



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

USAID KENYA TUSOME EARLY GRADE READING ACTIVITY

Quarterly Progress Report

January–March 2019

April 30, 2019; revised August 31 and November 6, 2019

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

USAID KENYA TUSOME EARLY GRADE READING ACTIVITY

FY 2019 QUARTER 2 PROGRESS REPORT

January 1 – March 31, 2019

Award No.: AID-615-C-14-00007

Revised and resubmitted August 31, 2019

Final version submitted November 6, 2019

Prepared for

[REDACTED] Contracting Officer (CO)
[REDACTED] Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)
United States Agency for International Development/Kenya
C/O American Embassy
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
P.O. Box 629, Village Market 00621
Nairobi, Kenya

Prepared by [REDACTED]

RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Road
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
USA

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed by the authors at RTI do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| List of Tables | v |
| Abbreviations | vi |
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Qualitative impact | 2 |
| 1.3 Quantitative impact | 3 |
| 1.4 Opportunities and constraints | 3 |
| 1.4.1 Opportunities | 3 |
| 1.4.2 Constraints | 4 |
| 1.5 Quarter 3 work plan, FY 2019 | 4 |
| 2. Key Achievements (Qualitative Impact) | 4 |
| 2.1 Increased availability and use of appropriate textbooks and supplementary materials that support reading | 5 |
| 2.1.1 Adaptation of CBC-compliant Tusome teaching and learning materials for SNE | 5 |
| 2.1.2 Adaptation of illustrations for CBC-compliant SNE materials | 7 |
| 2.1.3 Finalization of leveled readers | 7 |
| 2.1.4 Procurement of leveled readers from KPA | 7 |
| 2.2 Improved methods of delivering reading instruction | 9 |
| 2.2.1 School-based teacher professional development | 9 |
| 2.2.2 Tusome SNE interventions | 11 |
| 2.2.3 Tusome's Primary Teacher Training College interventions | 11 |
| 2.2.4 Tusome Youth Fund interventions | 12 |
| 2.3 Supervision support and classroom observations | 15 |
| 2.3.1 ICT for education | 15 |
| 2.3.2 Teachers' instructional support and coaching system | 16 |
| 2.3.3 Tusome staff support for CSOs and ICs | 16 |
| 2.3.4 Sustainability engagement with MoE and TSC officials at county and sub-county levels | 17 |
| 2.4 Increased capacity of GoK to design, implement, and assess programs to increase reading skills | 17 |
| 2.4.1 Development of joint work plans by county education officials | 17 |
| 2.4.2 Orientation of newly appointed MoE and SAGA personnel to Tusome | 18 |
| 2.4.3 Tusome collaboration with development actors to leverage reading | 18 |
| 2.5 Improved policy environment that promotes reading skills | 19 |
| 2.5.1 Policy guideline on copyright of Tusome materials and revision of book policy | 19 |
| 2.5.2 Policy on reviewing reading benchmarks for Kiswahili and English, grades 1 and 2; and setting grade 3 benchmarks | 19 |
| 2.6 Lessons learned | 21 |
| 3. Activity Progress (Quantitative Impact) | 22 |
| 3.1 County sustainability meetings | 22 |
| 3.2 Sub-county meetings | 23 |
| 3.3 Tusome technical staff support to CSOs | 23 |
| 3.4 Tusome staff support to ICs | 25 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 3.5 | Youth Fund grantees: Monitoring visits and support..... | 26 |
| 4. | Opportunities and Constraints..... | 26 |
| 4.1 | Opportunities..... | 26 |
| 4.2 | Constraints..... | 27 |
| 5. | Performance Monitoring..... | 27 |
| 6. | Progress on Gender and Inclusion Strategy..... | 29 |
| 7. | Progress on Links to Other USAID Programs..... | 29 |
| 8. | Progress on Links with Government of Kenya Agencies..... | 30 |
| 9. | Progress on USAID Forward..... | 31 |
| 10. | Sustainability and Exit Strategy..... | 32 |
| 11. | Subsequent Quarter's Work Plan..... | 32 |
| 11.1 | Cash flow and budget details..... | 33 |
| 11.2 | New subaward details..... | 37 |
| 12. | Activity Administration: Personnel..... | 38 |

