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# ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Center for Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Classroom Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIES</td>
<td>Comparative and International Education Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>Continuous Assessment Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Contracting Officer's Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Coordinating Center Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Coronavirus Disease 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSWO</td>
<td>District Probation and Social Welfare Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>Education Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Evaluation Design Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICYD</td>
<td>Integrated Child and Youth Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARA</td>
<td>Literacy Achievement and Retention Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoES</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORC</td>
<td>NORC at the University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;IE</td>
<td>Performance and Impact Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Primary 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Primary 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Primary 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Primary 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Primary 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Primary 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Primary 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWI</td>
<td>Research World International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Result 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Result 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;A</td>
<td>Retention and Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRP</td>
<td>School and Health Reading Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRGBV</td>
<td>School-Related Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>School-to-School International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>Social Behavior Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASO</td>
<td>The AIDS Support Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Treatment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKU</td>
<td>Uganda Kids Unite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCST</td>
<td>Uganda National Council of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

NORC at the University of Chicago (NORC), in partnership with subcontractor Panagora Group Inc., is pleased to submit the Final Report of the Performance and Impact Evaluation (P&IE) of the Literacy Achievement and Retention Activity (LARA) in Uganda.

LARA was a 6-year (April 7, 2015 to April 6, 2021) USAID-funded initiative to improve reading skills for 1.3 million learners in 28 districts throughout Uganda. The project, which was implemented by RTI International, was designed to support the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) – Uganda in its efforts to improve early grade reading (EGR) and retention. LARA had two main objectives:

- Result 1 (R1) focused on strengthening the capacity of MoES and other educational stakeholders to deliver EGR. To this end, the activity focused on improved reading skills in three local languages (Luganda, Runyankore-Rukiga, and Runyoro-Rutooro) and English for early primary grade (P1-4) learners.
- Result 2 (R2) focused on promoting a safer primary school learning environment to prevent and reduce incidents of school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV).

The activity hypothesized that reducing SRGBV will increase learners’ retention because they will be able to focus on their lessons and feel secure in their learning environment, thereby improving their ability to learn to read. To realize these objectives, the activity focused its efforts on systemic capacity building of the education system, school-level support, and community- and household-level support and participation.

The Uganda LARA P&IE activity (April 2016 - April 2021) had two objectives: (1) to assess the impact of LARA on learners’ literacy skills and retention rates; and (2) to assess the performance of LARA in terms of project management, learning, design, implementation, results, and sustainability. The Uganda LARA P&IE activity included a baseline study (2017), an impact evaluation (2019), and a final performance evaluation (2019), collecting quantitative and qualitative EGR and SRGBV data from learners, teachers, head teachers, and caregivers. Furthermore, NORC conducted annual classroom observations (CROs) of literacy lessons (2017–2019), and collected retention and attendance (R&A) data in each school term from a panel of learners and their teachers (2017–2020).
P&IE ACTIVITIES

NORC conducted the following activities for the LARA P&IE between April 2016 and April 2021:

INCEPTION TRIP, DESIGN WORKSHOP, CHANGES TO DESIGN

NORC submitted a strategy for the P&IE of LARA as a key part of its proposal to USAID. In the original proposal, NORC planned to use a mixed-methods approach combining a rigorous experimental -- randomized control trial (RCT) design and qualitative data for the IE. The implementing partner (IP) for LARA was responsible for EGRA data collection to be used in the IE. NORC was responsible for the collection of SRGBV indicators and intended to also work with USAID and the LARA IP to support the IP in identifying the best way to measure R&A given the constraints on availability and reliability of data.

However, the award of the P&IE contract took place about a year after RTI began implementing LARA. During this time, RTI initiated program activities and collected data to be used in the evaluation. NORC appreciated the LARA implementation plan and evaluation design, and that the baseline data was already collected for Cluster 1 for both EGRA and SRGBV. The primary concern, however, was that the sample size used to collect EGRA data was too small to detect the effects of the program. In addition, the IP had not collected data on retention and attendance.

This situation presented some challenges for NORC, but also some opportunities to be discussed later. It mostly implied changes to the original IE plans but it also had consequences for the performance evaluation.

The NORC team visited Uganda from June 22 to July 1, 2016 for the evaluation design scoping trip. During this time, it met extensively with the LARA team and USAID to understand and discuss the details of the program implementation, data collection and other ongoing and planned activities. The team visited one primary school where LARA was conducting a Support Supervision exercise and some team members also attended the first meeting of the MoES Advisory Committee on Early Grade Reading and Retention.

In discussions with USAID/Uganda, the NORC team considered several options on how to approach the P&IE given the accomplishments of LARA to date, the constraints, and the need for the highest possible quality external evaluation. Fortunately, LARA planned to implement its program to a new set of schools in Cluster 2 in 2017, which offered an opportunity for NORC to begin the external evaluation with a new cohort of schools.

EVALUATION DESIGN REPORT

NORC prepared an Evaluation Design Report (EDR) outlining the methodology of the P&IE, which focused on LARA cluster 2 schools located in areas where two languages dominate: Luganda and

---

1 RTI used a sample to collect baseline data that is powered to detect changes of 10 words in the ORF EGRA subtask.
2 This was initially called a Task Force.
3 Available at https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDNmY2Uy&stID=NTcwNjE4&inr=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=
Runyankore-Rukiga. The report describes NORC’s mixed-methods approach, which combines an RCT design with qualitative research. It also describes the randomization strategy, under which the treatment assignment was randomized at the coordinating center tutors (CCT) level, assigning the entire cluster of schools under a CCT to treatment one (T1, receiving R1 EGR activities only), treatment two (T2, receiving R1 EGR + R2 SRGBV activities), or the control group (receiving no activities). The EDR was approved in November 2016.

