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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Complementary Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSQ</td>
<td>Classroom Observation Schedule and Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMs</td>
<td>District Education Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAS</td>
<td>Department of Inspection and Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLNC</td>
<td>District Literacy and Numeracy Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTED</td>
<td>Department of Teacher Education and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTTC</td>
<td>Divisional Teacher Training Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMs</td>
<td>Education Divisional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGMA</td>
<td>Early Grade Mathematics Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIP</td>
<td>Education Sector Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOM</td>
<td>Government Of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTE</td>
<td>Initial Primary Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANEB</td>
<td>Malawi National Examinations Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Malawi Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESP</td>
<td>National Education Sector Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTED</td>
<td>National Strategy on Teacher Education and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>New Primary Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTED</td>
<td>National Strategy on Teacher Education Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODL</td>
<td>Open and Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAs</td>
<td>Primary Education Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>Presidential Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAR</td>
<td>Primary Curriculum and Assessment Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Result Area Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>Research Triangle International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACMEQ</td>
<td>Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMA</td>
<td>Senior Education Management Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALULAR</td>
<td>Teaching And Learning Using Locally Available Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>Teacher Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMIS</td>
<td>Teacher Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTPDS</td>
<td>Malawi Teacher Professional Development Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Teacher Training College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>US Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>US Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Malawi Teacher Professional Development Support (MTPDS) activity is a three-year, USAID-funded project supporting the professional development of teachers and implementation of the National Primary Curriculum (PCAR) through a framework of continuous professional development (CPD) for teachers nationwide. The project builds upon the successes of previous CPD programs, supported by the Government of Malawi’s Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST), USAID and other development partners. MTPDS is designed to provide unified teacher training and CPD, distance learning and systems management in direct support of the Primary Curriculum and Assessment Reform (PCAR) and the New Primary Curriculum (NPC). Its ultimate goal is to ensure that larger numbers of teachers are trained to help students develop early literacy and numeracy skills, and over time become independent learners.

This MTPDS Baseline Data Report reviews the baseline status of performance indicators adopted for monitoring progress of the project according to the Results Framework which is placed in Annex 1 (and included in Section 3 for ease of reference). Baseline data was collected on the status of indicators for each result area of MTPDS. The Baseline Report was informed by data from the following sources:

1) review of recent MoEST reform reports and policy documents, including nationwide assessment data (e.g. SAQMEC), the National Education Sector Plan (NESP), the National Strategy for Teacher Education Development (NSTED), reports of Education Management and Information Systems (EMIS), and others;
2) consultations with MoEST officials on the status of policy documents and education systems related to primary school education;
3) Standard 2 and Standard 4 performance assessment in reading (Chichewa) and mathematics;
4) classroom observations of Standard 2-4 instructional practice; and
5) interviews with Standard 2-4 teachers.

Planning for monitoring and evaluation of MTPDS, instrument adaptation/development, and data collection activities was completed with active participation of representatives from all education directorates involved in primary education, including Department of Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) division; Department of Inspection and Advisory Services (DIAS); Malawi Institute for Education (MIE); Basic Education (BE) division; Department of Teacher Education Development (DTED); and Teacher Education Institutions (e.g., Teacher Training Colleges and the Centre for Education Research and Training (CERT). As support from MTPDS is directly tied to the advance of Malawi’s PCAR, inter-departmental involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of MTPDS serves to build the collaboration needed for national monitoring of PCAR and at the same time strengthens the capacity for rigorous M&E across directorates.

For Result 1: Strengthened Teacher Policy, Support and Management Systems, and Result 6: Improved Teacher Education-PCAR M&E Systems and Quality, baseline consultations with MoEST officials reinforced the need to work closely with the MoEST to identify and advance policy reforms and
enhance monitoring and evaluation systems which directly impact the enhancement of early grade literacy and numeracy attainment. Baseline consultations related to Result 1 pointed to a number of areas where changes in education policy and systems could contribute to improve early grade learning. Some examples of this are the policy that addresses classroom size and teacher qualifications and competencies in Standard 1 and Standard 2; systems that serve to increase the frequency of and enhance the quality of teacher training and support related to specific reading and mathematics methodologies; and policy that welcomes and fosters the active involvement of communities in monitoring children’s learning. (Conclusions have been drawn from the findings of DeStefano, J. and Chapman, D. (2010). Result 1. Strengthened Teacher Policy and Support Systems: Analysis of Education Sector Policy Priorities and Implications for TPDS.)

Results from classroom observations provided a rich set of information for informing MTPDS CPD activities in support of Result 2: Enhanced Teacher Performance. When combining all observations (i.e., all Standards 2-4 and all lessons: Chichewa, English and mathematics), 41.3% of the teachers were considered to adequately demonstrate essential instructional practices according to the established criteria. The benchmark for this indicator is defined as “75% of the behaviors evaluated during the observation obtained a rating of “satisfactory” or better”. Only if teachers score better than this benchmark score are they counted as having adequately demonstrated essential instructional practices. Teachers were less likely to meet the criteria that were specifically focused on literacy teaching skills (Chichewa or English) than when teaching a mathematics lesson. Only 26.4% of the teachers observed teaching a literacy lesson met the criteria for “demonstrating essential instructional practices” compared to 70.2% of the teachers observed teaching a mathematics lesson.

Teachers demonstrated little to no familiarity with specific reading teaching methodologies such as practice with letters and words, use of phonics, or teaching reading comprehension strategies compared to the more general instructional practices such as grouping strategies, use of questions, provision of feedback. The average percentage of teachers obtaining a satisfactory rating on the 12 general teaching practices was 60.6% while the average percentage of teachers obtaining a satisfactory rating on the 7 specific reading methods was 24.8%. General practices are deemed those that are desirable at all times, across grades and subjects (such as providing formative feedback), while specific or essential practices are those skills and methods specific to a subject matter like reading or math, and that change over time as students progress in their learning. For example, specific to early reading, reading aloud (for individual readers) is important for beginning readers so the student can self-correct and teacher can give feedback, but silent reading becomes more effective (and occurs naturally) as students master decoding and can read with confidence.

Across the 7 subject specific instructional practices, there were a high percentage of lesson observations where the teaching practice was not observed at all. The percentage “0” or “not observed” ratings for these seven practices ranged from 40% to 65%. Thus indicating that, even though teachers are familiar

---

1 The average was calculated by taking the percentage of teachers obtaining a rating of “satisfactory” or above for each of the behaviors (i.e., each of the 12 general practices and each of the 7 specific practices) and calculated the mean of the percentages across the behaviors in each group.
with and usually apply many of the desirable general instructional practices, the majority of teachers are unfamiliar with specific methods required for teaching reading and mathematics. The single most important conclusion coming from the teacher observations is that teachers need specific training and support in “how to teach reading” and “how to teach mathematics” to Standard 1 to Standard 4 learners.

It is not unanticipated that Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners’ performance on the national baseline assessment of reading and mathematics through the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA) tests fell well below grade expectations. Notably, on the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) subtests a high proportion of learners in both Standard 2 and Standard 4 scored zero on a measure of oral reading fluency and reading comprehension. On these tasks, students are asked to read a short story and then answer questions about the part of the story they read. A total of 72.8% of Standard 2 students and 41.9% of Standard 4 students could not read a single word of the story. The percentage of zero scores on the reading comprehension questions was even higher: 97.1% of Standard 2 students and 69.3% of students in Standard 4 could not answer one comprehension question correctly.

Across the EGMA subtests a noticeable proportion of learners were able to answer only the most elementary and procedural of items. Even though the EGMA is based on Standard 1 to Standard 2 materials, the average mean percent correct was 21.8% for Standard 2 and 61.8% for Standard 4 students. None of the Standard 2 students and less than 25% of the Standard 4 learners was able to rote count beyond 100; and learners in Standard 2 and Standard 4 alike had difficulty recognizing numbers greater than 100.

Teacher interviews were conducted to establish a baseline of teachers’ perceptions of the adequacy of teachers’ guides and learners’ textbooks. In general teachers were satisfied with both the teachers’ guides and the learners’ textbooks: with 89.7% and 92.5% respectively of teachers rating the guides and texts as satisfactory or better. However, only 65.5% of the teachers were satisfied with the “use” of the textbooks and less than half were satisfied with learners’ guides. The wide-ranging paucity of resources for early grades is problematic, as is the need for assignment of more skilled teachers to early grades.

Teacher interviews also provided information on teachers’ views about the level of involvement of the SMC and PTA in the school and their satisfaction in the support and supervision they receive from head teachers, colleagues and the primary education advisors. The majority of teachers (82%) interviewed were satisfied with their relationships with the SMC and PTA, but less than 50% reported being satisfied with the SMC/PTA involvement in monitoring student learning, teacher meetings and extra-curricular activities, and provision of skilled resources. Approximately half the teachers were satisfied with head teacher and PEA supervision; however, ratings differed significantly according to location and division with a larger percentage of teachers in urban areas giving satisfactory ratings on head teacher and PEA support than in rural settings. Less than 25% of the teachers were satisfied with colleague support and supervision.
SECTION 2. INTRODUCTION TO THE MTPDS BASELINE REPORT

The MTPDS program Baseline Data Report provides baseline information on the six MTPDS results areas, including baseline data for each of the 28 MTPDS performance indicators submitted to USAID on November 9th 2010 as part of the MTPDS Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP).

In addition to providing a benchmark against which to measure the project’s progress toward achieving targeted results, the broad base of information from the baseline assessment serves to deepen the understanding of the state of affairs relative to each of the six Result areas. Conclusions presented at the end of the study have informed the evolving design of the project interventions.

Another important and explicit function of the baseline assessment was to promote an interdepartmental team spirit around the MTPDS program and a shared sense of responsibility and accountability for MTPDS results. This was achieved by involving MoEST staff from key Departments (i.e., Planning, Basic Education, MIE, and DIAS) in the study design, training, data collection, and analysis components of the baseline assessment.

Section 3 of this report gives a brief overview of the MTPDS Project and Section 4 provides an introduction to the sources of data that have informed the baseline study and a brief description of the methodologies that were used for data collection. Section 5 provides the background and description of the core set of activities supported under each of the six results, including a tabular presentation of baseline results and annual targets for all indicators related to each of the six results (Section 4). Section 5 also presents an analysis of findings from the baseline studies, organized according to project results. A summary and set of the Conclusions are given in Section 6. The MTPDS results framework and the guide to classroom instructional lesson observation are presented in Annexes at the end of the report.
SECTION 3. MTPDS PROJECT OVERVIEW

It is widely accepted that there is a crisis in the quality of basic education in Malawi. The introduction of Free Primary Education in 1994, in conjunction with the negative impact of HIV/AIDS on education, has placed Malawi’s education system under severe strain. By 2008, there were more than 3.6 million pupils enrolled in primary schools. Pupil teacher ratios are on average around 90 to 1 in primary schools, with over 50% of Standard 1 classes having more than 140 students to a teacher. Shortage of classrooms, trained teachers and teaching supplies have led to chronic low performance in student learning as demonstrated by Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) results\(^2\) and further confirmed by the Early Grade Reading and Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGRA, EGMA) MTPDS Baseline Study Results (see below). HIV/AIDS and the challenges presented to the sector have also played a role in maintaining the status quo as education professionals fail to access treatment and support and increasing numbers of orphans and other vulnerable children try to cope with the demands of ill or missing parents.