Annexes

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Annex A. | Success Stories..... | 39 |
| Annex B. | Summary of Key Achievements by Youth Fund Grantees (January–March 2019)..... | 41 |
| Annex C. | Summary of County and Sub-County Meetings, FY 2019..... | 44 |
| Annex D. | Classroom Observation Data (Dashboard) for January and March 2019..... | 55 |
| Annex E. | Performance Data Tables – Tusome-Wide Indicators..... | 61 |
| | Performance Data Table 1a – Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with US Government (USG) support (regular)..... | 61 |
| | Performance Data Table 1b – Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with US Government (USG) support (SNE)..... | 64 |
| | Performance Data Table 2a – Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili (regular)..... | 67 |
| | Performance Data Table 2b – Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili (SNE)..... | 70 |
| | Performance Data Table 3 – Number of schools using information and communication technology (ICT) due to USG support..... | 73 |
| | Performance Data Table 4a – Number of teachers / teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (grade 1, 2, and 3 regular teacher training)..... | 76 |
| | Performance Data Table 4b – Number of teachers / teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (grade 1 and 2 SNE teacher training)..... | 79 |
| | Performance Data Table 5 – Percent of Curriculum Support Officers (CSOs) supported by USG programs who meet the standard of 15 classroom observation visits per month..... | 82 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Performance Data Table 6a – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Curriculum Support Officers' and head teachers' trainings) | 85 |
| Performance Data Table 6b – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (CSOs' and Instructional Coaches' [ICs'] trainings)..... | 88 |
| Performance Data Table 6c – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (MoE / SAGA officials in CSOs' and ICs' trainings) | 91 |
| Performance Data Table 6d – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Quality Assurance and Standards Officers' [QASOs'] training) | 94 |
| Performance Data Table 6e – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Teachers' Service Commission Sub-County Director [TSC-SCD] training) | 97 |
| Performance Data Table 6f – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Sub-County Directors of Education [SCDE] training)..... | 100 |
| Performance Data Table 7 – Number of target institutions that have improved capacity as a result of USG assistance | 103 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 1. | Summary of Quarter 3 work plan, April–June 2019 | 4 |
| Table 2. | Proposed allocation of book titles..... | 8 |
| Table 3. | Adopted benchmarks..... | 20 |
| Table 4. | Percentages of pupils expected to reach the proposed benchmarks by 2022..... | 21 |
| Table 5. | Summary of Tusome staff support to CSOs, January–March 2019 | 24 |
| Table 6. | Summary of Tusome staff support to ICs..... | 25 |
| Table 7. | Cash flow report and financial projections (in US dollars)..... | 33 |
| Table 8. | Budget details (in US dollars)..... | 34 |
| Table 9. | Tusome hires/promotions from January 1 to March 31, 2019 | 38 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|----------|--|
| APBET | Alternative Provision of Basic Education and Training |
| ASAL | Arid and Semi-Arid Lands |
| CBC | competency-based curriculum |
| CDCS | Country Development Cooperation Strategy |
| CDE | County Director of Education |
| CEMASTEA | Centre for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education in Africa |
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer |
| clpm | correct letters per minute |
| CO | Contracting Officer |
| COR | Contracting Officer's Representative |
| CSO | Curriculum Support Officer |
| cwpm | correct words per minute |
| DAYO | Dream Achievers Youth Organization |
| DQAS | Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards |
| FAF | Foreign Assistance Framework |
| FY | fiscal year |
| GoK | Government of Kenya |
| GPS | global positioning system |
| HI | hearing impaired |
| IC | Instructional Coach |
| ICT | information and communication technology |
| IR | Intermediate Result |
| KEMI | Kenya Education Management Institute |
| KIB | Kenya Institute for the Blind |
| KICD | Kenya Institute for Curriculum Development |
| KISE | Kenya Institute of Special Education |
| KNEC | Kenya National Examinations Council |
| KPA | Kenya Publishers Association |
| KSB | Kenya Society for the Blind |
| KSDC | Kenya Society for Deaf Children |
| LN | local national |
| LOE | level of effort |
| M&E | monitoring and evaluation |
| MoE | Ministry of Education |
| NACONEK | National Council for Nomadic Education in Kenya |
| NASMLA | National System for Monitoring Learner Achievement |
| PREG | Partnership for Resilience and Economic Growth |
| PRIEDE | Kenya Primary Education Development project |
| PRIMR | Primary Math and Reading |
| PTTC | Primary Teacher Training College |

| | |
|---------|--|
| Q | quarter |
| QASO | Quality Assurance and Standards Officer |
| RDE | Regional Director of Education |
| RTI | RTI International (registered trademark and trade name of Research Triangle Institute) |
| SAGA | Semi-Autonomous Government Agency |
| SCDE | Sub-County Director of Education |
| SNE | special-needs education |
| TLM | teaching and learning materials |
| TP | Teaching Practice [tool] |
| TPD | teacher professional development |
| TSC | Teachers' Service Commission |
| TSC-CD | TSC County Director |
| TSC-SCD | TSC Sub-County Director |
| TTC | teacher training college |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| USG | United States Government |
| VAT | value-added tax |
| VI | visually impaired |
| VSO | Volunteer Service Overseas |
| WERK | Women Educational Researchers of Kenya |
| YIKE | Youth Initiatives Kenya |

I. Executive Summary

I.1 Background

The Tusome Early Grade Reading Activity is a Kenyan Ministry of Education (MoE) program. The Activity is a collaboration between the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the MoE to improve access to high-quality education in Kenya. The Activity seeks to improve the reading outcomes of children in grades 1, 2, and 3 in all Kenyan public primary schools and 1,500 Alternative Provision of Basic Education and Training (APBET) institutions; and to increase the capacity of the Government of Kenya (GoK) to deliver and administer early grade reading programs. Tusome boasts a proven model of improving results in early grade literacy based on a key set of elements: improved teacher capacity for effective curriculum delivery, improved teacher support through effective supervision and integration of information and communication technology (ICT), provision of appropriate learning materials, and an effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. Through these elements, Tusome has contributed to improved reading outcomes in 24,038 Kenyan primary schools (22,538 public and 1,500 APBET). The midline external evaluation of Tusome, for instance, established that the percentage of emergent and fluent readers increased at large and statistically significant rates between the Tusome baseline (July 2015) and midline (October 2016), for both English and Kiswahili.¹ A follow-up external endline evaluation planned for October 2019 should indicate whether the program was able to sustain or increase these gains.

In the second quarter (Q2) of fiscal year (FY) 2019 (i.e., January 1–March 31, 2019), the program's focus was to maintain momentum in establishing systems and structures for the sustainability of Tusome gains. The activities in line with this objective included county-led joint work planning; work with the MoE and Teachers' Service Commission (TSC) officers to support Curriculum Support Officers (CSOs) and Instructional Coaches (ICs) in classrooms during lesson observations; coaching and mentorship of teachers by CSOs and ICs; and adaptation of competency-based curriculum (CBC)-compliant Tusome teaching and learning materials (TLMs). All these activities were achieved in collaboration with the TSC, the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD), and Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs) in the MoE, among other literacy actors.