**BASELINE TOOLS DEVELOPMENT**

NORC developed a total of 12 instruments, as well as consent forms for adults (primary caregivers, teachers and head teachers) and scripts to get assent from learners. USAID/Uganda approved the 5 EGR instruments in January 2017, and the 7 SRGBV tools in March 2017.

For EGR:

1. Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA): The EGRA developed and used by RTI for the baseline data collection in 2016 on Cluster 1 schools was adapted by the NORC team for cluster 2 schools.
2. Learner context survey: collected basic information on the students to complement the EGRA.
3. Head teacher survey: gathered information from head teachers regarding their instructional leadership – including their training and education background and their support to the teaching of reading and SRGBV in the lower grades.
4. Teacher survey: gathered information on the teachers’ education, experience and demographics, the support and supervision received, and the availability of teaching materials.
5. Protocol for focus group discussions (FGDs) with caregivers: asked parents who they think is primarily responsible for teaching their child to learn how to read, and the role of the teacher versus the family; their confidence and challenges in helping their child learn to read; their child’s access to reading materials and factors affecting their child’s absence from class and their reading skills.

For SRGBV:

1. Learner instruments for (i) girl learners age 6 – 10, (ii) boy learners age 6 – 10, (iii) girl learners age 11+, and (iv) boy learners age 11+. All four instruments consisted of the same five sections. The questionnaire collected basic information on the students and their general attitudes about school climate and gender norms, complementing the measures for learners’ experiences of SRGBV administered at the end.
2. Teacher instrument: gathered information on teachers’ backgrounds, perceptions of their schools’ climate, acceptance of gender inequitable norms, methods to teach learners the right behavior or to address a behavior problem, and their opinions on discipline.
3. Head teacher instrument: covered the background characteristics of the head teacher, as well as their perceptions of school climate, attitudes toward disciplinary methods and exposure to any SRGBV-related training.

---

4 More details on each instrument are provided in the Data Collection Tools Report, available at [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxNDBmY2Uy&rrID=NTY2MjA0&inr=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxNDBmY2Uy&rrID=NTY2MjA0&inr=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=)
4. Primary caregiver instrument: collected data on the child participating in the LARA program and their home environment, as well as established the attitudes and behavior of the caregiver related to gender and violence.

5. Protocol for FGDs with learners age 11+: used participatory methods to engage the learners and get their feedback on how they feel on their journey to school as well as a typical day in the classroom, around the school, play and latrine areas.

6. Protocol for FGDs with teachers: asked teachers about their system of evaluation and reward and disciplining difficult students; what they know about violence and mistreatment of boys and girls in their school and about school safety; and if there has been any discussion in school on improving learner’s safety and decreasing violence, and teachers’ knowledge of child protection resources.

7. Protocol for FGDs with caregivers: asked questions regarding the use of discipline in school as well as violence and mistreatment of learners.

8. School Safety Inventory: consisted of a 10-item observational checklist. It served as an objective measure of school safety in the context of SRGBV as reflected in its relevant infrastructure.

In addition to the EGRA and supplementary surveys, instruments were also prepared for collecting R&A data, and conducting CROs.

**IRB CERTIFICATION FOR BASELINE DATA COLLECTION**

To get Institutional Review Board (IRB) certification for EGR and SRGBV data collection, NORC submitted applications within NORC and to two local IRB organizations in Kampala, Uganda (The AIDS Support Organization, TASO, and the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology, UNCST). Feedback received from NORC, TASO and UNCST were incorporated to ensure full compliance with human subject research. IRB certification was provided by TASO for EGR on Jan 3, 2017 and for SRGBV on March 28, 2017. UNCST also gave their approval for EGR on February 6, 2017 and for SRGBV on April 10, 2017.

**ENUMERATOR TRAINING FOR BASELINE DATA COLLECTION**

At baseline, NORC worked with two local data collection partners:

- Research World International (RWI) was responsible of gathering quantitative EGR-related data
- Center for Social Research (CSR) was in charge of conducting SRGBV quantitative surveys as well as FGDs for both SRGBV and EGR,

The NORC team, joined by staff from School-to-School International (STS), undertook the training for RWI enumerators on EGR and R&A data collection in February 2017 in Kampala. The training included a two-day pilot to test the instruments in two different locations – one in the Runyankore/Rukiga speaking area, and the second in a Luganda speaking area.

Training of CSR enumerators was carried out in Kampala in March 2017. This also included one day of piloting instruments; with pilots taking place in both Runyankore/Rukiga and Luganda districts.
More details regarding the selection of enumerators, training plan and the training can be found in NORC’s training plan⁵ and training report⁶.

**BASELINE DATA COLLECTION**

The fieldwork for EGR data collection was completed between February 20 and March 29, 2017. RWI gathered data from 4,876 P1 learners, 235 teachers, and 255 head teachers in 264 primary schools in 12 Ugandan districts. The EGRA and Learner Context data was gathered through the Tangerine computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) application, while the Teacher and Head Teacher surveys were conducted using the Nfield CAPI application.

Field work related to the SRGBV component of the evaluation was completed by CSR between April 3 and April 19, 2017. The survey field teams visited 80 schools in 11 districts, while the FGD teams visited 4 schools. Officials from TASO IRB observed data collection procedures on April 12-13, 2017. The quantitative data was collected from 3,846 P2, P4 and P6 learners, 942 caregivers, 225 teachers, and 78 head teachers⁷ using tablets and the Nfield CAPI application.