Begun in February 2010, MTPDS is a three-year, USAID-funded project supporting the professional development of teachers and implementation of the National Primary Curriculum (PCAR) through national teacher continuous professional development (CPD). The project has been designed to leverage and build upon the successes of previous CPD programs by providing unified teacher training and CPD, distance learning and systems management. By strengthening integration of PCAR and the NPC, the ultimate goal is to ensure that larger numbers of teachers are properly trained to help students develop early literacy and numeracy skills, and to become independent and successful learners. The project is being implemented by the Assistance to Basic Education (ABE) team comprised of Creative Associates International Inc., RTI International and Seward Inc.

MTPDS is a central element of USAID-Malawi’s broader education strategy. It was designed as a direct response to the Government of Malawi’s major new educational reforms to focus on strengthening MoEST primary education systems for successful PCAR implementation. Its aim is to achieve marked improvements in literacy and mathematics learning in Standards 1 - 4. The project aims to provide a cohesive and complementary set of activities that support the GoM in the area of basic primary education and to reach goals set in the National Education Sector Plan (NESP), Education Sector Implementation Plan (ESIP) and the National Strategy for Teacher Education and Development (NSTED).

MTPDS’s primary goal is to strengthen the capacity of the MoEST in its efforts to implement, monitor and manage new teacher education and professional development activities and directly impact children’s early grade literacy and numeracy skills development.

Project activities have been designed to achieve six specific Results. These are directly aligned with MoEST policy priorities as outlined in the National Education Sector Plan (NESP) and the National Strategy for Teacher Education Development (NSTED) as follows:

Result 1 – Strengthened Teacher Policy, Support and Management Systems
Result 2 – Enhanced Teacher Performance
Result 3 – Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy
Result 4 – Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy for Out of School Children and Youth
Result 5 – Enhanced Quality of Teaching and Learning Materials
Result 6 – Improved Teacher Education-PCAR M&E Systems and Quality

The specific performance indicators developed for measuring progress on these results are given in the MTPDS Results Framework. The Results Framework is presented below for ease of reference and is also included in Annex 1.
MTPDS Results Framework (included in Annex 1)

**GOAL:** Strengthened capacity of the MoEST and GOM to implement, monitor, and manage teacher education and professional development that directly impacts enhanced early grade literacy and numeracy attainment

**Result 1: Strengthened teacher policy, support and management systems**

*Indicator 1.0. Number of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to or quality of education (Agency indicator)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR 1.1: Strengthened coordination among Ministry institutions and departments concerned with teacher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.a. Roles and responsibilities with regards to Teacher Education, documented, and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.b. Output Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Administrators and officials trained (number of women, number of men) (Agency indicator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR 1.2: Teacher Education Management Information System Strengthened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.a. Number of host country institutions that have used USG assisted MIS to inform administrative/management decision (Agency indicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.b. Number of host country institutions with improved MIS as a result of USG. (Agency indicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.c. Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance (Agency indicator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR 1.3: HIV/AIDS in education strategy strengthened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.a. Number of targeted HIV/AIDS interventions developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.b. Comprehensive, sample-based study of HIV/AIDS impact on teachers, other education staff and students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result 2: Enhanced Teacher Performance**

*Indicator 2.0. Percentage Std. 1 - 4 teachers demonstrating essential skills in teaching literacy and numeracy.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR 2.1: MoEST CPD systems strengthened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.a. Percentage Std. 1-4 teachers receiving CPD training related to early grade reading and mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.b. Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (number of women; number of men) (Agency indicator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR 2.2: IPTE-ODL support and supervision systems strengthened using innovative technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.a. Percentage ODL design recommendations generated by TPDS that are implemented by MoEST (DTED) in developing enhanced ODL design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.b. Number of ODL Field Supervisors/teacher trainees using innovative information and communication technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 1. TPDS Results Framework (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 3: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0. Std. 1-4 pupil performance in literacy and numeracy compared to baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 4: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy for Out of School Children and Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0. Literacy and numeracy performance among learners in USG supported CBE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 5: Enhanced Quality of Teaching and Learning Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0. Increase in teachers’ quality rating score for Std 1 and 2 textbooks and teachers guides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 6: Improved Teacher Education – PCAR M&amp;E Systems and Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0. PCAR M&amp;E guidelines developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IR 3.1: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy Instructional Practices

Outcome Indicator
3.1.a. Teacher competencies for early grade reading and mathematics documented and approved

Output Indicators
3.1.b. Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based-setting (number of women, number of men) (Agency indicator)

#### IR 3.2: Communities mobilized to support school initiatives to improve early grade reading and mathematics

Outcome Indicator
3.2.a. Percentage of SMCs/PTAs implementing actions to support early grade literacy and numeracy in two target districts.

Output Indicator
3.2.b. Number of SMC/PTAs or similar “school” governance structures supported (Agency indicator)

#### IR 4.1: CBE early grade literacy and numeracy instruction enhanced

Outcome Indicators
4.1.a. Percentage of CBE centers implementing school report card system in collaboration with communities in two target districts.

Output Indicators
4.1.b. Number of CBE facilitators receiving regular CPD in two target districts of Ntchisi and Salima with USG support.

#### IR 4.1: CBE early grade literacy and numeracy instruction enhanced

Outcome Indicators
5.1.a. Percentage of Std. 1-2 teachers regularly using revised materials in the classroom

Output Indicators
5.1.b. Number of learner’s book and teacher’s guide revised for Std. 1-2

5.1.c. Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance (Agency indicator)

#### IR 6.1: Institutional capacity for PCAR M&E strengthened

Outcome Indicator
See 6.0 above

Output Indicators
6.1.a. Number of SMC trained on how to monitor performance of learners

6.1.b. Number of people trained in M&E with USG assistance (Agency indicator)

6.1.c. Number of people trained in research with USG assistance. (Agency Indicators)
SECTION 4. OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGIES AND SAMPLE POPULATION FOR LEARNER ASSESSMENTS AND SCHOOL-BASED OBSERVATIONS AND SURVEY

The sources of data for establishing the baseline include: document reviews and interviews with MoEST officials; review of existing school statistics data (e.g., EMIS); EGRA and EGMA learner performance assessments; classroom observations; and teacher, head teacher, and community interviews conducted at the school. The baseline was undertaken to establish the initial status of MTPDS project indicators. Field work took place between 22nd November and 8th December 2010. Classroom observation and teacher interview data were collected by a team of 2 who visited each school which was comprised of one MTPDS Divisional Teacher Training Coordinator (DTTC) and one Senior Education Management Advisor (SEMA) from DIAS.

Three separate baseline data collection activities informed this report. These are described in subsections 4.1 to 4.3 below.

This baseline review included an examination of reports available to the Ministry and data obtained from EMIS and TEMIS systems. Data included the number of teachers in the system, number of students, and availability of textbooks, policy reviews, and student performance on assessments (nationwide assessments) and is being used to inform activities across all project result areas.

4.1 Baseline policy consultations. Education policy experts providing short term technical assistance (STTA) in May 2010 informed baseline status on Malawi’s education policy environment in order to inform strategic action planning under Result 1 and Result 6.

4.2 School-based surveys. Baseline data on teacher instructional practices were obtained through observations of literacy and numeracy lessons in Standard 2 – Standard 4 classrooms and were supplemented with teacher interviews. Classroom observations were conducted by DTTCs and SEMAs and focused on essential instructional practices in early grade reading and mathematics. The observers used the attached Classroom Observation guide to survey a total of 274 different teachers in 79 schools. Individual teacher interviews were used to collect information on the teachers’ perceptions/evaluations of materials, supervision, and community involvement. A description of the sampling methodology used is presented below.

A total of 274 different teachers were observed and interviewed in the school-based survey. Twenty-four teachers were observed more than one time (e.g., some teachers were observed teaching lessons in two different subject areas or in two different grades) and therefore there were a larger number of classroom observations than there were teacher interviews. Altogether, 298 Standard 2-4 lessons were observed and 274 (108 male, 166 female) unique teachers were observed and interviewed across a random selection of 79 (60 rural, 19 urban) schools. Twelve to 14 schools were selected from each of six
divisions, as follows: Central East – 12; Central West – 13; Northeast -14; Southeast – 13; Southwest – 13; and the Shire Highlands – 14.

Chichewa, English and Mathematics lessons were selected from the timetable for Standard 2, Standard 3 and Standard 4 classrooms, with similar numbers of classroom observations across subjects and standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Chichewa</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of lessons observed</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of lessons observed</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 274 teachers observed/interviewed, 63 or 23% were teacher education students doing their field practice under the Open Distance Learning Program.

Data was collected by a team of 2 persons, a Senior Education Management Advisor (SEMA) for the Division and an MTPDS Divisonal Teacher Training Coordinator. The school-based survey, including both the observation and teacher interview components, consisted of a total of 62 items: 18 demographic items; 19 classroom behaviors rated on a 5-point Likert scale through direct classroom observations; 17 interview questions measuring teachers’ evaluations of the syllabus, teacher guides, and learner books; 5 interview questions measuring teachers’ perceptions of the level of involvement that the school governing bodies and parent-teachers associations play in supporting schools and learners; and 3 questions measuring teachers’ evaluations of the degree of supervision and support given by their peers, head teachers and school supervisors. Of the 19 teacher observation items, 12 were general good practices such as “use of groups,” “use of questions,” giving feedback to learners,” while 5 were desirable methods for teaching the subjects of reading and mathematics such as “use of phonics.” A written set of guidelines was provided to each observer as a resource in training and for reference purposes during data collection. The aim of this document was to standardize the interpretation of each item for the observers (See Annex 2).

4.3 Learner performance assessments. A total of 1,000 learners (500 Standard 2 and 500 Standard 4) from a random nationwide representative sample of 50 schools were assessed in reading (Chichewa) and mathematics. The schools were selected on the basis of random sampling with Division representation proportional to the proportion of the national student population in the division. The rural/urban distribution is representative of the distribution of rural and urban communities in the country. The tendency for a larger number of female teachers in the early grades is demonstrated in the relatively larger proportion of female teachers observed/interviewed. This relative proportion of female teachers would be expected to be even larger had we also observed standard 1. Standard 1 was excluded from the observations due to the early time of the school year (November) that the survey took place. Standard 1 classrooms at this time are orienting the young learners to formal schooling and the classroom environment and thus it was not possible to observe the Standard 1 teacher present a reading or mathematics lesson.
number of schools sampled for each division were: Central East, 7; Central West, 16; Northeast, 7; Shire Highlands; 7; Southeast, 8; and Southwest, 8. Twenty learners, 10 Standard 2 and 10 Standard 4 learners (5 girls and 5 boys from each standard), were tested from each of the 50 schools.