Alongside the school-level interventions are those aimed at increasing the capacity of the GoK to design, implement, and assess early grade literacy programs; and others intended to create a favorable policy environment for promoting reading skills. The Activity accomplishes both through on-the-job mentorship of GoK personnel, such as during classroom observations and development of county-owned joint work plans. Tusome's efforts have also been strengthened by its partnership with youth organizations, which work directly with parents and school systems to expand Tusome's reach through activities such as creation of literacy-promoting murals; reading exhibitions; parent/caregiver sensitization forums; and formation of reading clubs, thereby contributing to the overall goal of improved literacy outcomes. As of January 2019, 13 of the 23 Youth Fund grantees had been able to complete their activities. The remaining 10 had grant activities under way during the quarter: Bungoma Youth Bunge Forum, Dream Achievers Youth Organization (DAYO), Garissa County Youth Bunge Network, Kisii County Youth Development Forum, Lamu Youth Alliance and Lamu Community Educational Trust Fund, Mandera County Youth Bunge Forum, Migori County

¹ Freudenberger, E., & Davis, J. (2017). *Tusome external evaluation—Midline report*. Prepared for the Ministry of Education of Kenya, USAID/Kenya, and the UK Department for International Development under Contract No. AID-615-TO-16-00012. Washington, DC: Management Sciences International, a Tetra Tech company. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00MS6j.pdf

Youth (Development) Forum, Murang'a County Youth Network, West Pokot County Youth Network, and Youth Initiatives Kenya (YIKE).

This report describes the key achievements (both qualitative and quantitative); constraints and opportunities; performance monitoring activities; progress on the gender and inclusion strategy; progress on links to other USAID programs; progress on links with GoK agencies; progress on USAID Forward; sustainability and exit strategy; the work plan for Q3, FY 2019; financial information; and Activity administration.

1.2 Qualitative impact

As noted earlier, in the quarter under review, the Activity continued its efforts to build systems and structures to sustain Tusome's gains. Among the activities implemented were county-led joint work planning sessions; coaching and mentorship of teachers by CSOs and ICs; Primary Teacher Training College (PTTC) interventions; adaptation of CBC-aligned TLMs; and capacity-building for national, county, and sub-county MoE, TSC, and SAGA officers on early grade literacy.

Among the officers targeted by the capacity-building initiatives—such as county-level individualized or corporate engagements—were Regional Directors of Education (RDEs); County Directors of Education (CDEs); TSC County Directors (TSC-CDs); Sub-County Directors of Education (SCDEs); TSC Sub-County Directors (TSC-SCDs); Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs); CSOs and ICs; and head teachers and teachers, from both mainstream and special-needs education (SNE) schools. Over time, these types of engagements have led to a tremendous increase in the uptake of Tusome, as evidenced by the systematic adoption of Tusome elements, including the 1:1 ratio of books to pupils, schoolwide use of Tusome's instructional approach (i.e., in upper grades in addition to lower primary), instructional support supervision, and teacher trainings.

Some schools have adopted school-based training to ensure that all their teachers are trained on the Tusome methodology, to ensure continuity in the teaching of Tusome, and to improve performance in languages (English and Kiswahili). A case in point is Bishop Lawi Imathiu Primary School, Nanyuki County, where this strategy has been a success. When visited and asked for comments, the head teacher said about this initiative:

"We have been doing all these just by our initiative. We did not know that others would find it useful and come to learn from us." (Head Teacher, Bishop Lawi Imathiu Primary School, Nanyuki County)

Tusome also has gained traction across all the counties as schools have witnessed Tusome's effects in the upper grades, when learners transition into these classes. The Tusome model (direct instruction) is seemingly gaining currency in several schools. In Isiolo County for instance, a head teacher reported:

"I used the method, direct instructional model, to teach class B Kiswahili last year and the mean score improved from 48 to 57%." (Head Teacher, St. Teresa Primary School, Marsabit Central Zone, Marsabit County)

Teachers are also reporting use of Tusome strategies in teaching other subjects. One teacher commented:

"I use the 'before reading skill' or 'picture walk' or 'discuss the picture' to teach map work in Social Studies. I guide pupils to identify what they can see in the map and therefore pupils are able to interpret the map, identify the physical features. As a result of using Tusome skills to teach map work, performance has improved." (Teacher, Al Hidya Primary School, Marsabit County)

This was a common feature in most of the observed Tusome schools. As one of the head teachers noted, Tusome has built such a strong foundation in the younger learners that teachers in the upper classes look forward to having these learners as they move to upper primary. The head teacher commented:

"We have a very firm foundation thanks to Tusome. The upper classes teachers look forward to taking up lessons in classes transitioning from Tusome to the upper grades." (Head Teacher, ██████████ Chari Zone, Isiolo County)

The regional teams also held meetings at the sub-county level to follow up on the implementation of the joint work plans, among other things. This follow-up was necessary in order to cascade the momentum from the county level to the sub-counties. As noted by the SCDE for Garbatula Sub-County, Isiolo County:

"Consultative meetings are important for the updating of teachers' knowledge on curriculum delivery." (SCDE, Garbatula Sub-county, Isiolo County)

In addition to the Tusome-led interventions, others were made possible through the partnerships with Youth Fund grantees. Youth Fund activities have been critical in driving parental engagement activities, hence promoting a conducive environment for children to acquire reading skills. Youth groups were involved this quarter with parent/caregiver sensitization forums, reading exhibitions, reading clubs, provision of reading materials, and safe storage containers or cabinets for the materials.