**CHILDREN REFERRAL PROTOCOL**

NORC developed a Child Protection Referral System⁸ to be used during the LARA P&IE data collection activities. The protocol provided information for LARA P&IE staff and consultants; data collection partners; and child protective services to take appropriate action when it is believed that a child has suffered harm recently, or is likely to suffer harm during or following participation in a SRGBV interview for the LARA P&IE. The protocol provided guidance on:

- Ethical frameworks and principles for interviews with children
- Potential risks, management strategies and responsibilities
- Guidance on child protection case reporting and referral
- Reporting and referral decision-making criteria

NORC’s protocol is showcased in USAID’s School-Related Gender-Based Violence Measurement Toolkit⁹.

**BASELINE CHILDREN REFERRAL STUDY**

---

⁵ Available at https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDQmY2Uy&rd=NTY2MjA2&ir=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=

⁶ Available at https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDQmY2Uy&rd=NTY2MjA3&ir=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=

⁷ Available at https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDQmY2Uy&rd=NTY2MjA4&ir=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=


⁹ Available at https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00XF22.pdf
NORC and subcontractor Panagora Group Inc. submitted to USAID a Child Protection Referral Outcome Report on September 2017. The report detailed child protection officer actions and inactions by referral level; factors community development officers (CDOs) claimed prevented follow up actions on referrals; CDOs' recommendations for improvements to the government child protection mechanism; District Probation and Social Welfare Officers (DPSWO)s' perceptions of their role and involvement in case referrals; and NORC’s recommendations for strengthening the broader government child protection mechanism for referral response and tracking.

The main findings included:

- Only 32 of 459 children (6.9 percent) referred to CDOs were reported to receive any follow up during the monitoring period.
- Only 9 of 28 sub-counties reported any follow up on any child protection case that the LARA P&IE team referred to them.
- Lack of funds for transportation was the most frequent reason for inaction. No CDO reported receiving funds from the District for fuel or transportation.

**BASELINE REPORT**

NORC analyzed all the quantitative and qualitative EGR and SRGBV data collected for the LARA P&IE to produce the Baseline Descriptive Data Report\textsuperscript{10}, which was approved by USAID/Uganda in February 2018. The main findings included in the report are:

For EGR:

- PI learners show low levels of competence in early literacy and reading skills.
- Learners report practicing some reading at home and caregivers are aware of the importance of education and of reading as a fundamental building block.
- There are language challenges for teachers and learners that are not fluent in the language of instruction used in the schools.
- Teachers thought highly of the LARA training, and the only negative feedback given was that the training was not long enough.

For SRGBV:

- Strong gender inequitable attitudes prevail in school and the community. For both learners and caregivers, men and boys held stronger inequitable attitudes than their female counterparts.
- Learners agreed generally that they felt safe walking to and from school, but girls expressed more concern than boys. Boys and girls overwhelmingly reported that they did not feel safe at the school latrines, with girls reporting additional concerns around sexual violence in latrines. The survey results and FGDs revealed that incidences of sexual violence are primarily against girls, and perpetrated by men teachers and boy learners.
- Even though teachers and caregivers have a low opinion of the overall effectiveness of corporal punishment as a disciplinary method, its use is widespread. Four out of five learners had been hit

\textsuperscript{10} Available at [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00TGQQ.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00TGQQ.pdf)
by a cane, stick, belt, or book in the last school year. In addition, learners are subjected to other physical violence in the form of doing chores and tasks for teachers.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL SHRP AND LARA BASELINE REPORTS

Following the endline P&IE of the School and Health Reading Program (SHRP, 2012-2016\(^{11}\)) and the baseline data collection for the LARA P&IE, the Evaluation Team Leader, Dr. Ritu Nayyar-Stone, and the Evaluation Specialist, Dr. Alicia Menendez, shared the results of these two evaluations at a workshop conducted on September 19, 2017 in Kampala. The presentation included the findings on EGR from both SHRP and LARA as well as LARA baseline findings on the status of SRGBV in the LARA P&IE sample schools. A total of 54 participants from USAID, MoES, district and local governments, IPs, education development partners and institutions, and civil society organizations (CSOs) attended this dissemination workshop.

PRESENTATION AT CIES 2018 CONFERENCE

Dr. Alicia Menendez presented key findings from the LARA P&IE baseline report on March 26, 2018 in Mexico City at the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) Annual Conference. The presentation focused on the baseline results from the SRGBV quantitative and qualitative work.

The session was very well attended and the LARA baseline presentation attracted a lot of attention from the audience. Numerous comments and questions were shared, and several colleagues working in the area requested the report, material, and protocols. The "Global Working Group to end SRGBV\(^{12}\)" also requested the presentation, and invited Dr. Menendez to participate in their meeting and join the overall initiative.

RETENTION AND ATTENDANCE DATA COLLECTION

Administrative enrollment and attendance data are generally not reliable or available in Ugandan primary schools, and therefore NORC developed a monitoring system that used tablets and the NField CAPI application to collect attendance and retention data of students and their teachers through unannounced visits in 71 schools (23 control, 24 T1, and 24 T2 schools). NORC collected R&A data in every academic term for a panel of learners that started P1 and P4 in February 2017. These panel of P1 and P4 learners were followed for four consecutive years until most of them reached P4 and P7 in 2020, covering all years of primary education. Attendance data for their teachers was also captured each school term.

After the creation of the panel of students at baseline, the first follow-up data collection wave took place in the second term of the 2017 school year. Successive visits were conducted in the following

\(^{11}\) SHRP and LARA are two USAID-funded flagship EGR programs, implemented in Uganda from 2012 to 2021. Under the Uganda SHRP P&IE activity (October 2012-September 2017), the NORC team conducted four IEs (in 2014, 2015, 2016 and a final evaluation in 2017) and two PEs to 1) assess the causal impact of SHRP on the literacy skills of learners in P1-P4; and 2) assess the impact of HIV education interventions on knowledge, attitudes and practices towards HIV and AIDS of teachers and learners in P4-P7.