The EGRA assesses basic reading skill development in the following areas: letter naming fluency; syllable fluency; phonemic awareness; word reading fluency; unfamiliar word naming fluency; oral reading fluency; reading comprehension; and listening comprehension. The EGMA assesses the following basic mathematical skills: oral counting; one-to-one correspondence (rational counting); number identification; number (quantity) discrimination; missing number (pattern completion); word problems; and basic operations (addition and subtraction).
SECTION 5. KEY BASELINE FINDINGS FOR RESULTS 1-6

Section 5.1 Result 1. Strengthened teacher policy, support and management systems
In response to the broad base of challenges facing Malawi’s education sector today, the MoEST has developed a comprehensive policy framework which is described in the National Education Strategic Plan (NESP, 2008), the Education Sector Implementation Plan (ESIP, 2009) and the National Strategy for Teacher Education Development (NSTED, 2007). However, knowledge about these policy documents across the education system, including the school and school governing bodies was found to be limited at the start of the project. The capacity for successful implementation of policy; that is, the “translation of policy into practice” requires added policy focus and strengthening. This is particularly true for policy and systems that directly support the PCAR. For example, the roles of different organizations and institutions responsible for implementing and monitoring the impact of these policy reforms have not been clearly defined, and the education information systems required for monitoring their impact also needs strengthening. The absence of coordinating efforts for implementing the primary school reforms risks omission of critical activities or duplication. Both can only serve to disrupt the achievement of planned outcomes, namely early grade learning, and have cost implications for the sector.

Table 1. Result 1 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1. Strengthened teacher policy, support and management systems</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr. 1 Sep 2010</td>
<td>Yr. 2 Sep 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0. Number of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to or quality of education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR 1.1 Strengthened teacher management and support systems for supporting early grade learning

1.1.a. Roles and responsibilities with regards to Teacher Education, documented, and implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1 (def)</th>
<th>1 (doc)</th>
<th>1 (imp)$^4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.1.b. Number of Administrators and officials trained (number of women, number of men)
|                                                                     | 0 | 465| 465    | 465    | 465         |

IR 1.2: Teacher Education Management Information System Strengthened

1.2.a. Number of host country institutions that have used USG assisted MIS to inform administrative / management decision
|                                                                     | 0 | 0 | 7     | 43     | 43          |

1.2.b. Number of host country institutions with improved MIS as a result of USG
|                                                                     | 0 | 0 | 7     | 43     | 43          |

$^4$ (def) - defined; (doc) – documented; (imp) – implemented.
Table 1. Result 1 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1. Strengthened teacher policy, support and management systems</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.c. Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR 1.3: HIV/AIDS in education strategy strengthened

| 1.3.a. Number of targeted HIV/AIDS interventions developed | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1.3.b. Comprehensive, sample-based study of HIV/AIDS impact on teachers, other education staff and students | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

5.2 Result 2. Enhanced Teacher Performance

5.2.1 Overview

The introduction of the National Primary Curriculum (NPC) in 2006 supported a shift from the traditional didactic teaching methods to an outcomes-based and learner-centered approach and is referred to as the Primary Curriculum and Assessment Reform (PCAR). The roll out of these reforms has had enormous implications for Continuous Professional Development or “CPD.” Considering the vast numbers of active teachers in the primary education sector as a whole, requiring both orientation and training on the NPC (45,000), a model that is “light and effective” and minimizes dependence on external inputs was proposed by the MoEST. MTPDS will concentrate on meeting the needs of the nearly 30,000 teachers who teach in standards 1-4.

The development and implementation of the national CPD system and delivery of training and support is the pivotal element of MTPDS operations. Early grade reading, early grade mathematics and life skills are the focus of MTPDS CPD training modules. Technical Assistance (TA) and training is provided within the context of existing MoEST structures for delivering in-service training/CPD. This reflects the “light and effective” model desired by the MoEST to ensure that the CPD modules, training and support processes established and used under the MTPDS are sustained.

Malawi also suffers from a serious deficit in teacher supply. The NSTED forecasted that Malawi will need an estimated number of more than 72,000 teachers by 2015. The current deficit in the number of teachers to meet current needs is estimated to be at least 16,000. To address this priority, in 2010 the MoEST initiated the Open and Distance Learning (ODL) program for the initial training of teachers.

A second focus of activity supporting Result 2 is to provide TA and training to Malawi’s Open and Distance Learning (ODL) program through the application of strategic technical innovations aimed at improving the learning experience and support to ODL students.

Thus, under Result 2, MTPDS TA, training, materials development and teacher support will help establish
CPD modules and systems that will lead to measurable shifts in teacher instructional practices and ultimately lead to measurable improvements in learner performance, especially in early grade reading and mathematics. The enhancements to the Malawi ODL program supported by the MTPDS will focus on improving communications between ODL students working in the field and their supervisors based at the Teacher Training College (TTC). Table 2 presents the baseline status and annual targets for each Result 2 indicator. A more in-depth discussion of the school-based survey results is presented in Section 5.

### Table 2. Result 2 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 2. Enhanced teacher performance</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr. 1 Sep 2010</td>
<td>Yr. 2 Sep 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0. % Std 2-4 teachers demonstrating essential skills in teaching literacy and numeracy</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IR 2.1: MoEST CPD systems strengthened**

2.1.a. % Std 1-4 teachers receiving CPD training related to early grade reading and mathematics

| 0 | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% |

2.1.b. Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (number of women; number of men)

| 0 | 29,685 (W=12,152) (M=17533) | 29,685 (W=12,152) (M=17533) | 29,685 (W=12,152) (M=17533) | 29,685 (W=12,152) (M=17533) |

**IR 2.2: IPTE-ODL support and supervision systems strengthened using innovative technologies**

2.2.a. % ODL design recommendations generated by TPDS that are implemented by MoEST (DTED) in developing enhanced ODL design

| 0 | 0 | 50% | 75% | 75% |

2.2.b. Number of ODL Field Supervisors/teacher trainees using innovative technologies

| 0 | 0 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |

*Criteria for selection: 75% of “essential” instructional practices rated as satisfactory or above.

### 5.2.2 Findings from classroom observation study results and teacher use of essential instructional practices

The teacher classroom observations used criteria established for a teacher to be counted as “demonstrating essential skills in teaching literacy and numeracy” and thus entered into the percentage calculation for Result 2 Indicator 2.0 if 75% of the teacher’s observed behaviors were rated as satisfactory or higher; that is, teachers were counted if 75% of the observation ratings were “3”, “4” or “5” on a 5-point Likert Scale. The classroom observation tool included, covered both general classroom...
teaching practices and subject-specific teaching practices in reading and mathematics. The distribution of items was as follows: 12 general teaching practices; 5 reading teaching practices and 2 mathematics teaching practices.

Overall, teachers’ early grade instructional practices need strengthening. Less than half (41.3%) of the teachers observed obtained a satisfactory rating in at least 75% of the instructional practices evaluated. Reading lessons tended to be weaker in general than mathematics lessons. Only 26.4% of the teachers observed teaching a literacy lesson (Chichewa and English observations combined) met the 75% criteria compared to 70.2% of the teachers observed teaching a mathematics lesson. Performance differences between literacy and numeracy instruction were statistically significant (Chi-Square = 53.1, p=0.000).

![Figure 1. Teachers Demonstrating Satisfactory Application of Essential Skills by Lesson Observed*](image)

**Table 3. Teachers Demonstrating Essential Skills by Subject**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Criteria</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to Meet Criteria</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though ratings overall differed between literacy and numeracy instruction, instructional ratings did not differ statistically for Chichewa and English literacy instruction. Teacher observation ratings did not differ statistically for teachers across standards or for teachers in rural and urban locations. Teacher performances did vary, however, according to division. This relationship was statistically significant (Chi-square = 21.3, p<.002). A smaller percentage of teachers observed in the Central West Division (22%) and the Southeast Division (31%) met the 75% criteria as compared with the national average of 41%. Relative to national performance, teachers in the Southwest Division scored higher with 60% of the teachers reaching the 75% criteria. Figure 2 shows the percentage of teachers meeting the criteria for “demonstrating essential teaching skills” across division.
As shown in the Figure 3 below, teacher ratings on subject specific teaching methods were much lower than their performance on more generic teaching practices.\(^5\) Seventy of the 197 teachers (35.5\%) who were observed teaching a literacy lesson failed to obtain even one satisfactory rating across the five literacy teaching practices evaluated.\(^6\) Another 19.3\% obtained a satisfactory rating on only 1 of the 5 literacy teaching practices. Thus, over half the teachers (54.8\%) failed to demonstrate any working knowledge of essential reading instructional methods.

The situation was slightly better for teaching of mathematics. Only twenty-four of the 101 teachers observed teaching a math lesson (23.8\% compared to 35.5\% for literacy) failed to obtain a satisfactory rating on either of the two observation items specific to the teaching of mathematics\(^7\) and an additional 13.9\% obtained an average rating on only 1 of the 2 mathematics teaching observations. This suggested that approximately 62.4\% of the teachers observed teaching mathematics demonstrated sufficient

---

\(^5\) Essential “generic” or non-subject specific skills included: lesson planning; variety of methods; use of questions; use of TALULAR; learner participation; feedback; promote problem solving; confidence; class management; use of continuous assessment; and records and student progress.

\(^6\) Essential reading instructional practices included: opportunities to practice letter names; use of phonics; use of reading comprehension strategies; systematic instruction in writing; and providing a variety of literacy learning resources.

\(^7\) Essential mathematics practices evaluated: presents appropriate skills to develop numeracy concepts; uses relevant techniques to teach basic mathematics concepts.
working knowledge of essential mathematics instructional practices to promote basic numeracy attainment among early grade learners.

Figure 4 below underscores the difficulty that teachers have in applying specific reading and mathematics teaching methodologies. Figure 4 presents the percentage of teacher observations where the particular subject-specific teaching method was rated as “not observed.” The high percentage of “not observed” ratings suggests that the majority of teachers did not have sufficient understanding of the methodology to attempt to apply it in their lesson presentations for reading and mathematics. On average, only 24.8% of the teachers observed demonstrated satisfactory application of these desirable reading and mathematics instructional practices.
Teachers performed much better on the general teaching practices than they did on the subject specific methodologies though there is still room for improvement. On average, the percentage of teachers demonstrating satisfactory use of the 12 general teaching practices was 60.6% compared to 24.8% for the 7 reading and mathematics teaching methods.