1.3 Quantitative impact

Quantitative data this quarter came primarily from county-led joint work planning meetings, as well as from teacher coaching and mentorship through Tusome technical staff, CSOs, and ICs. County-led joint work plans are seen as the tools through which the counties can rally stakeholders to work together toward the sustainability of Tusome's interventions. Consequently, in the quarter in review, Tusome technical teams continued to use these meetings to sensitize and build the capacity of these officers to embrace the culture of joint work planning. These efforts bore fruit, as county after county agreed to work on and launch a joint work plan. From the beginning of Q2 FY 2019, 30 county-led joint work plans were developed across the country, with 21 of these being officially (publicly) launched by the regional and county TSC and MoE leaders as a show of commitment to implementation.

1.4 Opportunities and constraints

In the period under review, the Activity encountered a mixture of opportunities and challenges. These are discussed below.

1.4.1 Opportunities

The opportunities realized during the quarter stemmed from activities such as the county-led joint work planning meetings that the technical teams supported. The regional teams capitalized on the cooperation and the bridges built by the joint work plans and stepped up engagement with county officials on the Tusome transition and sustainability.

Adaptation of Tusome teaching and learning materials was another activity that helped strengthen Tusome's collaboration efforts. The planning and the execution of the workshop benefited from the support of KICD and the MoE's Directorate of SNE. For instance, during the workshop, KICD offered three of its own graphic designers to work on the material alongside Tusome designers,

providing opportunity for the two teams to learn from each other. Tusome will continue building on this collaboration while developing teaching and learning materials for both SNE and regular learners.

1.4.2 Constraints

While the Activity was successful overall this quarter, the advances were undermined somewhat by challenges that continued to slow down the achievements. Among the challenges were turnover of CDEs, which slowed county-led joint work planning; high teacher attrition, especially in APBET institutions, which affected performance and continuity in the implementing schools; CSOs' retirement and/or transfers, which left many teachers unsupported; uncertainties around the interventions in APBET institutions coming to an end in April 2019; and book shortages in grade 1.

These and other opportunities and challenges are discussed further in section 4.

1.5 Quarter 3 work plan, FY 2019

Table 1 is a list of activities that have been scheduled for Quarter 3, FY 2019.

Table 1. Summary of Quarter 3 work plan, April–June 2019

| Activities | Description |
|--|---|
| Monitoring of implementation of joint county work plans | Tusome technical staff have been holding meetings at the sub-county and county levels to ensure that Tusome's activities are mainstreamed and aligned with the MoE's and TSC's work plans, to sustain the gains so far. The next phase of this activity will involve the technical staff monitoring the implementation of these joint work plans. |
| Tusome staff, TSC, and MoE support CSOs and ICs in classroom lesson observations | This effort will entail having Tusome staff, TSC staff, or MoE officers visit schools to support the CSOs or ICs via lesson observations. |
| Coaching and mentorship of teachers by CSOs and ICs | CSOs and ICs will visit schools for classroom instructional support. |
| CSOs and ICs hold zonal/cluster termly reflection meetings | The CSOs and ICs will have such meetings with grade 1, 2, and 3 teachers and head teachers from their respective public school zones or APBET clusters to reflect upon and discuss the progress of Tusome implementation. |
| Monitoring of Youth Fund grantees | This effort will entail supervising Youth Fund grantees to ensure they deliver the agreed-upon milestones and meet their imperatives for cost, time, scope, and quality. |
| Finalize CBC-compliant SNE materials approved by KICD | The draft CBC-aligned SNE materials were under review at the end of March 2019. They are expected to be finalized and ready for KICD approval in Q3. |
| Print final approved leveled readers | The leveled readers for Tusome were at the editing stage in March 2019. They are expected to be ready for printing and later distribution to schools in Q3. |
| Procurement of leveled readers from Kenya Publishers Association (KPA) | Apart from the Tusome-developed readers, the Activity will also procure additional leveled readers from the KPA. Specific lists of readers from each publisher were generated in February, with procurement expected to ensue in Q3. |

2. Key Achievements (Qualitative Impact)

As indicated earlier, Tusome recognizes that achieving its goal of improved reading outcomes calls for greater teacher capacity to deliver the curriculum effectively; provision of appropriate learning materials; improved teacher support supervision and coaching, as well as integration of ICT; and an effective M&E system. All of these elements have contributed to Tusome's continued success, and

during January–March, the Tusome team conducted a number of related activities: adaptation of CBC-aligned Tusome teaching and learning materials for SNE; finalization of leveled readers; and instructional support and coaching for teachers.

Alongside these activities were others aimed at building the institutional capacity of the MoE and TSC to sustainably implement a national reading program. Toward this end, the Activity continued engaging with counties and sub-counties, as well as PTTCs and Youth Fund grantees. The activities were conducted in collaboration with the MoE, KICD, Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE), Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI), TSC, and key civil society organizations such as Women Educational Researchers of Kenya (WERK) and the Tusome Youth Fund grantees.

The achievements of each activity are discussed in detail below, and **Annex A** contains selected success stories.

2.1 Increased availability and use of appropriate textbooks and supplementary materials that support reading

The availability and use of appropriate and well-designed teaching and learning materials is a key element for any successful literacy intervention. Based on this premise, Tusome continued to provide appropriate learning materials targeted at grade 1, 2, and 3 learners in all public primary schools (both regular and SNE) and 1,500 APBET institutions. Between its inception in 2014 and the end of this quarter (March 31, 2019), Tusome had distributed 25,310,531 teaching and learning materials. The achievements within this objective during Q2 specifically are explained below.

2.1.1 Adaptation of CBC-compliant Tusome teaching and learning materials for SNE

During the quarter, the Tusome team began the process of adapting Tusome TLMs for grades 1, 2, and 3 for special needs education. The adaptations will cover TLMs for visually impaired (VI) and hearing impaired (HI) learners and teachers. First, on February 8, a team of participating SNE experts held a briefing meeting in Tusome's Nairobi office. During the briefing, the team reviewed the plan and instruments for a survey to determine the challenges experienced with the current SNE materials and the needs of learners and teachers.