\(^{12}\) The Global Working Group is comprised of more than 30 of the leading international agencies, civil society organizations and institutions promoting girls’ education and gender equality. It is co-hosted by the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) and UNESCO, with funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).
The schedule was set such that no fieldwork was undertaken in the first two weeks of the term, when attendance is still low. Similarly, there was no data collection at the end of the school terms, when students and teachers are preoccupied with end-of-term evaluations. Table 1 presents data collection dates.

Table 1. School visits schedule of R&A data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unannounced School Visit</th>
<th>School Term</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Baseline-Panel Creation</td>
<td>Year 1: Term 1 (Y1T1)</td>
<td>Feb 20-March 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wave 1</td>
<td>Year 1: Term 2 (Y1T2)</td>
<td>July 13-24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wave 2</td>
<td>Year 1: Term 3 (Y1T3)</td>
<td>Oct 5-Nov 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wave 3</td>
<td>Year 2: Term 1 (Y2T1)</td>
<td>March 13-23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wave 4</td>
<td>Year 2: Term 2 (Y2T2)</td>
<td>July 17-27, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wave 5</td>
<td>Year 2: Term 3 (Y2T3)</td>
<td>Oct 22-Nov 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wave 6</td>
<td>Year 3: Term 1 (Y3T1)</td>
<td>March 11-22, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wave 7</td>
<td>Year 3: Term 2 (Y3T2)</td>
<td>July 15-25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wave 8</td>
<td>Year 3: Term 3 (Y3T3)</td>
<td>Oct 7-31, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wave 9</td>
<td>Year 4: Term 1 (Y4T1)</td>
<td>March 11-20, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Y4T1, the R&A fieldwork was scheduled to take place between the 11th and the 20th of March 2020. Unfortunately, the fieldwork was stopped one day earlier, after the Ugandan government requested all schools to close as a safety measure against COVID-19. When enumerators left the field on March-19th, 62 out of 71 schools (87%) had been visited.

The sample included 3,502 learners who were followed up each school term for three years until term 1 of school year 2020. The learners’ attendance was checked in the grade they were enrolled at the moment of the data collection; most learners were in P1 and P4 in 2017, P2 and P5 in 2018, P3 and P6 in 2019, and P4 and P7 in 2020. The enumerators recorded the learner’s presence in the classroom, enrollment status, and reason for absence. After each round of data collection, NORC’s Nfield programmer updated the student instrument to show the learner’s grades of enrollment.

The enumerators also captured data from teachers in the 71 schools in the sample. One teacher of each of the following grades was interviewed in each round of data collection: P1 and P4 in 2017, P2 and P5 in 2018, P3 and P6 in 2019, and P4 and P7 in 2020, except for the three schools without P6 and P7 in 2019 and 2020, respectively. The enumerators recorded teacher attendance as well as reasons for not attending school (as reported by the head teachers independently).

**CLASSROOM OBSERVATION DATA COLLECTION**

In conjunction with the R&A data collection, RWI performed CROs of literacy lessons in a sub-sample of 7 control and 24 treatment schools in term 3 of 2017, 2018, and 2019. The team also captured audio recordings that were later transcribed in a subset of 8 schools from the CRO sample. P1 classrooms were visited in 2017 and 2018, while enumerators observed P3 classrooms in 2019.

When measuring classroom practices at scale, it is common to use closed-ended instruments that require relatively low inference judgments on a range of features of instruction. The NORC CRO
studies used a novel methodology that collected both process and input data by designing a tool that included both closed-ended items and open-ended narrative descriptions of classroom activity.

To gain a ‘thicker’ description in the narrative record, two trained observers each produced a description of the same lesson and the two descriptions were then read together during analysis. In addition, the closed-ended part of the tool was completed after the lesson by both fieldworkers so that their judgments were subjected to a form of inter-rater reliability at the point of data collection. When observing in the classrooms, the enumerators also used the tablets to photograph LARA materials, teacher lesson plans, and Continuous Assessment Monitoring (CAM) forms.

The mixed method approach was used to obtain a more complete understanding of what was going on in the classrooms. At the point of analysis, it was used to confirm the quantitative measures with qualitative accounts and to explain some of the quantitative results.

Prior to each CRO data collection, fieldworkers participated in extensive training in Kampala led by Education and Classroom Practices Expert Dr. Ursula Hoadley. This allowed the enumerators to gain knowledge of EGR and become familiar with writing open-ended lesson narratives. Training also included the use of videos of literacy lessons and one day of on-site data collection practice in non-sample schools.

**RETENTION AND ATTENDANCE AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION STUDIES AND PRESENTATIONS**

**2018 REPORTS**

NORC compiled and analyzed the first three waves of R&A data, and prepared the 2018 Retention and Attendance Data Report. The key findings included in the report are:

- The percentage of dropouts is 7 percent after only one year of following the student panel. Learners from treated schools tend to stay enrolled in the same school in higher rates than those from control schools.
- Average learner attendance is just over 80 percent each school day.
- Repetition rates are high.
- Sixteen percent of the classrooms visited did not have a teacher-assigned or substitute-present.

The NORC P&IE Team also produced the Classroom Observation Study Report 1 with the CRO data collected in 2017. The analysis indicated that:

- The LARA training was being incorporated by teachers in the majority of classrooms. The CRO data showed that teachers in the treatment schools mainly included the components amenable to repetition in their lessons; however, theme discussions, picture discussions and open-ended questions were absent or restricted.
- There was a striking difference between lessons in treatment and control schools. The lack of specified progression for literacy learning was evident in the very low level of content introduced in the control classrooms.
2018 PRESENTATIONS
The LARA P&IE Team presented the results of the R&A and CROs data analysis in Kampala on October 17th, 2018. Around 20 participants from MoES, USAID, IPs and CSOs attended the presentations.