In contrast to the subject-specific practices, teachers applied 8 of the 12 general methodologies in 95% or more of the observed lessons. Only 4 of the 12 general teaching practices were lacking, or not observed at all in more than 10% of the observations. These were: keeping records of learner progress, use of continuous assessment, lesson planning, and promoting of problem-solving behaviors.

The percentage of teachers who demonstrated satisfactory application of each of the teaching practices evaluated is presented in Figure 5 below. In this figure the blue bars represent percentage of teachers with ratings of satisfactory or higher for the 12 general methodologies while the red bars represent the percentage of teachers with satisfactory or higher ratings on reading and mathematics teaching methods. The discrepancy is notable, favoring the generic teaching practices.

The discrepancy is notable, favoring the generic teaching practices.
5.3 Result 3. Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy

In lower primary school, pupils struggle in large classes to master the basic literacy and numeracy skills that will lay the foundation for later learning. As the MTPDS National Literacy Forum illustrated, there have been a number of previous literacy projects implemented in Malawi. However, none has thus far managed to be scaled-up to achieve national impact. Consistent with recent developments in the USAID education sector strategy, measurable improvement in learner achievement will be treated as the paramount indicator of project impact. In response to this global mandate, MTPDS actions under Result 3 involve the consolidation of effective practices for teaching literacy and numeracy and the development/pilot of an early literacy and numeracy instructional methodology which may be taken to scale nationally. Promotion of a broad base of support for early grade literacy and numeracy attainment in schools and communities will be included among activities leading to the achievement of Result 3.

Table 4. Result 3 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 3: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
<th>Yr. 1 Sep 2010</th>
<th>Yr. 2 Sep 2011</th>
<th>Yr. 3 Sep 2012</th>
<th>End Mar 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0.a. Percent improvement from baseline on oral reading fluency for Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners (measured in correct words per minute)</td>
<td>1.1 Std 2 1.3 (Male) 0.86 (Female)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Only baseline data</td>
<td>10% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td>20% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 Std 4 12.0 (Male) 11.6 (Female)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Only baseline data</td>
<td>10% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td>20% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0.b. Percent improvement from baseline mean on the Early Grade Mathematics Assessment for Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners</td>
<td>21.8% Std 2 21.4% (Male) 22.3% (Female)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Only baseline data</td>
<td>10% over baseline</td>
<td>20% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.8% Std 4 63.0% (Male) 60.7% (Female)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Only baseline data</td>
<td>10% over baseline</td>
<td>20% ↑ over baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR 3.1: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy Instructional Practices

| 3.1.a. Teacher competencies for early grade reading and mathematics documented and approved | 0 | 1 (def) | 1 (doc) | 1 (imp) | 1 (imp) |
| 3.1.b. Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based | 0 | 75% Learners | 75% Learners | 75% Learners | 75% Learners |
5.3.1 Intermediate Result 3.1: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy Instructional Practices

Summary of Result from the National Baseline Assessment of Early Grade Reading and Early Grade Mathematics

The following presents a general summary of the results from the Malawi National Baseline Study of Early Grade Reading and Early Grade Mathematics conducted in November, 2010. Section 4.4 above briefly describes the learner assessment methodologies. Separate comprehensive baseline report is available for both the reading and mathematics national baseline assessments. The presentations of findings for reading and mathematics presented below have been extracted directly from the Malawi National Baseline Reports for the Malawi Early Grade Reading Assessment and Malawi Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (J. Mejia and A. Brombacher, respectively).

Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) Baseline Results

As discussed in the National EGRA Baseline Report for Malawi, early grade literacy attainment in Malawi falls well below age and grade expectations. Standard 2 and Standard 4 students had limited knowledge of letter names or printed words, and consequently reading comprehension was negligible. Notably, a high proportion of learners in both Standard 2 and Standard 4 scored zero on the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension subtests. These results are presented in Figure 6 below. On these tasks, students are asked to read a short story and then answer questions about the part of the story they read. A total of 72.8% of Standard 2 students and 41.9% of Standard 4 students tested could not read a single word of the story. This finding points to the serious limitations of learners’ knowledge of letter-sound relationships and ability to sound out words. The percentage of students with a zero score on the reading comprehension questions was even higher: 97.1% of Standard 2 students and 69.3% of students in Standard 4 could not answer even one comprehension question correctly. These numbers imply that even students who were able to read some words did not understand what they were reading well.
enough to be able to correctly answer any of the questions. (See J. Mejia, Malawi Early Grade Reading Assessment: National Baseline Report, p.6).

**Figure 6. Percent of Zero Scores for Oral Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension by Standard**

![Bar graph showing percent of zero scores for Oral Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension by Standard.](image)

*Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010*

Table 5 shows the means for each EGRA subtest by standard. Learner scores on all subtests are very low. Oral reading fluency (ORF) scores fell far below that which is required for meaningful reading comprehension, with average ORF scores of 1.06 and 11.66 for Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners, respectively. Reading at a rate of 11.66 words means that, on the average, it takes a Standard 4 student approximately 5 seconds to read one word. When learners must dedicate this much effort to decode words – when reading is not automatic – there is little mental capacity available for them to process the meaning of the passage and comprehension is impaired. The reading comprehension scores are indeed low with average scores on the reading comprehension subtest at 1.80% and 21.37% for Standards 2 and Standard 4, respectively. The 3 students in the sample (out of 1,000) who obtained satisfactory reading comprehension scores (80% correct or 4 out of 5 questions) also demonstrated much higher ORF scores, from 50 – 55 correct words per minute. Though still below grade expectations, some Standard 4 learners did demonstrate the ability to break words up into small segments, suggesting that students are learning (and teachers are teaching) some word decoding skills. (This summary was taken from J. Mejia, Malawi Early Grade Reading Assessment: National Baseline Report).

**Table 5: EGRA Means by Standard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Letter Naming</th>
<th>Initial Sound</th>
<th>Syllable Segmentation</th>
<th>Syllable Reading</th>
<th>Familiar Words</th>
<th>Non Words</th>
<th>Oral Reading Fluency</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension (%)</th>
<th>Listening Comprehension (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>31.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>50.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>39.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010*
Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA) Baseline Results

According to the National Baseline Report on the Malawi Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (A. Brombacher, 2011), Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners were performing “well below” grade expectations according to the Malawi curriculum. Across the EGMA subtests a noticeable proportion of learners were able to answer only the most elementary and procedural of items. Overall results are presented below. The material on the Early Grade Reading Assessment is based on Standard 1 to Standard 2 curricular items, yet the average mean percent correct was 21.8% for Standard 2 and 61.8% for Standard 4 students.

Table 6. EGMA overall means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (weighted)</td>
<td>21.8% ± 1.44%</td>
<td>61.8% ± 1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>85.53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Both rote counting and the counting of objects or “rational counting” were, on the average below grade expectations. None of the Standard 2 students and less than 25% of the Standard 4 learners was able to rote count beyond 100. This fundamental skill is an important foundation for higher mathematics learning and needs focused support. Learners in Standard 2 and Standard 4 alike had difficulty recognizing numbers greater than 100 and for Standard 4 numbers greater than 1,000 were particularly challenging. Although learners performed better on a test of quantity discrimination, their overall performance remained low. All learners were found to be particularly challenged on tasks involving pattern recognition.

Nearly 56% of Standard 2 students were unable to answer even one single-digit addition calculation, even when the answer was also a single digit number and nearly 65% of the learners were unable to perform even one single-digit subtraction problem correctly. Even though Standard 4 learners did better, as expected, they still had trouble doing the basic mathematical operations involving double and triple digits that are expected of a learner 2 standards below their Standard 4 class.

5.3.2 Intermediate Result 3.2: Communities mobilized to support school initiatives to improve early grade reading and mathematics

Baseline information on the performance measures for IR3.2, Indicator 3.2.a. Percent of SMCs/PTAs implementing actions to support early grade literacy and numeracy in two target districts of Ntchisi and Salima is based on the number of SMCs/PTAs that have included literacy and numeracy support activities within their School Improvement Plans (SIP). None of the SMC’s had included these types of support in the SIP prior to project interventions.

---

The weighted mean ± the standard error is provided.
In addition to this, the school-based survey provided information, according to teacher reports, about the relative involvement of SMCs and PTAs in the learning of children at the school. Teachers were questioned about their satisfaction with school governing bodies (SMCs) and parent-teacher associations (PTAs) in the following categories:

1. Community participation in extra-curricular activities
2. Participation of SMC/PTAs in monitoring of children’s learning
3. Number of meetings teachers have with parents, the SMC and PTA
4. Provision by community (SMC/PTA) of skilled resources to support school improvement
5. Relationship between teachers and the SMC/PTA

The majority of teachers (82%) interviewed were satisfied in general with their relationships with the SMC and PTA, but less than 50% reported being satisfied with the involvement of SMCs and PTAs in the other areas queried: monitoring student learning; providing skilled resources; participating in teacher meetings and extra-curricular activities. Only 24.4% of the teachers were satisfied with their community’s contribution of skilled resources to support school improvement. The compiled results for each community involvement parameter are presented in Figure 7 below.

Importantly, the distribution of teacher ratings of SMC/PTA involvement in the five areas of participation studied varied significantly across divisions and location.

Figure 8 presents the percentage teachers who reported that they were at least satisfied with a particular community involvement area, averaged across all five community areas according to Division or location of the school. It can be seen in Figure 8 that, on the average, teachers in urban settings tend to be more satisfied with the involvement of SMCs and PTAs than are teachers in rural settings. Teachers in the Central West (and to a lesser degree, Northeast) tend to be less satisfied with SMC/PTA involvement while teachers in the Central East Division (and to a lesser degree, Southeast) tend to be more satisfied.
Figure 7. Percentage of Teachers satisfied with SMC/PTA Participation in School Improvement

- Relationship between teachers and the SMC/PTA: 82.2%
- Provision by community (SMC/PTA) of skilled resources to support school: 24.4%
- Meetings teachers have with parents, the SMC and PTA: 47.5%
- Participation of SMC/PTAs in monitoring of children’s learning: 43.3%
- Community participation in extracurricular activities: 44.4%

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Figure 8. Average percentage of satisfactory ratings across 5 areas (see Fig.6) according to division and location

- Shire Highlands: 42%
- Northeast: 38.4%
- Central West: 26.2%
- Central East: 67.2%
- Southwest: 50.4%
- Southeast: 55.4%
- Rural: 45.6%
- Urban: 59%

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010
The following presents the findings on teachers’ ratings in each of five community involvement areas.

Relationship between teachers and the SMC/PTA

Table 7. SMC/PTA Relationship with Teachers by Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-square = 7.27; p < .007

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Table 8. SMC/PTA Relationship with Teachers by Division*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-Square = 36.08; p < .0001

Table 9. SMC/PTA Provides Local Skilled Resources by Division*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-Square = 45.21; p < .0001

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Table 7 and Table 8 above show the relationship between teacher perceptions of their relationship with SMCs and PTAs and the location and division where the school resides, respectively. Consistent with overall findings, teachers in urban regions and in the Southeast and Central Divisions were more satisfied than teachers in rural areas.