The survey data collection took place February 11–15, 2019, targeting 21 SNE centers (14 HI and 7 VI) across the country. Team members participating in the survey were drawn from the MoE, TSC, KISE, Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC), Kenya Society for Deaf Children (KSDC), Kenya Society for the Blind (KSB), Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO), and Kenya Institute for the Blind (KIB). Four members of the Tusome materials development team and two Tusome technical staff who are SNE specialists accompanied this survey team, to assist with logistics and to support any queries regarding the Tusome methodology or the Tusome CBC materials. The survey results informed the review and the adaptation process for grades 1 and 2 HI and VI materials.

The first of two adaptation workshops took place at KICD from February 18 to March 2, 2019. Participants were, once again, drawn from KICD, MoE (Directorate of SNE), KISE, KSDC, KSB, KIB, VSO, TSC, and Tusome. The workshop began with opening remarks from the following key guests: Director of SNE; Chief of Party, Tusome; Head of Research Department, KICD; and Senior Curriculum Development Officer, KICD. The key coordinators were the Tusome Senior Education Program Coordinator, SNE; and the Tusome Senior Production Manager.

The first three days were targeted at ensuring that all the participants understood the Tusome methodology, the structure of the existing Tusome books, and the structure of the approved CBC-aligned books for Tusome. The three activities were led by the members of the materials development team: Tusome Materials Development Specialist, Tusome Regional Education Program

Officer – Nakuru Region, Tusome Education Program Specialist – Isiolo Region, Tusome Education Program Assistant – Nanyuki Region, and Tusome Education Program Specialist – Eldoret Region.

During the adaptation workshop, the adapters were first assigned to either the VI or the HI group. In their two groups, and informed by the survey findings, the teams began with a discussion about areas they would adapt in the Tusome learner books and teacher guides for grades 1 and 2. Among the recommendations of the HI team members were:

- **Flexible instructions.** A typical classroom that caters to hearing impairments has a mix of hearing, hard of hearing, and deaf learners as well as those with multiple disabilities. In a class with varied abilities and needs, the teacher will need a guide that contains instructions enabling them to teach all the learners.
- **Not the same lessons for all.** The team originally chose to retain but adapt for SNE all the activities in the lessons for the regular learners, prompted by KICD's asserting that the instruction should be the same for all learners. Rather than creating entirely new lessons, the focus was on writing instructions for the teachers on how to teach the adapted activities. They reasoned that even in the case of phonological awareness activities, the learners who are hard of hearing would still need the information for knowledge and for building the foundations for developing lip-reading skills. It is also relevant in the development of correct spelling and therefore writing for the deaf. As a result, when learners who are hearing or hard of hearing are instructed to say sounds of letters or words, their counterparts who are deaf will be cueing, fingerspelling, and signing letters or words. However, after further consideration of the skills HI learners bring to school, and related discussions with KICD, the team agreed to additional adaptation in order to teach Signed Exact English instead of oral language in the beginning of grade 1, reduce the texts and restructure grammar routines to accommodate the unique needs of the learners who are deaf and those who are hard of hearing.
- **Addressing sign-language deficits.** A study of the KICD curriculum design showed that all categories of learners in a classroom are expected to learn the same content and develop the same competencies. These are the same competencies examined by KNEC. Learners with HI should be cueing, fingerspelling, or signing and sign reading, while their counterparts with visual impairments should be saying, pronouncing, or reading. This requirement therefore implies that reducing the content for learners with hearing impairments would greatly disadvantage these learners. The team grappled with this expectation, however, given the reality in schools. For instance, most learners who are deaf join grade 1 with limited sign language knowledge, which then inhibits their communication in school. However, the team discussed restructuring content—especially in the oral lessons for HI learners—to cater to learners whose sign language knowledge is so limited that they may not understand most of the content taught in the early days.

By the end of the first workshop, the two groups had achieved the following:

- a) Hearing impairments
 - All content for grades 1 and 2 was adapted and corrections implemented for the first draft.
 - All content for grade 3 was adapted, pending corrections for the graphic design team.
 - All draft illustration briefs (i.e., instructions to the artists, by page) were prepared and issued to explain where adjustments needed to be made in the illustrations.

b) Visual impairments

- All content for grade 1 and 2 was adapted and corrections implemented for the first draft of the pupil books. Corrections for the teacher guides were completed after the workshop.
- Half of the content for grade 3 was adapted, pending corrections for the graphic design team.
- All draft illustration descriptions were included.

Pretesting of the materials was done March 18–22, 2019. A team comprising staff from MoE and RTI Tusome piloted the materials in 21 (14 HI and 7 VI) sampled schools for the hearing or visually impaired. At the end of the quarter, the data from the pretesting activity were still being analyzed to inform the next workshop, scheduled for April 2019. During the second workshop, the team will review the corrected materials against the pretest findings. Judging by the preliminary results, however, the materials for HI learners will need to undergo significant changes, especially the oral lessons.

2.1.2 Adaptation of illustrations for CBC-compliant SNE materials

The documentation of how the illustrations for CBC-compliant SNE materials should be adapted was completed for HI, grades 1, 2, and 3; and for VI, grades 1 and 2. The illustration list continued to undergo review by the materials development team as they checked the corrected texts to create comprehensive illustration briefs for the artist. The illustration briefs may undergo further changes during the April 2019 workshop, when the pretested content is reviewed.