Dr. Ritu Nayyar-Stone and Dr. Alicia Menendez from NORC shared the R&A results with USAID/Uganda and project stakeholders. The presentation included findings on enrollment and absenteeism for students, teachers’ absenteeism, and differences across grades, gender, and LARA treatment status.

Additionally, Dr. Ursula Hoadley gave a presentation on the findings from the CROs conducted in LARA P&IE study. She discussed observations of literacy lessons and the differences across control and treatment schools, and provided insight into if and how LARA curriculum and practices were implemented in the classroom.

2019 REPORTS
NORC compiled and analyzed the first six waves of R&A data, and prepared the 2019 Retention and Attendance Data Report. The key findings included in the report are:

• Dropout rates are high and less than 65 percent of students in the sample were still enrolled in the original school (either in the corresponding grade or in a different grade) in term 1 of 2019. Learners from treated schools (T1 and T2) tend to stay enrolled in the same school in higher rates than those from control schools.
• Average learner attendance is 82 percent each school day.
• Repetition rates are high.
• Seventeen percent of the classrooms visited did not have a teacher -assigned or substitute-present.

The NORC P&IE Team also produced the Classroom Observation Study Report 2 with the CRO data collected in 2017 and 2018. The analysis indicated that:

• There was a clear shift in the way in which the program was taken up in 2018: greater fidelity to the program structure in terms of pacing and sequencing, but fewer classes in which all learners had the LARA book than in 2017.
• As in 2017, classroom discourse patterns in 2018 tended to follow traditional patterns of highly repetitive chorused readings of syllables, words, sentences or short texts with little opportunity for learners to read individually on their own.
• Teachers tended to follow the LARA lesson plans in a very procedural way, rarely exercising any agency in contextualizing the lesson plans in their classrooms.
• Class discussion took up a minimum amount of time in the lessons.

2019 PRESENTATIONS
NORC’s Dr. Ritu Nayyar-Stone, shared the results of the analysis of the R&A and CRO data with USAID/Uganda in Kampala on June 26, 2019. The main findings were presented to a wider audience of project stakeholders (31 attendees from MoES, USAID, IPs and CSOs) in Kampala on October 1, 2019. Dr. Nayyar-Stone presented the results of the analysis of R&A data collected between July 2017 and
March 2019; and Dr. Ursula Hoadley gave a presentation on the findings from the comparison of CROs data gathered in 2017 and 2018.

**MIDLINE TOOLS DEVELOPMENT**

The LARA P&IE team updated the baseline evaluation instruments to include questions and get feedback from respondents on LARA implemented activities. The tools used for midline data collection included:

For EGR:

1. **EGRA:** was fielded in the dominant local languages (Luganda and Runyankore/Rukiga) as well as English. The local language instruments included subtasks on Orientation to Print, Letter Sound Knowledge, Segmenting, Non-word Decoding, Oral Passage Reading, Oral Recall and Listening Comprehension. The English EGRA included subtasks on Letter Sound Knowledge, Oral Passage Reading, Listening Comprehension and Receptive Vocabulary.

2. **Learner context survey:** collected basic information on the learner to complement the EGRA. It gathered basic demographic information (age, sex, and language), learner’s living arrangements, assets in the home, and home literacy environment. The survey also included questions on school attendance for both the learner and his/her teacher.

3. **Head Teacher Survey:** gathered information from head teachers regarding their instructional leadership, including their training and educational background and their support and supervision of reading instructional practices in the lower grades.

4. **Teacher Survey:** collected information on the teachers’ demographic characteristics, education, experience, and in-service training. It also asked questions about support supervision received, availability, use, and opinion of teaching materials, and absenteeism. At the end of the survey, enumerators counted the number of learners and the availability of reading books in the classrooms.

5. **Protocol for FGDs with Caregivers:** prompted caregivers to share who they think is primarily responsible for teaching their child to read, and the role of the teacher versus that of the family. It also focused on the caregivers’ confidence and challenges in helping their child learn to read; their child’s access to reading materials, and factors affecting their child’s absence from class and their reading skills.

For SRGBV:

1. **Learner instrument:** NORC and Panagora Group Inc. developed a survey instrument that adapted the measurements of SRGBV experiences depending on the respondent’s gender. The instrument included sections on (1) demographic information, (2) the learners’ perspectives on school climate, (3) the learners’ general attitudes towards gender norms, and (4) personal experiences with SRGBV. Finally, depending on incidents disclosed during the interview and some key responses from the interviewer, the learner received final instructions on how to follow up with a counselor or other support services if they wanted to speak with someone about anything they talked about during the interview. Some reported incidents required an immediate referral to services, and these incidences were flagged in the questionnaire.

2. **Teacher instrument:** gathered information on teachers’ backgrounds, perceptions of their schools’ climate, acceptance of inequitable gender norms, methods to teach learners the right behavior or to address a behavior problem, and their opinions on discipline.
3. Head teacher instrument: covered the background characteristics of the head teacher, their perceptions of school climate, attitudes toward disciplinary methods, and exposure to any SRGBV-related training.

4. Primary caregiver instrument: collected data on the child participating in the LARA program and their home environment (i.e. adverse events during childhood, household asset level). It also established the attitudes and behaviors of the caregiver related to disciplinary methods, gender, and violence.

5. School Safety Inventory: consisted of a 10-item observational checklist. It served as an objective measure of school safety in the context of SRGBV as reflected in its relevant infrastructure.