Provision of skilled resources to support school improvement

In general teachers across the nation were not satisfied with the contributions by the SMC and PTA of skilled resources in support of school improvement. Teachers’ satisfaction with this parameter was not viewed differently for urban and rural settings although there was a significant relationship between teacher ratings and the division. Teachers in the Central West, Northeast, and Shire Highlands were less likely to be satisfied on this parameter than teachers Central East Division who were more likely to be satisfied.

Meetings teachers have with parents, the SMC and PTA
Table 10. SMC/PTA Meets with Teachers by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 13.86; p < .018
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Participation of SMC/PTAs in monitoring children’s learning

The majority of teachers nationwide were not satisfied with the involvement of community, SMCs and PTAs in monitoring learner achievement. Teacher satisfaction ratings were related to both the location and division where the school was based. Teachers in urban regions tended to be more satisfied with the SMC/PTA participation in monitoring of children’s learning. Teachers in the Central West Division were notably dissatisfied with the involvement of SMCs and PTAs in monitoring children’s learning.

Table 11. SMC/PTA Monitors Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 4.88; p < .028
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Table 12. SMC/PTA Monitors Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 20.62; p < .0015
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Participation of SMC/PTAs and communities in extra-curricular activities

About half of the teachers were satisfied with the meetings held with members of the SMC and PTA. This was also consistent for rural and urban settings. Central West and Northeast Divisions tended to be less satisfied with meetings with the school governing body and parents than the other divisions.
Table 13. Community Participation in Extra-curricular Activities by Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 8.35; p < .005

Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

Table 14. Participation of SMC/PTA in Extra-curricular Activities by Division*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 83.02; p < .0001

Overall, the majority of teachers were not satisfied with SMC and PTA involvement in extra-curricular school activities, however these views were dependent on both location and division. Teachers in urban settings were more likely to be satisfied with SMC and PTA involvement in extra-curricular activities than teachers in rural settings. Central West, Northeast, and the Shire Highlands Divisions were, in general not satisfied with the participation of the SMC and PTA in extra-curricular activities while more teachers than not in the Southwest and Central East Divisions were satisfied.

5.4 Result 4. Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy for Out of School Children and Youth

In 2008 it was estimated that 20% of Malawian children aged 6-13 were not attending school. In response, the MoEST developed a system of Complementary Basic Education (CBE) to provide a ‘second chance’ to out-of-school children and youth through more flexible methods of service delivery. In support of Result 4, MTPDS will provide TA and training to support the MoEST’s CBE program in two districts, Ntchisi and Salima. Specific activities will include the provision of CPD to CBE facilitators and will mobilize and assist community members to monitor the CBE programs taking place in the target districts.

MTPDS has been informed as a result of preliminary discussions with MoEST and USAID on the CBE initiatives that this work is being completed by GIZ and as such any activities will be a duplication of effort. Accordingly, MTPDS has not as yet begun working to support Malawi’s CBE initiatives in the target districts of Ntchisi and Salima and therefore no baseline results are available at this time. The activities for Result 4 are pending an ongoing contract modification of the MTPDS Scope of Work. If there is confirmation that Result Area 4 is to be maintained, baseline data will be collected at that time. Table 15 presents the original targets for the Result 4 Performance Indicators.
Table 15. Result 4 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 4: Improved Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy for Out of School Children and Youth</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR 4.1: CBE early grade literacy and numeracy instruction enhanced</td>
<td>4.1.a % of CBE centers implementing school report card system in collaboration with communities in two target districts of Ntchisi and Salima</td>
<td>Pending modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Result 5: Enhanced Quality of Primary Teaching and Learning Materials

5.5.1 Overview

In Malawi, poor access to learning materials remains a serious impediment to learning in most government schools. Active teaching methods require the presence of learning materials in the classroom environment. Also, learning materials originally produced by the MoEST to support initial NPC implementation were not properly piloted and are urgently in need of revision.

MTPDS activities supporting Result 5 focus on: (i) the evaluation, revision, printing and distribution of textbooks in Standards 1 and 2; and (ii) production and distribution of complementary reading and/or mathematics materials. Limitations in reaching Standard 1 teachers exist as these teachers were involved in orienting Standard 1 learners yet were not formally presenting any lessons at the time baseline data was collected. Data from interviews with Standard 2 teachers only served as the baseline data for Indicator 5.0.a and 5.0.b. Table 16 baseline results illustrate that the majority of Standard 2 teachers were generally satisfied with the teacher guides and learner textbooks (despite a dearth of supplementary learning and reading materials). Further discussion is provided in Section 5.5.2.

Table 16. Result 5 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 5: Enhanced Quality of Teaching and Learning Materials</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010*</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0.a Percent of teachers’ ratings of Std 1 and 2 teachers guides judged to be satisfactory</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0.b Percent of teachers’ ratings of Std 1 and 2 textbooks judged to be satisfactory</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IR 5.1: Quality of revised PCAR materials for Std 1 - 2 improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IR 5.1.a. % of Std 1-2 teachers regularly using revised materials in the classroom</th>
<th>IR 5.1.b. Number of learner’s book and teacher’s guide revised for Std 1-2</th>
<th>IR 5.1.c. Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.a.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.b.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28 new titles</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.c.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>28 new titles</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Baseline data represent the Standard 2 teacher interview data.

5.5.2 Discussion of findings for Indicator 5.0.a: Percent of teachers’ ratings of Standard 2 teachers’ guides judged to be satisfactory and Indicator 5.0.b: Percent of teachers’ ratings of Standard 1 and Standard 2 learners’ texts judged to be satisfactory

The school-based survey interviewed only Standard 2 – Standard 4 teachers. The baseline data for Indicator 5.0.a is based on teacher evaluations of the Standard 2 teachers’ guides. By selecting only Standard 2 teachers, the teacher sample was reduced to a total of 101 as opposed to the total teacher sample of 274. Teachers interviewed were asked about the guides and books that they were using in their classrooms.

Standard 2 teachers were, for the most part, satisfied with the adequacy of the teachers’ guides and the learner’s books with 85.7% of the teachers judging the teachers’ guides as satisfactory and 89.7% of the teachers judging the Standard 2 texts as satisfactory. The Standard 2 teacher evaluations of the guides and learner texts were consistent with the entire sample of 274 teachers. Overall 89.7% of the Standard 2 – Standard 4 teacher interviewed reported being satisfied with the teachers’ guides and 92.5% of the teachers sampled were satisfied with the textbooks. These baseline statistics were higher than the baseline targets that were set prior to data collection. Targets will therefore be revised upwards in the next revision of the MTPDS Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP).

Importantly, teachers were less satisfied with the extent to which the learners’ books were being used. Overall, only 65.5% of the teachers found the use of learners’ books to be satisfactory.

Teacher assessments of the learner guides were also less favorably rated. Only 49.3% of the teachers judged the learner’s guides to be satisfactory. In Central West Division only 22.4% of the teachers provided “satisfactory” ratings of the learners’ guides.

5.5.3 Discussion of findings on teacher supervision and support

Teachers were also interviewed about three different types of support and supervision, provided by colleagues, head teachers, and primary education advisors (PEAS).

Satisfaction with colleague supervision

Only 24% of the teachers felt that the provision of school-based support and supervisions from colleagues was acceptable. Teachers’ ratings of colleague supervision were not related to differences in
location (e.g., urban vs. rural). However, according to the cross-tabulation results they were dependent on or related to the specific division. Table 17 illustrates that teachers in the Central West and Southeast Division were less satisfied with colleague support and supervision than those in Central East and Southwest Divisions.

Table 17. Percentage Teachers Satisfied with Colleague Supervision by Division*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chi-Square = 15.45; p < .009
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

### Satisfaction with head teacher supervision

Teachers’ perception of head teacher supervision were more favorable with 45.2% of the teachers rating head teacher supervision as satisfactory or better. As above, teachers’ ratings on head teacher supervision were not related to differences in location (e.g., urban vs. rural). However, teacher ratings of head teacher supervision were dependent on or related to the division where the school was located. Teachers in the Central West and Northeast Divisions were less satisfied with head teacher supervision compared to the overall teachers’ ratings, while a higher percentage of teachers in the Northwest and Shire Highlands rated head teacher supervision as satisfactory or better. These results are presented in Table 18 below.

Table 18. Acceptability of Head Teacher Supervision by Division*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-Square = 17.61; p < .004
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010
Satisfaction with Primary Education Advisor (PEA) supervision

Even though about half the teachers, on average, were satisfied with supervision provided by the PEA, ratings varied significantly according to location and division. Teachers in urban settings tended to be more satisfied with PEA supervision than teachers in rural settings. Teachers in the Southwest Division had the highest ratings of PEA supervision with 78% of the teachers judging PEA supervision to be satisfactory or better. Teachers in the Northeast Division were the least satisfied, with only 24% of the teachers judging PEA supervision as satisfactory or better. These data are presented in Table 19 and Table 20, respectfully.

| Table 19. Acceptability of PEA Supervision by Location* |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Division       | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
| Rural          | 42.7         | 57.3         |
| Urban          | 72.3         | 27.7         |
| TOTAL          | 49.5         | 50.5         |

*Chi-Square = 17.56; p < .0001  
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20. Acceptability of PEA Supervision by Division*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire Highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-Square = 29.01; p < .0001  
Source: MTPDS Baseline Survey 2010

5.6 Result 6: Improved PCAR M&E Systems and Quality

5.6.1 Overview

Many diverse policy initiatives are underway as part of a national drive for quality improvement. There is an urgent need to develop systems for monitoring and evaluating the impact of reform activities and for providing feedback to teachers and managers about their performance at all levels of the system. Of special importance and urgency is the need to develop systems to evaluate implementation of the NPC, a key element of which is the PCAR. Therefore, activities under Result 6 will provide assistance to the MoEST in developing and implementing a strategy for monitoring and evaluating PCAR, and for strengthening the capacity of the MoEST across all Directorates in education M&E. MTPDS activities will also promote and support active roles for parents and community members in monitoring education and the early grade literacy and numeracy attainment of their children. Selected policy initiatives
identified in DeStefano, J. and Chapman, D. (2010). *Result 1. Strengthened Teacher Policy and Support Systems: Analysis of Education Sector Policy Priorities and Implications for TPDS* have also been used to inform the work under Result 6.