2.1.3 Finalization of leveled readers

In FY 2018, the Tusome technical team helped to develop leveled readers using the leveled readers framework. However, a review by an external literacy consultant suggested that some of the readers did not meet certain parameters for publishing. This finding resulted in the need to retrain the technical team. The training—which happened from January 28 to February 2, 2019—was facilitated by the consultant, the Tusome Senior Production Manager, one of the Tusome Senior Education Program Specialists, and the Tusome Regional Education Program Officer for Machakos Region. The key objectives were to train and refresh team members on the Kenya leveled-readers framework, to train the writing team on how to prepare leveled readers, to develop illustration briefs to support the texts, and to develop guidelines on how to use leveled readers.

During February 4–6, the team embarked on developing and cleaning up the Kiswahili and English texts. Each reader was reviewed to ensure alignment with the leveled-readers framework, readability, and clarity of content. Other criteria the team looked at were how appropriate the stories were for young children, how relevant the materials were to the CBC, and how captivating the content was. Once it had been established which stories met the minimum criteria, the team analyzed the text in detail, looking at all the categories in the framework. Most of the writers found it more challenging to write for the intermediate and higher levels, and few typescripts were received. Some team members were tasked to write additional texts for those levels.

2.1.4 Procurement of leveled readers from KPA

Technical evaluation meetings for KPA readers were held on January 14 and January 25, 2019, to narrow down the list of leveled readers further to accommodate Tusome's budget. The team came up with the following selection criteria:

- i. **Cost:** The publishers should provide the known average price of books for each level, which could help the technical team make a selection in case of a scoring tie among several readers.
- ii. **Allocation ("spread") of books per level:** The allocation for each level would be based on the following:
 - a) The need for more books for the middle levels, which is where the external midline evaluation placed most learners
 - b) The need for a variety of genres and themes.

Thus, the allocations per level were determined as proposed in **Table 2**, assuming sufficient funds to purchase 60 titles.

Table 2. Proposed allocation of book titles

2a. Spread by levels

| Level | % of titles | Number of titles (assuming purchase of 50 pupil readers + 10 teacher read-alouds) |
|------------------------|-------------|---|
| Emergent (A–C) | 10% | 5 |
| Beginner (D–F) | 50% | 25 |
| Transitional (G and H) | 30% | 15 |
| Intermediate (I and J) | 10% | 5 |
| Teacher read-alouds | | 10 |
| Total | | 60 |

2b. Graphic representation of reader allocation

| Level | Sublevel | Breakdown | Pupil readers: Graphic representation of spread | Teacher read-alouds |
|--------------|----------|-----------|--|---------------------|
| Emergent | A | 1 | █ | |
| | B | 1 | █ | |
| | C | 3 | █ █ █ | |
| Beginner | D | 5 | █ █ █ █ █ | |
| | E | 10 | █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ | |
| | F | 10 | █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ | |
| Transitional | G | 10 | █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ █ | |
| | H | 5 | █ █ █ █ █ | |
| Intermediate | I | 3 | █ █ █ | |
| | J | 2 | █ █ | |
| Total | | 50 | | 10 |

This formula was designed to be applied to any agreed-upon quantity, depending on the final budget available. In addition, it was decided that each school will receive a full set (or sets) of readers. The allocation will not be by grade as was the case for supplementary readers, where each class received a set of readers. Because the leveled readers are aligned to individual pupils' abilities, the levels cross grades. For example, the Tusome midline results indicated some nonreaders remaining in grade 3. The Tusome procurement team will determine the final number of classrooms for each grade based on available data at the time of final purchase.

- iii. **Other considerations:** The evaluation team agreed to
 - a) Maintain a record of the score awarded to each book for the final report
 - b) Flag all titles written by Tusome coaches, consultants, or team members, to avoid conflicts of interest.

2.2 Improved methods of delivering reading instruction

This result area seeks to equip teachers and other curriculum implementers to create an environment in which high-quality reading instruction can be provided. This has traditionally been done through termly cascaded trainings in which Tusome would train a group of master trainers drawn from TSC, MoE and its SAGAs; who would train the CSOs and star teachers; who would subsequently train teachers and head teachers on the requisite skills for teaching early grade learners. Although this model was not feasible in the January–March quarter due to budgetary constraints, the Activity leveraged the peer- and school-based training approaches currently being implemented in some schools, as a way of consolidating the gains in teacher professional development (TPD). The ongoing PTTC and Youth Fund grantee interventions also were connected to this result. Efforts on these fronts are explained below.

2.2.1 School-based teacher professional development

Among the pillars of Tusome's success is TPD, primarily a termly training activity conducted by the CSOs or ICs at the zonal level (or the cluster level, for APBET schools) for the Tusome implementing teachers and respective heads of schools. The training typically is scheduled during school holidays. In the case of government schools, based on the CSO's ability, he or she is partnered with a nearby CSO while supported by a resident zonal "star teacher" to conduct teacher trainings. In APBET schools, three ICs partnered to train their respective teachers, supported by the City Managers (who serve as coordinators of the ICs). When the schools reopen, the teachers apply the skills they gained from the trainings to lead early grade literacy lessons that improve outcomes among learners. Further, Tusome has ensured that teachers are supported as consistently as possible.

The 2017 midline evaluation results convinced many schools to vest their trust in the program; for example, head teachers were reported to have taken decisive measures to ensure Tusome is fully supported and implemented. Because this type of internal influence and energy has worked organically in certain schools, as gathered from the anecdotal reports from Tusome regional officers, it was suggested as a possible strategy to enhance the uptake of Tusome in schools. If sustained, the best practices of Tusome, as envisioned, would help improve literacy outcomes not only in grades 1, 2, and 3, but also in all classes in a school.

