



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

EdData II

Education Data for Decision Making

# **Practical Tools to Assist the Quality Agenda: Contributions from the EdData II (USAID) Project**

Presentation to UNESCO Institute for Statistics

EdData II Project Director Luis Crouch

RTI International, Washington, DC, USA

3 June 2009

Further questions, comments? Write [lcrouch@rti.org](mailto:lcrouch@rti.org) or  
for materials visit [www.eddataglobal.org](http://www.eddataglobal.org)

# About the presentation

- This presentation was prepared for a talk at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO's) Institute of Statistics (UIS), Montreal, Canada, June 3, 2009. This special-purpose talk was designed to promote networking between the USAID EdData II project and UIS.
- EdData II is led by RTI International under Contract No. EHC-E-00-04-00004-00.
- Icons appearing on some slides in this presentation represent links to embedded files that are not available in the PDF version of this document. To obtain copies of the embedded files, please contact Dr. Luis Crouch (see slide 1).

# Hypothesis (USAID, U.S. development consultants, think tanks:

- *Part of the reason for (apparently?) better donor action in health sector is better data*
  - *Better action? More funding, at least, maybe more results focus*
- *Ed sector lacked formidable sources like Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS)*
  - *Dozens of countries, over decades*
  - *In fact DHS data still get used to drive education conclusions*
- *Various parties hypothesize: ed sector could be helped by more survey data*
- *Model: DHS, household (HH) surveys, so, EdData project*
  - *But...*

# Conclusion: EdData: Do surveys

- *Model was: DHS itself, households*
- *HH surveys address basic access questions (ever-attend, dropout, etc.)*
- *But...*
  - *At the time DHS got started it was the only game*
  - *When EdData was added:*
    - *Countries doing their own HH surveys*
    - *These, and first few HH EdData applications tended to find extremely similar things: no. 1 limitation is economic, etc., etc.*
    - *Hence, repetitive?*
    - *Also: cannot address quality question*

# So, need more variety of surveys

- *EdData II launched with a different mission:*
  - *innovate, no single focus on HH surveys for access issues, look at quality*
- *Yet, by early 2000s, large international assessments (TIMSS, PIRLS, PISA, etc.) and regional, were focusing on quality*
  - *Not just outcomes but also processes, and with some convergence of methods, questions*
  - *So, from HH had access measured, from LO had quality measured...!*
- *So what is contribution? What is value added? What niche to fill to provide something meaningful?*

# EdData II's conclusion:

- *Value-add to donor toolset in 3 simple ways:*
  - *Staying focused on quality*
  - *Focus on most basic skills (early grades):*
    - *Continuing to take cue from health sector: what is equivalent in ed of infant mortality, vaccination?*
    - *Most basic skills in early grades*
    - *What could be interesting rallying cry similar to saving children's lives and vaccinating them? Get them all reading.*
  - *Do things either for a) policy eclat or b) teaching use, not for massively detailed policy analysis*  
*(For now, but other departures?)*

# Some guiding principles:

- *Fast turn-around to particular applications*
  - *Though basic design may improve over years*
- *Keep everything totally open: design approach, tools, instruments, [www.eddataglobal.org](http://www.eddataglobal.org)*
- *Every application adapted locally if possible*
- *Keep every single aspect in public domain*
- *No league tables, no comparisons encouraged, no fixed global standard*
  - *Encourage country standards, but encourage publication of country's speed of approach to their own standard*
  - *(Yes, may suffer from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) problem, but if standard is very simple this should not be a problem, discuss later)*

# Enough preliminaries: Where's the beef?

- *So far: three basic assessment outputs*
- *EGRA: **E**arly **G**rade **R**eading **A**ssessment*
- *EGMA: **E**arly **G**rade **M**athematics **A**ssessment*
- *SSME: **S**napshot of **S**chool **M**anagement **E**ffectiveness*

# Applications, results thus far:

- *EGRA used as policy dialogue tool in some 20 countries*
  - *Policy impact, thus go on to instructional implications in 4-5 countries (Kenya, Liberia, South Africa, ??)*
- *SSME: piloted in 2 countries (Jamaica, Peru)*
  - *May lead to policy impact, “implementation”: Jamaica*
- *EGMA: designed, to be piloted Kenya, June 2009*

# Development process similar in all cases

1. *EdData II review literature intensively*
2. *Draft preliminary ideas*
3. *Convene panel of key academic experts and donor experts/users*
4. *Vet, discuss preliminary instrument*
5. *Draft preliminary background paper, justification of items*
6. *Pilot test*
7. *Modify instruments, modify documentation*
8. *Further use*

*No real interest in “league tables” and comparisons, so no emphasis on getting it “perfect” at the beginning, though some interest in systematization*

# EGRA – Typical features

1. *Mostly oral*
2. *Many segments timed to 1 minute, total 10-15 minutes*
  - *Importance of fluency*
  - *More humane*
  - *More efficient*
3. *Relatively simple scoring*
4. *Can be done on sample basis for policy dialogue, or “universal” classroom basis for teaching*
  - *Too expensive to do with outsiders on universal basis!*
5. *Results can be produced quickly, e.g., for a school or village*
6. *Components:*

| Instrument Component                             | Early Reading Skill     | Skill demonstrated by students' ability to:   |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Engagement and Relationship to Print          | Orientation to print    | Indicate where to begin reading (uppermost left corner)   |
|  |                         | Indicate direction of reading within a line (left to right)   |
|  |                         | Indicate direction of reading within a page (top to bottom)   |
| 2. Letter Naming                                 | Letter recognition      | Provide the name of upper- and lower-case letters distributed in random order   |
| 3. Phoneme Segmentation                          | Phonemic awareness      | Segment words into 2 to 5 phonemes, counting of phonemes within words   |
| 4. Familiar Word Reading                         | Word reading            | Read simple and common one and two syllable words   |
| 5. Nonsense Word Decoding                        | Alphabetic principle    | Make grapheme-phoneme correspondences (GPCs) through the reading of simple nonsense words   |
| 6. Paragraph Reading and Comprehension Questions | Oral reading fluency    | Read a text with little effort and at a sufficient rate   |
|  | Reading comprehension   | Respond correctly to different type of questions (literal with options, literal and inferential) about they text they have read               |
| 7. Listening Comprehension                       | Listening comprehension | Respond correctly to different type of questions (literal with options, literal and inferential) about they text the enumerator reads to them |
| 8. Dictation                                     | Alphabetic principle    | Write, spell and use grammar properly through a dictation exercise  |

## Branched presentation...

### Given limited time: Choose one or two, or can go very lightly over all three

1. *EGRA: piloted, applied in many countries, used as basis for intervention design/evaluate.*
  - *Provide more detail, typical application results*
2. *EGMA: to be piloted, can talk about design, basic components*
  - *More challenging than EGRA (less background work in the literature)*
3. *SSME: has been piloted, some interesting results*

# EGRA – Typical results, used in policy dialogue, teaching improvement interventions

## Case: Liberia



Liberia Case  
Highlights

# EGMA – Components



EGMA

# SSME – Components, some results



SSME

# Future (by way of conclusion)

1. *Pilot EGMA*
  - *Possibly pilot early grade maths intervention*
2. *Continue EGRA*
3. *Continue EGRA-based interventions (South Africa, Liberia, Kenya), as rigorous as possible (randomized, etc.)*
4. *SSME: hone, use for feed inspectorate, quality assurance (QA) “interventions”*
5. *Other? (Youth literacy, youth skills, skills?)*
  - *Or stay focused?*
6. *Collaborations?*