6. Protocol for FGDs with learners: used participatory methods to engage the learners as well as emotion cards and drawings to facilitate discussion. It asked learners how they feel on their journey to school, on a typical day in the classroom, and around the school, play, and latrine areas. It also asked who they can approach if they need help while in school, and if they had ever had a class discussion about children’s safety in school.

7. Protocol for FGDs with teachers: asked about their system of evaluation and reward and disciplining difficult learners. It also asked teachers what they know about school safety, child protection resources, violence and the mistreatment of learners in their school, and if there had been any discussion in school on improving learner’s safety and decreasing violence.

8. Protocol for FGDs with caregivers: asked questions concerning the use of discipline in school and existing violence and mistreatment of learners. It also asked caregivers if they have ever had a discussion with teachers or head teachers about safety and violence in school, and if they can help their learners access child protection resources. Finally, it included a few general questions on the role of caregivers in improving school safety and decreasing violence, and what other interventions/services/programs they think would help prevent violence against children at or around the school.

RENEWAL OF RESEARCH PROTOCOLS FOR MIDLINE DATA COLLECTION

NORC submitted progress reports and applications for annual renewals for the research protocols entitled “USAID/Uganda Performance and Impact Evaluation for Literacy Achievement and Retention Activity (LARA) Project” and “USAID/Uganda Performance and Impact Evaluation for Literacy Achievement and Retention Activity (LARA): School-Related Gender-Based Violence (SRGBV) Assessment” to TASO. TASO renewed the studies for a period of one year. TASO’s approval is valid until 31st December 2019 and 25th March 2020 for EGR and SRGBV data collection, respectively.

NORC also submitted a request for renewal of the SRGBV research protocol to UNCST. In May 2019, UNCST granted continuing approval valid until 10th April 2022. It was not necessary to request to UNCST a renewal for the continuation of the EGR study because the approval granted in February 2017 is valid until February 2022.

ENUMERATOR TRAINING FOR MIDLINE DATA COLLECTION

Before training the enumerators, the LARA P&E team updated training manuals and materials, and prepared introduction letters to allow the fieldwork team access to schools in the districts where data collection takes place. In June 2019, Marie-Celine Schulte, SRGBV expert, joined Dr. Ritu Nayyar-Stone and Mr. Carlos Fierros to provide training in Kampala to CSR enumerators on quantitative and qualitative SRGBV data collection.
Training for EGR data collection occurred in September 2019 in Kampala. NORC, in collaboration with STS, trained RWI enumerators to gather quantitative EGR-related data for the midline IE. Dr. Ritu Nayyar-Stone also trained Dr. Richard Wamimbi, the Local Evaluation Manager, and Mr. Emmanuel Mafabi on NORC’s protocols and best practices to conduct the FGDs with caregivers.

**MIDLINE DATA COLLECTION**

NORC gathered data for the midline Impact Evaluation (IE) in July 2019 for SRGBV and in September and October 2019 for EGR.13 NORC, in collaboration with Panagora Group Inc. and local firm CSR, collected SRGBV data in 80 primary government schools in 11 Ugandan districts through surveys (for learners, primary caregivers, teachers, and head teachers), FGDs (with female and male learners, female and male primary caregivers, and female and male teachers), and a school infrastructure checklist. The quantitative data was collected from 2,901 learners in grades 4 – 6, 613 primary caregivers, 151 teachers, and 80 head teachers using tablets and the Nfield CAPI application.

As part of the SRGBV data collection preparations, CSR conducted advance visits to the target schools to secure parental consent from sampled P4 and P6 learners. A review of enrollment numbers (small class sizes), parental consent for P4 and P6 learners, and the fact that some sampled schools did not have a P6 class, revealed that several sampled schools did not have enough P4 and P6 respondents to reach the target sample of 10 P4 boys, 10 P4 girls, 10 P6 boys, and 10 P6 girls. In response, NORC requested that the local data collection firm first survey all the P4 and P6 learners for whom we had parental consent and then survey as many P5 learners as needed to reach the target of 40 learners per school. The teams revisited the 20 T1 and 20 T2 schools with the lowest total P4 plus P6 enrollment and obtained parental consent for P5 learners to participate in the survey.

NORC’s local data collection RWI, conducted EGRA and collected data from 4,936 learners, 230 teachers, and 250 head teachers in 264 primary schools in 12 Ugandan districts. The EGRA and Learner Context data was gathered through the Tangerine CAPI application, while the Teacher and Head Teacher surveys were conducted using the Nfield CAPI application. In addition, Dr. Richard Wamimbi and Mr. Emmanuel Mafabi, conducted 6 FGDs with 55 caregivers on EGR issues in October 2019. The FGDs were conducted in 3 schools in the Luganda region (Bukomansimbi district), and 3 schools in the Runyankore/Rukiga region (Rukungiri district).

**MIDLINE CHILDREN REFERRAL STUDY**

In November 2019, NORC submitted to USAID the Midline Child Protection Referral Outcomes Report and the de-identified dataset of all the child referrals made to the districts during the SRGBV data collection. The report documented the outcomes of the SRGBV referral cases made to the district and tracked over a 7-week period from July 20 to September 6, 2019.

---

13 Detailed information on the targets and number of observations collected through each instrument is available at [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkvNjktZ2cxMjM2NDIwY2Uy&rID=NTcwNjE3&inr=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&dc=VHRk&rtrc=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkvNjktZ2cxMjM2NDIwY2Uy&rID=NTcwNjE3&inr=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&dc=VHRk&rtrc=VHJlZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=)
A total of 515 referrals were made out of 2,904 learners surveyed, that is, 18 percent of learners received a referral. Follow-up calls made to CDOs and DPSWOs inquired what actions had been taken in response to the child protection referral packets provided by the LARA P&IE data collection team.