### Table 21. Result 6 baseline and target summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 6: Improved PCAR M&amp;E Systems and Quality</th>
<th>Baseline Dec 2010</th>
<th>Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr. 1 Sep 2010</td>
<td>Yr. 2 Sep 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 PCAR M&amp;E guidelines developed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR 5.1: Quality of revised PCAR materials for Std 1 - 2 improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.a. Number of SMC trained on how to monitor performance of learners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.b. Number of people trained in M&amp;E with USG assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.c. Number of people trained in research with USG assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.6.2 Discussion of findings

The baseline data collection processes, including MoEST policy consultations, early grade learning assessments, teacher observations and teacher interviews helped to forge the path towards development of a set of M&E guidelines to monitor the uptake and effectiveness of Malawi’s PCAR. A broad base of stakeholders, all of the MoEST Directorates, and several teacher education specialists were involved in these processes. Importantly, for primary data collection officials across Directorates were involved in designing, developing and/or adapting instruments and collecting the data.

Teacher interview data provided important information for informing Result 6 baseline. As discussed in Section 5.3, the involvement of school governing bodies and parents in monitoring learner performance is desired. Yet, teachers are not satisfied with the current level of involvement of SMCs and parents in monitoring student performance. According to study results, teacher ratings were dependent on local and Division influences. Teachers were less satisfied with SMC and PTA involvement in monitoring student learning in rural locations and in the Central West Division.

In moving forward with the PCAR M&E System it will be critical to leverage opportunities to engage school governing bodies, PTAs, and community members in school performance monitoring activities. Annual school-based M&E activities will need to include provision for a limited time period in the M&E schedule for facilitation of small discussion groups including school and community members. The intent will be to spark dialogue about student learning and foster widespread and continuous responsibility toward effective schools and student learning.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Section 6.1 Introduction

The summary conclusions below are summative. As noted, this study has been informed by various sub studies and the national baseline assessment study reports. Each of these reports has included its own set of conclusions and associated recommendations. This study takes a “big picture” approach and attempts to link the various reports and the conclusions/recommendations contained within each.

A major conclusion of this study and confirmed through the baseline is that teachers have very limited knowledge of specific methodologies for teaching reading and mathematics in the early grades. This was established by the contrast in teacher observation ratings on subject-specific instructional practices and general teaching practices. The vast majority of teachers need to learn specific methods to effectively teach reading and mathematics. This factor has likely weighed heavily in the limited attainment measures on assessments of basic literacy and numeracy skills observed among early grade learners. Over 72.8% and 41.9% of the Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners tested at baseline, respectively, were unable to read any words on a test of oral reading fluency. And, 97.1% and 69.3% of Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners, respectively, were unable to answer any reading comprehension problems. Basic numeracy abilities and simple mathematics calculations also challenged Standard 2 and Standard 4 learners. This included rote counting to 100, recognition of 3 digit numerals and simple addition and subtraction operations involving single digits.

Consequently, MTPDS technical assistance training should target assistance principally on activities that will serve to enhance and increase the basic literacy and numeracy attainment of Malawi’s early grade learners. This includes education policy and systems support. It also includes assistance to the MoEST in establishing CPD modules, delivery and support systems that establish and sustain strong reading and mathematics instruction among all Standard 1 to Standard 4 teachers.

Section 6.2 Conclusions from Baseline Policy Consultations

Baseline consultations on policy and systems support identified three areas where policy studies might help to inform and potentially strengthen the policy environment in support of early grade learning. (The conclusions below were also informed by the DeStefano, J. and Chapman, D. (2010). Result 1. Strengthened Teacher Policy and Support Systems: Analysis of Education Sector Policy Priorities and Implications for TPDS.)

Conduct an assessment of the Teacher Development Centers (TDCs). If the TDCs are to play an important role in teacher support and training as suggested in Malawi’s ESIP, there is a need for an assessment of the institutional capacity resources and organizational structure of the TDC. This would help to inform how the TDC could be leveraged to improve the effectiveness of teacher professional development systems. It would also be needed to maximize the contribution of the TDC in favor of
strengthening teachers and teacher support networks expressly for early grade reading and mathematics instructions.

Promote a national policy focus on early grade learning. Another area of reform would be to prioritize resources in favor of the early grades. This would include the assignment of classrooms and strong teachers and materials to support the early grades. Also, applying the information gained from the EGRA and EGMA tests to the teaching priorities and CPD modules for Standard 1 – Standard 4 will help teachers ensure that reformed classroom practices lead to improved learner performance. In addition, a policy study would establish a rich source of quality data (e.g., from, a qualitative study or KAP survey) from which to drive and mobilize widespread community support for the classroom reforms and enhanced early grade literacy and numeracy attainment.

Study and define the necessary decision-making processes required to assure coordination of funding for implementing targeted education reform initiatives within the MoEST. It is essential that the intersection of policy, financial, and process decisions that support the training and deployment of new teachers graduating from the Open Distance Learning initiative be more fully understood.

Baseline information related to strengthening MoEST capacity in M&E identified the need to facilitate the coordination of school-based monitoring and evaluation across all MoEST directorates. MPTDS baseline consultations identified the beginnings of an M&E framework for PCAR and the NPC. At the time of these consultations, the framework required finalization. It also needed a set of performance indicators to be developed that would guide an annual school-based data collection process that could be used to monitor PCAR’s uptake and success in improving teacher instructional practices and especially early grade learner performance. The role of school and community in monitoring education is recognized as an important factor in ensuring that policy reforms are translated appropriately and implemented at the school and community level and that teachers are supported as they “try on” new teaching practices. It is important that the monitoring of school performance involves educators, school governing bodies, and community members as much as possible. Recommendations in support of improved national monitoring and evaluation include:

- Finalizing the M&E Framework for NPC
- Developing, costing an M&E Implementation Strategy
- Establishing a strategy for regularly engaging school governing bodies and communities in M&E

Section 6.3 Recommendations from Classroom Observations

Classroom observations led to recommendations that teacher professional development should focus fully on establishing widespread teacher skills in the teaching of reading and mathematics in the early grades. While general “good” instructional practices are important, it appears that teachers have learned these skills outside of the subject context. Thus, in addition to specific evidence-based practices in reading and mathematics teaching methodologies for Grades 1 to 4, teachers should learn specific ways to apply the more general practices (i.e., practices which most teachers are aware of and often apply) such as “use of grouping,” “use of feedback,” and “promoting active learning participation”
directly to the teaching of reading and mathematics. Teachers need to learn specific reading and mathematics methodologies. They also need to learn to contextualize some of their “good general practices” within their presentation of reading and mathematics lessons.

Baseline EGRA and EGMA results should be used to inform the development of the CPD modules in early grade reading and early grade math. This will help ensure that specific learner weaknesses in the baseline serve as a source of information for strengthening teacher skills and for developing community and home learning support programs. Such “diagnostic” information should be consolidated with information emerging from the early grade learning pilot activities in Ntchisi and Salima districts.

The two general practices that most challenged teachers were “providing continuous assessment” and “keeping records of learner progress.” Conduct of a special study of teachers’ application of continuous assessment may prove helpful in identifying the precise barriers to effective and efficient application of formal and informal classroom assessments. This information could be used to establish a more teacher directed learning module on learner assessment and progress tracking – even in large classrooms. The pilot teams in Ntchisi and Salima may be a viable setting for learning more about the barriers to teacher applications of continuous assessment and record keeping.

Section 6.4 Recommendation from Learner Assessments

A number of specific recommendations emerged from the baseline studies of early grade reading and mathematics: Malawi National Baseline Reports for the Malawi Early Grade Reading Assessment (J. Mejia) and Malawi Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (A. Brombacher). These, summarized here, are based on the conclusions that (1) students are performing poorly on EGRA and EGMA; and (2) teachers perform poorly on the use of specific learning skills, thus the need for CPD or intensive training to improve their performance. Please refer to the complete study report for more detailed discussion.

Early grade reading recommendations
- Dedicate 45 minutes of reading and reading instruction in schools
- Begin teaching reading on day one of Standard 1 and make reading a focus of all instruction
- Teach decoding skills
- Teach formal reading comprehension skills
- Review teacher in-service and pre-service programs to ensure that teacher education specifically builds teachers’ skills in teaching letter sounds and decoding words.
- Develop a National Early Literacy Strategy that aims to ensure that all children learn to read by the end of Standard 2

Early grade mathematics
- Professional development is needed in specific instructional strategies and methods focused on mathematics (both pre and in-service training on numeracy instruction) focusing attention on how children are getting the basics, and develop conceptual understanding, adaptive reasoning,
and strategic competence (e.g., frequent or daily opportunities to count concrete objects with counters)

- Ensure that teachers focus attention to understanding, reasoning and application, offering opportunity for students to practice calculations in developing learning and understanding, and experience mathematics as a meaningful, sense-making, problem-solving activity rather than memorization of facts, rules, formulas and procedures

- Train PEAS to be instructional coaches. Refocusing PEAs to be experts in early numeracy instruction and coaching. This could include modeling and providing constructive feedback to teachers during regular classroom visits
ANNEX 1

Guide to Classroom Instructional Lesson Observation

This document is intended to serve as a guide for data collectors to conduct effective classroom observations of teacher performance.

The first section begins with an overview of the desired characteristics for a classroom observation specialist. This is followed by both a sampling guide and scoring guide. Definitions are included for each observation lesson. The ratings range from 0-5 as follows.

1. Not observed/used during this lesson
2. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 of the above
3. Weak - teacher meets 2 items
4. Satisfactory - teacher meets 3 to 4 items
5. Good - teacher meets 5 of the above items
6. Very good - teacher meets all 6 items outlined above

QUALITIES OF A GOOD OBSERVER

The qualities of a good “observer” include a combination of traits and skills which enable them to serve as an impartial and constructive assessor of teacher performance.

This new assessment of teacher performance requires a degree of subjective or personal interpretation of desired classroom practices. Thus, it is important that the classroom observer is fully prepared in advance and understands the ratings checklist beforehand, as well as the desired classroom practices. Just as teachers should be prepared for instructional lessons, those responsible for assessing their teaching practice and providing constructive feedback should prepared for this important role. The qualities or traits of a “good observer” typically include:
• Positive, forward-looking attitude toward his/her work; displays solidarity and commitment to the profession.
• Embodies the values of the profession in his/her behavior; believes in and promotes the work of MoEST and the PCAR reforms.
• Displays a sincere interest in promoting teacher learning and professional development.
• Demonstrates an understanding of the need to balance control and direction with respect for teachers’ autonomy.
• Brings expert and current knowledge of PCAR, of effective instructional teaching practices and of Outcomes Based Education (OBE) practices.
• Prepared to share such expertise by providing teachers with information feedback loops and constructive suggestions that are relevant to challenges in daily teaching practices.
• Demonstrates a problem-solving orientation toward the work of and challenges of teachers.
• Focuses on consensus-building and cooperation derived from democratic participation in school management, rather than overly directive techniques.
• Provides and articulates a clear, flexible structure for maximizing the observer-teacher relationship as a supportive feedback process.
• Conveys culturally-sensitive behavior in helping the teacher to understand students’ particular situations and challenges; is non-sexist and non-racist in orientation and action; and is aware of his/her own cultural biases.
• Establishes caring relationships with teachers characterized by a sense of psychological and professional safety (e.g., accepting, warm, empathic, respectful, interested, supportive, flexible, genuine; trustworthy; honest; fair; wit; and honors confidentiality).
• Equipped to share expertise in a way that facilitates learning optimally; including a readiness to engage in appropriate levels of self-disclosure on professional challenges and successes.
• Displays technical and professional competence in assisting teachers in planning and executing their work, joined with competence in interpersonal human relations with others.
• Exhibits tolerance and acceptance of mistakes and failures, recognizing these as learning opportunities and a natural component of the teacher development process.

