In Nimba 59% of schools had not received books yet, though of those that had, the majority (around 80%) had distributed them to students and teachers.

The results of this monitoring exercise emphasize that the Reading First + Math program continues to be implemented, at least in basic ways, in the majority of Cohort I schools in the four counties surveyed in this monitoring exercise. However, activities have not been sustained equally across counties, and the program appears most endangered in Lofa, where RST attrition was highest (occurring in 1 of every 3 schools monitored) and distribution of textbooks and teacher guides within schools that received books was lowest of the four counties (occurring in only half of schools). Additional support for RST staffing and materials may help maintain reading and math instruction in schools where they are needed.

References

USAID (2013). Mid-term assessment of the Liberia Teacher Training Program Phase II.
Monrovia, Liberia: USAID.

Annex: Reading First + Math Cohort I School Monitoring Form



READING AND MATH COHORT 1 SCHOOLS MONITORING FORM

NAME OF SCHOOL: _____ **School Code** _____

District: _____ **County:** _____

Name/Signature of LTP Staff Completing the form:

_____/_____
Name Signature

Name/Signature of (Current) Reading Support Teacher:

_____/_____
Name Signature

Name/Signature of School Principal or Representative:

_____/_____
Name Signature

Date of Visit to School (MM/DD/YY): _____

Time of Arrival at School: _____ **Time of Departure from School:** _____

1. Is the school in session? Yes ____ No ____
2. How many teachers in the school teach:
Grade 1 _____
Grade 2 _____
Grade 3 _____

3. How many Grade 1 -3 classrooms are there at the school?

Number of Grade 1 classrooms _____

Number of Grade 2 classrooms _____

Number of Grade 3 classrooms _____

4. How many classes are in session today?

Grade 1 _____

Grade 2 _____

Grade 3 _____

5. How many Grade 1 – 3 teachers are present or absent today?

	PRESENT	ABSENT
Number of <i>Grade 1</i> teachers	_____	_____
Number of <i>Grade 2</i> teachers	_____	_____
Number of <i>Grade 3</i> teachers	_____	_____

6. Is the designated RST for the school still employed at the school? Yes ___ No ___

7. Was the RST at the school today? Yes ___ No ___

8. What grade(s) does the RST teach? *(Check[✓] all that apply)*

Grade 1 ___ Grade 2 ___ Grade 3 ___ Other Grade ___

9. Does the RST have a written plan for the teaching of reading this week? Yes ___ No ___

10. What was the most recent reading activity taught?

(For questions 10 to 18, observe and note)

11. Number of Grade 1 classrooms with a schedule of subjects taught displayed on the classroom wall: _____

12. Number of Grade 2 classrooms with a schedule of subjects taught displayed on the classroom wall: _____

13. Number of Grade 3 classrooms with a schedule of subjects taught displayed on the classroom wall: _____

14. Is there a posted all-school teaching schedule at the school? Yes ___ No ___

15. Location of posted all-school classroom schedule:

16. Does the class schedule include a schedule for teaching reading? Yes _____ No _____

17. According to the class schedule, how many days each week is reading supposed to be taught?

(Note: just enter the number; example 5 not 5 days)

Grade 1: _____ Grade 2: _____ Grade 3: _____

18. According to the class schedule, how many days each week is math supposed to be taught?

(Note: just enter the number; example 5 not 5 days)

Grade 1: _____ Grade 2: _____ Grade 3: _____

19. Who teaches Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3 classes when the teachers for these grade levels are absent?

The Principal: Always _____ Sometimes _____ Never _____

The RST: Always _____ Sometimes _____ Never _____

20. Did the school receive the most recent (2014) LTTTP reading books for Grade 1-3 teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

21. Did the school receive the most recent (2014) LTTTP reading books for Grade 1 – 3 pupils?

Yes _____ No _____

22. Did the school receive the most recent (2014) LTTTP math books for Grade 1-3 teachers?

Yes _____ No _____

23. Did the school receive the most recent (2014) LTTTP math books for Grade 1-3 pupils?

Yes _____ No _____

24. Have the LTTTP reading books been distributed to teachers?

Grade 1 teacher: Yes _____ No _____

Grade 2 teachers: Yes _____ No _____

Grade 3 teachers: Yes _____ No _____

25. Have the LTTTP reading books been distributed to pupils?

Grade 1 pupils: Yes _____ No _____

Grade 2 pupils: Yes _____ No _____

Grade 3 pupils: Yes _____ No _____

26. Have the LTTP math books been distributed to teachers?

Grade 1 teachers: Yes ____ No ____

Grade 2 teachers: Yes ____ No ____

Grade 3 teachers: Yes ____ No ____

27. Have the LTTP math books been distributed to pupils?

Grade 1 pupils: Yes ____ No ____

Grade 2 pupils: Yes ____ No ____

Grade 3 pupils: Yes ____ No ____

28. Reason(s) given by RST for why teachers did **NOT** receive: *(Please be precise **NO NARRATIVE**)*

Reading books

Math books

29. Reason(s) given by RST for why pupils did **NOT** receive: *(Please be precise **NO NARRATIVE**)*

Reading books

Math books

30. Reason(s) given by Principal for why teachers did **NOT** receive: *(Please be precise **NO NARRATIVE**)*

Reading books

Math books

31. Reason(s) given by Principal for why pupils did **NOT** receive: *(Please be precise **NO NARRATIVE**)*

Reading books

Math books

32. Where are the teachers' Reading and Math books stored? *(Check[✓] all that apply)*

In the classroom: _____

In the Principal's office: _____

Other location: _____ (specify) _____

33. Where are the pupils' Reading and Math books stored? *(Check[✓] all that apply)*

In the classroom: _____

In the Principal's office: _____

Other location: _____ (specify) _____

34. During the visit to the school which of the following did you see taking place? *(Check[✓] all that apply)*

READING

Grade 1 reading instruction using the LTTP teachers' reading books _____

Grade 1 reading instruction using the LTTP pupils' reading books _____

Grade 2 reading instruction using LTTP teachers' reading books _____

Grade 2 reading instruction using the LTTP pupils' reading books _____

Grade 3 reading instruction using LTTP teachers' reading books _____

Grade 3 reading instruction using the LTTP pupils' reading books _____

MATH

Grade 1 math instruction using LTTP teachers' math books _____

Grade 1 math instruction using LTTP pupils' math books _____

Grade 2 math instruction using LTTP teachers' math books _____

Grade 2 math instruction using LTTP pupils' math books _____

Grade 3 math instruction using LTTP teachers' math books _____

Grade 3 math instruction using LTTP pupils' math books _____

35. If the LTTP Reading and Math program is *not* currently being conducted/implemented in the school: : *(Please be precise NO NARRATIVE)*

What reason(s) did the RST give?

What reason(s) did the Principal give?

Other comments and observations (if any)