Thirty-one sub-counties of the school districts of P&IE SRGBV midline received referrals that ranged from 3 to 41 in number. The breakup of referrals was as follows:

- 25 Level 1 referrals; recent abuse (in past month) that requires immediate action
- 189 Level 2 referrals; recent abuse (in past month) that may require action
- 171 Level 3 referrals; not recent abuse (in past year) that may require action
- 47 Level 4 referrals; not recent abuse (before past year) that may require action; and
- 83 Level 5 referrals; voluntary notification of wanting to see a counselor.

Only 28 out of 515 children (5.4 percent) referred to CDOs were reported to receive any follow-up during the monitoring period. This represents only 6 out of 31 sub-counties that reported any follow-up on any child protection case that the LARA P&IE team referred to them. CDOs cited different reasons for why officials were not able to follow up on referrals. The most frequently cited reason was lack of resources for transportation.

PRESENTATION OF MIDLINE PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In February 2020, NORC did a remote presentation on the preliminary results of the Midterm IE to USAID/Uganda and RTI. The review of the main quantitative and qualitative findings from our analysis highlighted:

- Very modest effect of SRGBV activities;
- Evidence of implementation of SRGBV activities in T2 schools, but very far from universal;
- Positive effects on EGR; and evidence of implementation of EGR activities, but limited support supervision reported by teachers.

FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

NORC’s final Performance Evaluation (PE) included mixed methods. NORC and subcontractor Panagora Group Inc. used the qualitative and quantitative data collected for the IE, and collected additional qualitative data to answer two evaluation questions developed through a consultative process with USAID, MoES, and LARA for the evaluation design:

1. Is LARA on track to achieve results by the end of the project?
   a. What are the key outcomes of the project?
   b. Were activities carried out as planned?
   c. Are activities sufficient and relevant to achieving R1 and R2?
2. What factors accelerated or inhibited the achievement of LARA results?

NORC and Panagora Group Inc. conducted an extensive review of LARA documentation and preliminary findings of the midline IE data to prepare guides for the PE Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with representatives of USAID/Uganda, MoES LARA counterparts, RTI, and RTI sub-grantees, as well as
District Education Officers (DEOs), head teachers, and teachers. The PE data collection tools included interview guides for stakeholders based:

1. At the National Level: the guides asked USAID and LARA staff questions on their priority of information needs and project implementation, while asking MoES and Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development officials about their perspectives on LARA implementation and perceived impacts.
2. At the School Level: the guides asked teachers and head teachers about their role in the implementation of LARA and their perceptions on the impacts of both EGR and SRGBV activities.
3. At the Community Level: the guides asked district officials (DEOs, inspectors, tutors, DPSWOs, and child and family protection officers) as well as LARA subcontractors and sub-grantees questions about their relationship with LARA as well as their perceptions of the program’s impacts and overall management.

Melanie Sanders-Smith, the PE Team Leader/Evaluation and Education Specialist, and Marie-Celine Schulte arrived in Uganda on February 29, 2020 to conduct the KIIIs along with local team member Elizabeth Nyivuru. The KIIIs successfully started in Kampala on March 2, 2020.

On the week of March 9, the PE team traveled to conduct interviews with local stakeholders – schools, district officials and community-based organizations outside Kampala. While on the field, news reported that international travel was being restricted because of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Thus, the two international consultants had to curtail the trip and return to their home countries (Ms. Schulte and Ms. Sanders-Smith left Uganda on March-12th and March-13th, respectively).

The PE team was originally scheduled to conduct complementary KIIIs back in Kampala during the third week of March. Ms. Nyivuru helped to shift these in-person meetings to video conferences, and two video conference interviews were successfully conducted.

Despite the limitations, the team was able to complete 48 interviews. The list of interviewees as well as the data collection instruments and more information on the research design is included in the Final Performance Evaluation Data Collection Report.

The results of the PE provide insights into systemic and structural factors throughout the education and social welfare sectors in Uganda that affected LARA implementation and results. The findings and conclusions of the PE were incorporated into the Midterm IE and Final PE Report.

**MIDTERM IMPACT EVALUATION AND FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT**

NORC submitted the Midterm IE and Final PE Report to USAID/Uganda in June 2020. After addressing the feedback received, NORC delivered the final version of the body and executive summary of the report.

---

14 Available at [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/DetailPresto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rlD=NTgwMzAx&inr=VHj1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHj1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/DetailPresto.aspx?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rlD=NTgwMzAx&inr=VHj1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHj1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=)
In addition, NORC summarized this comprehensive report in a Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (FCR) Matrix, which was submitted to USAID on October 15, 2020. USAID Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) Jill Jupiter-Junes approved the full report on October 27, 2020. The main conclusions included in the report are:

**IMPLEMENTATION OF EGR ACTIVITIES**

- Most activities were implemented as planned.
- In many cases, reading books are not in the hands of the students. Learners share books in the school and have no reading material to take home.
- Reading materials in English and reading cards are insufficient, and the lending system does not work well.
- The strengths of the LARA program are evident when comparing instructional reading practices between treatment and control schools. Lessons tend to focus on the letter, syllable, word, sentence and extended text levels, although around half of the observed teachers completed 50 percent or less of the lesson plan for the day. The more challenging aspects of the program were left out. There is also excessive repetition, limited learner talk, and low engagement with meaning of text.
- There are no regular assessments of learners’ reading proficiency. CAM forms are not being used, teachers are not creating alternatives to these forms, and even oral feedback to learners seems insufficient.
- There is insufficient teacher support supervision, although LARA trained CCTs and DEOs, among others, to coach teachers. CCTs and DEOs indicated that they do not conduct support supervision due to lack of time and resources.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF SRGBV ACTIVITIES**

- Social Behavior Change Communication (SBCC) campaigns, and teacher training to cover Journeys and Uganda Kids Unite (UKU) activities are considered insufficient for institutionalization and long term sustainability.
- Teachers and head teachers in T2 schools show higher familiarity with Journeys materials and experience with UKU groups.
- However, evidence of implementation of Journeys activities in T2 schools is far from universal. For example:
  - only 25 percent of learners participated in any activity related to violence prevention, and
  - only 52 percent of learners had seen any Journeys materials.
- Journeys focuses primarily on socio and emotional learning with SRGBV interspersed throughout.
- Having Journeys only in English led to some inconsistencies in comprehension and implementation fidelity of the content.