**Teachers’ Sampling Guide**

To begin, randomly select one teacher from Standards 1 - 4 teaching mathematics and literacy in the selected school from the list provided to you by the head master. Ensure a proper gender balance during selection of sampling of the teachers for classroom observation and in observing teacher interaction with male and female students. In an event that there is more than one stream of teachers, randomly select one class for observation.
SCORING GUIDE

The Scoring Guide has been designed to help observers rate the effectiveness of the teaching lesson. The consistency in format and rating scales provided below are intended to aid the classroom observer in easily marking the checklist without need for continuous reference to this guide. The guide has two parts: the first part describes what is expected on each assessment or checklist question. The second rating guides the observer on how to award a score for each particular item.

25. The teacher has prepared a detailed and comprehensive lesson plan
   1. Preamble
   2. Introduction
   3. Clear success criteria
   4. States suitable T/L and assessment materials
   5. Detailed and tasks are clearly stated
   6. End with a summary of main points
   7. Lesson evaluation at the end

   Rating

   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 of the above
   2. Weak - teacher meets 2 to 3 items
   3. Satisfactory - teacher meets 4 to 5 items
   4. Good - teacher meets 6 of the above items
   5. Very good - teacher meets all 7 items outlined above

26. The teacher introduces lesson by explaining what students are expected to learn
   1. Begins the lesson with a welcoming and supportive tone
   2. Uses techniques to motivate and draw students' attention for the lesson
   3. Begins the lesson from what is “known” to what is “unknown”
   4. Accomplishes the lesson introduction in 5 minutes or less
   5. Outlines what students are expected to do or learn
   6. Involves students in the lesson introduction

   Rating

   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 of the above
   2. Weak - teacher meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - teacher meets 3 to 4 items
   4. Good - teacher meets 5 of the above items
   5. Very good - teacher meets all 6 items outlined above
27. Teacher varies methods and activities (e.g., group work, individual work, games, songs, role-play, discussion)
   1. Provides students with clear and easy-to-follow instructions
   2. Moves around to check and supervise how students are faring
   3. Allocates adequate time for activity
   4. Assigns roles to the learners
   5. Provides feedback on the findings to learners

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 of the above
   2. Weak - teacher meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - teacher meets 3 items
   4. Good - teacher meets 4 of the above items
   5. Very good - teacher meets all 5 items outlined above

28. Teacher uses question and answer teaching techniques
   1. Prepares questions in advance
   2. Uses both open-ended and close-ended questions
   3. Gives equal opportunity to boys and girls to respond to questions
   4. Selects respondents from all corners of the classroom
   5. Uses Question Pause and Name technique (QPN)

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 item of the above
   2. Weak - teacher meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - teacher meets 3 items
   4. Good - teacher meets 4 of the above items
   5. Very good - teacher meets all 5 items outlined above

29. Teacher uses visual aids and TALULAR materials (teaching and learning using locally accessed resources)
   1. Class has “talking walls” and includes graphics, illustrations, and/or students’ work
   2. Visual aids hang at reasonable height for students to read/see properly
   3. Adequate TALULAR materials are available for all learners
   4. Selected TALULAR materials are relevant for the objective
   5. Materials are displayed orderly according to defined learning areas
   6. Materials are well drawn and/or constructed with care
   7. Large print is used for students to read materials

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - teacher meets none or 1 item of the above
   2. Weak - teacher meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - teacher meets 3 to 4 items
4. Good - teacher meets 5 to 6 items
5. Very good - teacher meets all 7 items outlined above

30. **Teacher engages students in active lesson participation**
1. Students follow teacher’s instructions
2. Students answer questions from the teacher or each other
3. Students offer reports on group discussions and provide comments to class
4. Students are used by the teacher in demonstration activities
5. Students are attentive to the teacher and others during the lesson

**Rating**

0. Not observed/used during this lesson
1. Poor - Students make noise and/or remain idle
2. Weak - Less than one-half participate in an activity
3. Satisfactory - Between one-half and three-quarters participate
4. Good - Between three-quarters and three-quarters participate
5. Very good - More than three-quarters participate

31. **Teacher gives students feedback through written/oral gestures**
1. Marks students’ work and returns the written comments to students
2. Provides verbal responses to students’ questions and/or answers
3. Nods head, hands, and/or physically responds to reinforce approval of learners
4. Uses inaccurate responses to reinforce leaner’s effort before selecting another student
5. Teacher consolidates students’ work so that they make corrections

**Rating**

0. Not observed during this lesson
1. Poor - Listens to students responses but provides no comment
2. Weak - Offers verbal comment
3. Satisfactory - Offers verbal comment with gestures
4. Good - Offers verbal, physical and/or written responses
5. Very good - Demonstrates all the above and returns written work in a timely manner

32. **Teacher encourages students to find answers and to demonstrate problem-solving skills**
1. Uses critical questioning techniques
2. Asks thought-provoking and open-ended questions
3. Provides adequate information from which students can find answers
4. Asks students to identify and articulate main lesson points
5. Asks students to summarize the key lesson concepts
6. Provides tasks that encourage and reinforce understanding of information
7. Allows students to present information and/or strategies in different forms
8. Guides students to offer their own opinion with a safe environment

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the above items observed
2. Weak - Two to three of the above items observed
33. **Teacher displays confidence in the subject area content**
   1. Displays competence in subject matter content
   2. Simplifies content to the appropriate grade or learning level of students
   3. Prompts students to ask questions where content is not clear
   4. Provides clear explanations when asked questions by learners
   5. Provides alternative explanations and offers more examples as asked

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - Teacher does not meet any of the above
   2. Weak - Less than one-half participate in an activity
   3. Satisfactory - Between one-half and three-quarters participate
   4. Good - Between three-quarters and three-quarters participate
   5. Very good - Most than three-quarters participate

34. **Teacher demonstrates skill in class management**
   1. Establishes and reinforces rules of school work standards
   2. Builds positive teacher-learner and peer interrelationships
   3. Uses language of reinforcement equally for correct and incorrect answers
   4. Resolves conflicts and restores group unity without blame
   5. Plans and prepares interesting and appropriate lessons
   6. Listens to students and encourages them to express their views

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

35. **Teacher demonstrates effective use of continuous assessment**
   1. Selects suitable material for assessment practices
   2. Keeps every child engaged throughout the assessment period
   3. Records continuous assessment records
   4. Updates continuous assessment records
   5. Parents help improve learner performance through school involvement

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
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4. Good - Four of the above items observed
5. Very good - All the above items observed

36. Teacher keeps well-organized records of students’ progress and performance
   1. Maintains portfolios of individual students’ performance
   2. Prepares scoring rubrics to assess progress and performance
   3. Uses checklists to assess students’ progress and performance
   4. Maintains progress record of at least 1 grade per fortnight (2 grades per month)
   5. Updates student performance register regularly
   
   Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above assessment tools was used
   2. Weak - Two of the above assessment tools were used
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above assessment tools were used
   4. Good - Four of the above assessment tools were used
   5. Very good - All the above assessment tools were used

37. Teacher presents clear activities for practicing letter naming and letter sounds
   1. Provides clear instructions on what to be done
   2. Provides examples/demonstrates naming and sounding letter(s)
   3. Offers students opportunity to practice individually, in pairs and/or in groups
   4. Uses letter cards to demonstrate letter shapes and names
   5. Teacher introduces interactive games using cards
   
   Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

38. Teacher uses phonics in teaching literacy
   1. Introduces phonics
   2. Demonstrates clear pronunciation and repeats as needed
   3. Practices phonics with students individually, in pairs, and/or in groups
   4. Practices writing the letter shapes
   5. Marks students’ work and provides direct feedback
   
   Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very Good - All the above items observed
39. **Teacher provides clear instruction in the use of reading comprehension strategies**
   1. Provides clear instruction on what students are expected to do
   2. Provides pre-reading questions or words meanings
   3. Discusses the passage and solicits answers to pre-reading questions
   4. Asks students to answer comprehension questions orally
   5. Offers written marks to exercise and/or students exchange notebooks for peer review

   **Rating**
   
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

40. **Teacher provides systematic instruction in mechanics of writing based on pupil levels**
   1. Allows students to practice orally what they are preparing to write
   2. Asks students to practice writing letters in the air following the teacher demonstration
   3. Asks students to practice writing patterns of certain letters
   4. Draws lines on chalk board and demonstrates the written word of the number
   5. Offers students opportunity to practice writing number words/sentences on chalkboard
   6. Circulates in class to mark student work and comment

   **Rating**
   
   0. None of the above items observed
   1. Poor - One of the above item observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the five items above observed

41. **Teacher uses a variety of teaching and learning resources to support literacy instruction**
   1. Resources are user friendly and accessible to students
   2. Resources are displayed in an orderly manner
   3. Resources are relevant to the content and age-appropriate
   4. Resources are adequate for the students’ knowledge levels
   5. Students’ are offered opportunities to interact with the resources

   **Rating**
   
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed
42. **Teacher provides appropriate instruction for skills development of numeracy concepts**

1. Reviews core components: counting, number identification, quantity discrimination, pattern completion, word problems, and basic operations
2. Emphasizes conceptual understanding, reasoning, and application
3. Presents tasks as a progression of skills toward mathematics proficiency
4. Systematically samples student test skills as indicator of mastery
5. Asks students to rote count as far as they can to assess fluency
6. Uses one-to-one exchange (rational counting) to assess ability to use two processes
7. Instructs on number identification to confirm identification of written symbols
8. Asks students to compare quantities in object groups (number discrimination)
9. Asks students to name missing numbers to complete patterns
10. Observes strategies children use to solve problems, such as word problems testing joining/separating, combining and comparing
11. Asks students to perform addition calculations mentally, and with and without manipulatives (counters) and/or pencil and paper
12. Asks students to perform subtraction calculations mentally both with and without manipulatives (counters) and/or pencil and paper
13. Provides opportunities for individual students to count as far as they can (group counting can hide proficiency levels)
14. Offers lessons in rational counting of objects and sets of objects (number sense and size)
15. Articulates differences between rote counting (reciting a rhyme) and rational counting – the counting of objects (individual activity)
16. Offers opportunities and practice for regular writing of numbers and exposure to numbers greater than 20 (grade 2) and greater than 100 (grade 4)
17. Assists students to discriminate effectively between numbers by studying patterns
18. Offers opportunities for students to recognize, describe, extend, and generalize patterns
19. Provides more exposure to counting in steps other than 1
20. Provides opportunities for students to count in steps to decompose and recompose numbers