Tusome consistently works to strengthen strategies that have the potential to sustain the gains made. It also seeks ways for the MoE and relevant agencies to mainstream key successful activities. For instance, Tusome has highly prioritized working through the existing government structures and systems. With the addition of the anecdotal information about school-based strategies, Tusome embarked on identifying schools that had adopted Tusome methods to conduct school-based teacher support. In all, 102 schools from Tusome regions were established to have been conducting school-based teacher and peer support, through short-term trainings, peer consultative feedback, or trainings that targeted all teachers regardless of the subject or classes they were handling. In a bid to learn how these activities might align with the TSC teacher professional development process, efforts were made to visit the schools to establish how the schools had been conducting internal teacher capacity development.

A team composed of 17 Tusome technical staff and 5 others from KICD was dispatched to visit 49 sampled schools during March 4–8, 2019, across Kenya. This team aimed to find information on:

- Who championed such strategies at the schools;
- Who the trainers were;
- Who the trainees were;
- The content for the training;
- When the last such training was held at the schools;
- The duration of the training;
- How often such trainings were conducted;
- The impact of such trainings; and
- Implications of such trainings in terms of cost, time, and uptake by teachers new to the Tusome strategy.

Feedback obtained from this weeklong activity showed evidence of trainings in all the sampled schools, which had sought to expand the use of the Tusome techniques beyond the Tusome-trained teachers. In some cases, these trainings were conducted upon the request of teachers handling upper primary classes. Such teachers would pick specific strategies applied in Tusome that they had observed as potentially useful in their upper primary classes, and would request to be trained on them. In other schools, especially where the head teacher played a lead role, the need to have internal trainings was prompted by the desire to ensure continuity in the case of teacher retirements, transfers, and attrition, as well as absenteeism.

Some schools had adopted an approach whereby teachers trained in the early grade literacy program subsequently trained all other teachers in the school. Others narrowed down the trainings to specific skills and strategies used to teach early grade literacy to enable learners in the upper primary grades to improve their literacy skills.

Specifically, the findings included the following:

- Head teachers took the lead to ensure these trainings were conducted.
- Some CSOs were very persuasive in promoting this type of internal training, meaning that large numbers of schools were reported.
- Whereas most of the trainers were Tusome-trained teachers, in some cases, external trainers—especially the zonal star teachers—were called upon to help with the trainings.
- Teachers handling grades 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 formed the majority of those highly interested in adopting Tusome strategies. The reasons given were that learners in grades 4 and 5 had previously been taught using the Tusome instructional approach, and they would urge teachers to follow a particular method when teaching English and Kiswahili. Learners would, for example, remind teachers about “picture walk” before reading a story. For grades 6 to 8, however, the teachers were motivated by the observed effectiveness of the Tusome methodology in teaching reading, hence the promise of helping to assist nonreaders at these grade levels.
- Compared to other subjects, teachers of Kiswahili and English highly embraced the trainings.
- Minimal costs for refreshments and/or bus fare would be incurred during such trainings.
- Most of the trainings were conducted outside the lesson time, during breaks or in the evenings after school.

- The specific strategies most frequently trained on were steps in teaching vocabulary, sound practice, before-reading activities such as “picture walk” and predictions, and steps in writing compositions.

Tusome intends to use these results to engage the TSC and MoE on how to establish a cost-effective TPD strategy that is teacher-oriented. This engagement also will help further leverage Tusome’s best practices. If TSC and MoE buy into this concept, they and their relevant agencies, along with the Tusome technical team, can chart the approach most likely to ensure that teachers acquire skills, that early grade literacy becomes entrenched within the government systems, and that literacy acquisition functions as part of curriculum implementation.

2.2.2 Tusome SNE interventions

The major Tusome SNE activity conducted during January–March was adaptation of materials. This process was necessitated by the introduction of the CBC and the full rollout that commenced in January 2019. The main objectives of this activity were to align Tusome SNE instructional materials with the CBC, to identify and fix errors, and to flag and remediate instructions that would be confusing for teaching learners who are visually or hearing impaired.

In order to identify where revisions were needed, the materials development team consulted Tusome teachers for practical and reliable information that could inform the process. Data were collected from teachers in special schools and units for the deaf and for the blind in 15 counties during February 11–15: Baringo, Bungoma, Busia, Kakamega, Kiambu, Kirinyaga, Kisumu, Kwale, Laikipia, Meru, Mombasa, Nyeri, Siaya, Trans Nzoia, and West Pokot. The officers who conducted this activity came from KIB, KICD, KISE, KSB, KSDC, the National Technical Team, TSC, VSO, and the MoE Directorate of Special Needs Education.

The Tusome technical team reviewed the Tusome methodology and instructional materials with the two adaptation teams (i.e., one group for visual impairments and the other for hearing impairments). The two groups had separate sessions on key structure and style issues pertaining to the teachers’ guides’ and pupil books. All their agreements were documented to provide technical and contextual guidance during the material adaptation.

The separate teams then engaged in the adaptation tasks for the teachers’ guides and pupil books for grades 1, 2, and 3, conforming to the technical agreements and recommendations made earlier. As they completed pages and sections, the Tusome materials development team edited the revisions and also corrected any printing errors that had been identified in the grade 1 and 2 books (the grade 3 teachers’ guides and pupil books had not yet been printed).

2.2.3 Tusome’s Primary Teacher Training College interventions

In the quarter under review, Tusome conducted a number of pre-service interventions regarding Tusome early grade literacy. For example, in 2018, teams from PTTCs and the MoE’s Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) had developed the Primary Teacher Education Teaching Practice assessment tool (the “TP tool”). This quarter, Tusome supported the validation of the tool, which incorporates resources for observing



A lecturer at Kitui Teachers Training College gives feedback to a teacher trainee as the Tusome National Coordinator (center) listens

[Photo: Tusome staff]

and evaluating new teachers' instruction in early grade literacy, numeracy, and the CBC. The validation workshop sessions were held at Tusome's Nairobi offices January 31–February 1. The participants came from DQAS, KICD, PTTCs, and Tusome.