15 The LARA Midterm IE and Final PE Report is available at https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDNmY2Uy&rID=NTgwMzA3&inr=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&dc=YWRk&rrtc=VHJ1ZQ%3d%3d&bckToL=
• District Inspectors can only reach about half of the schools in one term.

**IMPACTS OF R2 ACTIVITIES ON SRGBV OUTCOMES**

• Persisting prevalence of school violence, and only modest effect of R2 activities on some intermediate outcomes.
• No differences on gender attitudes, school climate, or prevalence and reporting of violence, except for:
  o Teachers in T2 schools report less use of insults, refusal to speak, or locking up learners as a form of discipline.
  o Learners report suffering fewer types of physical violence and a lower prevalence of caning in T2 schools.
  o The percentage of learners reporting they have an adult they can trust to report violence to is higher in T2 schools.
• There is a misunderstanding about the concept of corporal punishment, suggesting that teachers do not consider caning as corporal punishment.
• Girls and boys feel insecure in the latrines area and around the perimeters of school compounds that are unfenced. Girls feel particularly unsafe on the way to and from schools.

**IMPACTS OF LARA ON R&A:**

• There is slightly more retention in T2 schools but only in Runyankore-Rukiga speaking areas.
• There is no effect on absenteeism, which is high for learners and teachers and has not changed since baseline.

**IMPACTS OF LARA ON READING PERFORMANCE:**

• EGR activities had positive effects on P3 learners. They are similar in Luganda and Runyankore-Rukiga speaking areas.
• Effects are stronger in local languages but very modest in English (positive effects on letter sounds, but none or minimal effects on oral reading fluency (ORF)).
• There are no differences between T1 and T2 schools, indicating that R2 activities brought no additional benefit to learners’ reading ability beyond the EGR intervention.
• Reading performance is still low: over a quarter of P3 learners cannot read a single word from a short grade-2-level paragraph.

**YEAR 5 WORK PLAN DISCUSSIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOLS CLOSURE DUE TO COVID-19**

Data collection for the endline IE was scheduled for July (SRGVB) and October (EGR) of 2020. However, MoES announced on March 18 that all schools were closing as a preventative measure against COVID-19. Therefore, NORC submitted a draft COVID-19 Contingency Plan for the P&IE for LARA in March 2020, and a revised version on April 2020.

Between April 2020 and February 2021, NORC staff attended multiple videoconferences with USAID representatives to discuss options for a work plan to continue with the final IE in Year 5. The video calls with USAID/Uganda included the following topics:
• Discussion of the contingency plan for the LARA P&IE;
• How the COVID-19 pandemic was affecting LARA – staff from RTI also participated in this meeting;
• Scenarios for additional data collection and research;
• Ideas for further research and analysis of the data gathered before the COVID-19 school closure; and
• USAID’s key research priorities that would provide important input and findings for the implementation of the Integrated Child and Youth Development (ICYD) activity, which is the follow-up of LARA.

The final version of the P&IE’s Year 5 work plan was submitted and approved in February 2021. It reflects the result of the discussions between NORC and USAID/Uganda.

MEET AND GREET MEETING WITH THE ICYD TEAM

In October 2020, NORC met with representatives of USAID and the Education Development Center (EDC), who are currently implementing the ICYD activity. USAID introduced NORC to ICYD as their 3rd party Evaluation Partner for SHRP and LARA. During this meeting, NORC presented the evaluation design for both projects.

MIDTERM LEARNING WORKSHOPS

NORC presented the P&IE FCRs in February 2021 to around 20 representatives of USAID/Uganda, LARA, and ICYD, among others. The presentation summarized the research and evaluation work conducted under the P&IE and presented empirical evidence based on data collected between 2017 and 2019.

Then, NORC held a separate FCR Questions and Answers (Q&A) discussion session in March 2021. A recording of the presentation was shared before the Q&A session so that all 20 attendees were familiar with the outcomes of the P&IE.

POLICY BRIEFS

NORC prepared four policy briefs that summarized in a simple and visually-appealing way the P&IE’s findings and recommendations on specific topics. NORC presented the briefs in two workshops in April 2021 to almost 20 staff members of USAID/Uganda and ICYD and other participants. The ICYD team responded positively and was very engaged during the discussions. The briefs, which are expected to reach various types of local stakeholders, cover the following topics:

• Why Lule still can’t read at the end of P3?16

• The High Absenteeism of Teachers and Learners in Uganda\textsuperscript{17}
• Teachers' implementation of LARA in classrooms\textsuperscript{18}
• Ending Teacher-to-Learner Violence as an Entry-point to Addressing School-related Gender-based Violence\textsuperscript{19}

**LEARNING QUESTIONS**

In April 2021, NORC submitted to USAID/Uganda a brief titled “Early Grade Reading and School-Related Gender-Based Violence Outcomes in Uganda: Key Learning Questions.” This document built on NORC’s findings and lessons learned from the USAID-funded evaluations of SHRP and LARA to inform future programming related to EGR, school completion, and reduction of SRGBV, especially in Uganda.