43. **Teacher uses techniques relevant for basic mathematics concepts**

1. Addresses pattern recognition, and extension and increasing and decreasing sequences
2. Offers students counters (manipulatives) and paper and pencil to solve problems
3. Uses analysis of the problem itself before students perform an operation
4. Promotes mathematics as a problem-solving activity and not memorization of facts, rules, formulas and procedures
5. Promotes understanding of mathematical concepts, operations, and relations
6. Promotes skills in flexibly, accuracy, efficiency, and appropriateness
7. Promotes strategic competence, ability to formulate, represent, and solve mathematical problems
8. Promotes adaptive reasoning—capacity for logical thought, reflection, explanation, and justification
9. Promotes productive disposition—habitual inclination to see mathematics as sensible, useful, and worthwhile, coupled with a belief in diligence and one’s own efficacy

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One to three of the above items observed
2. Weak - Four to six of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory - Seven to twelve of the above items observed
4. Good - Thirteen to sixteen of the above items observed
5. Very good - All the above items observed
44. **Students demonstrate acquisition of new knowledge and skills**
   1. Provides students with correct answers
   2. Show interest in the lesson
   3. Less absenteeism
   4. Good pupils / teachers relationships
   5. Follow instruction
   6. Neat work
   7. Cry for more work
   8. Less unnecessary noise
   9. Good test result
   10. Good competition among learners
   11. Ability to assist the teachers
   12. Self release in solving problem
   13. Helping one another during break

   **Rating**
   
   0. One or none of the above items observed
   1. Poor - Two of the above items
   2. Weak - Four of the above items
   3. Satisfactory - Six of the above items
   4. Good - Eight of the above items
   5. Very good - Any ten of the above items

45. **Availability and adequacy of teacher guides**
   1. Makes teacher’s guides available for all subjects
   2. Makes teacher’s guides available for all classes
   3. Maintains teacher’s guides in good conditions
   4. Makes teacher’s guides available for all subjects in all classes in the ratio of ITG to 1 teacher
   5. Stores teacher’s guides in safe place/cabinets

   **Rating**
   
   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - meets none or 1 of the above
   2. Weak - meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - meets 3 items
   4. Good - meets 4 of the above items
   5. Very good - meets all 5 items outlined above
46. **Availability and adequacy of student books**
   1. Makes student books available for all subjects
   2. Makes students books available for all classes
   3. Maintains students books in good conditions
   4. Makes students books available for all subjects in all classes in the ratio of 1 learner
   5. Stores students books in safe place/cabinets

   **Rating**

   0. Not observed/used during this lesson
   1. Poor - meets none or 1 of the above
   2. Weak - meets 2 items
   3. Satisfactory - meets 3 items
   4. Good - meets 4 of the above items
   5. Very good - meets all 5 items outlined above

47. **Topics in the teachers’ guide based on the syllabus**
   1. Topics are found in the syllabus
   2. Topics are suitable to the level and standard of the letter
   3. Scope is well structured following the syllabus
   4. Topics are sequenced following the syllabus

   **Rating**

   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - One and half of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Two of the above items observed
   4. Good - Three of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

48. **Activities in the teachers’ guide properly sequenced**
   1. Sequences from known content to the unknown
   2. Transitions from simple tasks to difficult ones
   3. Links topics in order of similarity
   4. Builds topic or knowledge from the previous topics or activity

   **Rating**

   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - One and half of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Two of the above items observed
   4. Good - Three of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

49. **Instructions in teachers’ guide linked and shows clear relationship to the student book**
   1. Provides clear direction to the teacher
2. Instructions indicate clearly what students are expected to do
3. Pages correspond with those in students' books
4. Guides teacher support activities in students' books

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the above items observed
2. Weak - One and half of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory - Two of the above items observed
4. Good - Three of the above items observed
5. Very good - All the above items observed

50. Appropriate language used in the teacher guide

1. Relevant depending on age and class level
2. Relevant without misleading information
3. Contains explicit instructions for teacher use
4. Enhances and promotes simple understanding of subject matter

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the above items observed
2. Weak - One and half of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory - Two of the above items observed
4. Good - Three of the above items observed
5. Very good - All the above items observed

**Use of teachers' guide**

1. Contains activities from the teachers guide in lesson plans
2. Contain topics/activities from the teachers' guide schemes of work
3. Students exercises referenced from the teachers guide
4. Teachers learning and assessment methods stipulated in the teachers guide
5. Teaching, learning and assessment materials stipulated in the teachers guide

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - Any of the items above
2. Weak - Any of the two above
3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
4. Good - Any four items above
5. Very good - Any all items above
52. Teachers guide in an acceptable condition

1. Complete with all pages in the teachers guide available
2. Provides at least one teacher guide to be used by one teacher
3. Securely and well-bound for durability
4. Contains legible and clear print
5. Includes friendly and accessible vocabulary

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the items above
2. Weak - Any two items above
3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
4. Good - Any four items above
5. Very good - All items above

53. Student book content matches the teacher’s guide

1. Corresponding content in the students book with teacher’s guide
2. Corresponding exercises in the students book match with the teacher’s guide
3. Corresponding pages in the students book match with the teacher’s guide
4. Activities or exercises in the students book help to achieve success criteria in the teachers’ guide for the lessons
5. Alignment between sequence and scope with the teacher’s guide

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the items above
2. Weak - Any two items above
3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
4. Good - Any four items above
5. Very good - All the items above

**Student guide activities are properly sequenced**

1. Relationship of steps
2. Time given for each activity
3. Preparation for activities
4. Students participation
5. Teachers participation

**Rating**

0. Not observed
1. Poor - One of the items above
2. Weak - Any two items above
3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
4. Good - Any four items above
5. Very good - All the items above
54. Instructions in the student book are clear
1. Clarity of instruction
2. AI/Ds suitable and appropriate Language used
3. Teachers explanation to learners
4. Attractiveness and easy to follow
5. Logically sequenced

   Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the items above
   2. Weak - Any two items above
   3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
   4. Good - Any four items above
   5. Very good - All five items above

55. Content in the student book is suitable for the level of the learners
1. Builds up from previous class in systematic and suitable manner
2. Vocabulary suitable for the ability level of learners
3. Size of paragraph small and contains one idea
4. Grammar suitable for the ability level and class
5. Comprehension questions easy to understand

   Rating
   0. No observed
   1. Poor - One of the items above
   2. Weak - Any two items above
   3. Satisfactory - Any three items above
   4. Good - Any four items above
   5. Very good - All five items above

56. Illustrations in the students’ book complement the text
1. Relationship
2. Clarity(clearness)
3. Story coverage
4. Lesson given(protraction)
5. Coloured

   Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the items above
57. Language used in the student book is age appropriate
   1. Vocabulary used suitable for learner ability
   2. Levels of language are appropriate for students
   3. Proper sentence construction
   4. Proverb included relevant to the story
   5. Easy to understand

Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

58. Student book print size is appropriate to the learners
   1. Size of letters appropriate for the learners
   2. Class levels or level of learners
   3. Students’ sight
   4. Book positioning or handling
   5. Length of the book in the learner face.

Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

59. Student books are in active use
   1. Consistently uses books during lessons
   2. Equips every learner with a book
   4. Students provided books to read at home
   5. Students use books to complete school assignments

Rating
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very Good - All the above items observed
60. **Student books are in acceptable condition**
   1. Distribution to students is 1:1
   2. Pupils and teachers take care of the books
   3. Quantity enough for the school
   4. Time or period for use not less than three or four years
   5. Learner’s book are available and can be replaced when missing

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

61. **SMC/PTA participate in the school’s extracurricular activities**
   1. Development plan available
   2. Involvement in games at school
   3. Involvement in discipline of learners/teachers
   4. Students feeding programmes in place
   5. Absenteeism of both students and teachers is checked

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

62. **SMC/PTA monitor what children are learning at school**
   1. SMC/PTA interest in students education
   2. SMC/PTA call for the meetings regularly
   3. SMC/PTA attendance teachers meetings
   4. SMC/PTA give assistance given to teachers and learners
   5. SMC/PTA attend closing ceremonies

   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed
63. SMC/PTA and teachers meet to discuss student performance
   1. SMC/PTA meet regularly to discuss students performance
   2. SMC/PTA meet with parents to discuss students performance
   3. Performance improvement proposals given
   4. SMC/PTA eager to meet when need arises
   5. Attendance of SMC/PTA encouraging
   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

64. SMC/PTA support school as skilled resource persons
   1. School programmes done voluntarily i.e. collection of sand
   2. Mounding bricks
   3. Making play field
   4. Provision of free transport
   5. Construction of school buildings
   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed

65. Relationship exists between SMC/PTA and the teachers
   1. Willingness to help each other
   2. Listening to each other’s problem
   3. Eagerness to work together
   4. Call meetings
   5. Full control of school discipline
   **Rating**
   0. Not observed
   1. Poor - One of the above items observed
   2. Weak - Two of the above items observed
   3. Satisfactory - Three of the above items observed
   4. Good - Four of the above items observed
   5. Very good - All the above items observed
66. Frequency of supervision by colleagues
1. Willingness of supervision frequency
2. Willingness to adjust
3. Availability of supervision time table for all
4. Frequent supervision meetings
5. Teachers response to comments/advice given

Rating

0. Not observed
1. Poor  -  One of the above items observed
2. Weak  -  Two of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory  -  Three of the above items observed
4. Good  -  Four of the above items observed
5. Very good  -  All the above items observed

67. Frequency of supervision by the head teacher
1. Supervision time table available
2. Record of frequent supervisory meetings by the head teacher
3. Teacher’s good response records available
4. Availability of supervision records
5. Availability of timetable for heads of sections

Rating

0. Not observed
1. Poor  -  One of the above items observed
2. Weak  -  Two of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory  -  Three of the above items observed
4. Good  -  Four of the above items observed
5. Very Good  -  All the above items observed

68. Frequency of supervision by the PEA
1. Number of supervisory visits
2. Record of supervision feedbacks to teachers
3. Record of teachers response
4. INSET conducted at cluster level
5. INSET conducted at school level
6. INSET conducted at zone level

Rating

0. Not observed
1. Poor  -  One of the above items observed
2. Weak  -  Two of the above items observed
3. Satisfactory  -  Three of the above items observed
4. Good  -  Four to five of the above items observed
5. Very Good  -  All the above items observed