After validation of the TP tool, Tusome supported the piloting of the tool during teaching practice in selected PTTCs. Ten officers from DQAS and PTTCs conducted the pilot. Locations were Bomet Teachers Training College (TTC), Garissa TTC, Kenyena TTC, Kitui TTC, Shanzu TTC, Thogoto TTC, Valley TTC, and Western TTC. The pilot was conducted from February 25 to March 1, except at Garissa TTC, where the pilot took place March 11–14.

Tusome staff from all nine regions supported PTTC lecturers during teaching practice in the catchment-area schools, which was held between February 11 and March 22, 2019. The TP support entailed a Tusome staff member joining an assigned lecturer in a lower-grade classroom where a trainee teacher would be teaching either a Kiswahili or an English lesson. Afterward the lecturer and trainee would take time to reflect on the lesson, with the Tusome staff providing feedback so that both the trainee teacher and the lecturer would benefit. To effectively support PTTC lecturers, Tusome staff first held sensitization sessions in the regional offices for all staff who did not directly participate in training PTTC lecturers. These sensitization sessions were held February 4–7, 2019, in the afternoons.

Among the issues identified during the TP support were:

- While some PTTCs had incorporated early grade literacy into their teacher training and had posted their teacher trainees to teach in lower grades, other PTTCs had not taken up instructional preparation around literacy.
- PTTCs that had Tusome-trained lecturers (e.g., Eregi, Mosoriot, Kenyena, and Thogoto TTCs) were doing much better than the others in preparing teachers for instruction in early grade literacy.
- Some large public PTTCs that did not have Tusome-trained lecturers, such as Asumbi TTC and Migori TTC, did not even post trainee teachers to lower primary grades.
- Staff turnover at private TTCs was very high, as many of those who were trained by Tusome in August 2018 had since left the institutions.

Despite the aforementioned challenges, the lecturers welcomed the role Tusome is playing in the PTTCs, noting that it will be integral to influencing how literacy lessons are implemented in schools for posterity. The lecturers who participated in the teaching practice alongside Tusome advised their teacher trainees to be keen on Tusome approaches since it would give them an edge over others. One lecturer said about the Tusome approach:

"If the teachers leave primary teacher training equipped with Tusome methodologies, they will be marketable." (Lecturer, Tendo Valley PTTC, Meru County)

2.2.4 Tusome Youth Fund interventions

The Tusome Youth Fund is an intervention arm of Tusome that works with youth-led organizations to promote early grade literacy activities in communities. The Youth Fund grantees operate in six of the nine Tusome regions. As of the end of December 2018, 13 out of the 23 groups had been able to complete their activities. However, 10 had activities ongoing during Q2. Achievements by these youth groups are discussed below. See **Annex B** for a detailed summary of accomplishments by each youth group.

Creation of murals

During the reporting period, Murang'a County Youth Network arranged for 12 murals to be designed and painted in its target schools. This was done with guidance and recommendations from the teachers and the Tusome technical team in Nairobi. There was great excitement among the learners once they were able to read from the walls on their schools. The teachers also encouraged the learners to make use of the walls during their free time.



A youth paints a mural at Kangangu Primary School
[Photo: Murang'a County Youth Network]



Students from [redacted] read the mural at their school during their break time
[Photo: Murang'a County Youth Network]

Reading Exhibitions

To expose the children to more reading activities, the youth groups organized reading exhibitions at the school, cluster, or zonal level. In Nairobi, Youth Initiatives Kenya conducted five reading exhibitions for the 20 APBET schools in Korogocho Cluster. The reading exhibition activities captured the following concepts, which were agreed upon beforehand during a planning meeting with the teachers and the Instructional Coach for Korogocho cluster: word blending, use of letter cards, word segmenting, storytelling, spelling, and use of vocabulary words to make sentences. The parents were also treated to seeing their children read aloud. All the children who participated were awarded with storybooks to motivate them.



Pupils using letter cards to make words during a reading exhibition activity in Korogocho Cluster
[Photo: YIKE]



Galbet CSO moderating the second exhibition at Garissa Primary School
[Photo: Garissa County Youth Bunge Forum]

Similar successes were also reported by Murang'a County Youth Network, which organized reading exhibitions at 12 different participating schools. In Mandera, Mandera County Youth Bunge Forum

organized three reading exhibitions for 11 schools in Rhamu Zone. In Garissa, Garissa County Youth Bunge Network organized two reading exhibitions involving 12 schools in Waberi, Galbet, and Township zones.

Parent/caregiver sensitization forums

During the quarter, Lamu Youth Alliance and Lamu Community Educational Trust Fund conducted six radio talk shows hosted by Radio Sifa, a local station in Lamu West Zone. This programming was aimed at reaching more parents/caregivers and enlightening them on how to directly support their children at home, do reading sessions with their children at home, and create a conducive reading environment at home. The guest speakers were three teachers from Mkomau, Shella, and Manda Primary Schools; one former teacher; one CSO; and one religious leader.



*A religious leader at Radio Sifa during the radio talk show
[Photo: Lamu Youth Alliance]*

Other Activities

a) Youth participation in the “Hands on the Future Kenya Skills Show 2019”

The Hands on the Future Kenya Skills Show aims to attract youth, their parents, and the general public to experience interactive and informative showcases on training, entrepreneurship, and life skills. The event was held at the Kenyatta International Conference Centre in Nairobi, February 8–10, 2019.



*DAYO M&E officer engaging with a youth during the skills show
[Photo: YIKE]*

Four youth groups that have been working with Tusome (Dream Achievers Youth Organization, Garissa County Youth Bunge Network, Murang'a County Youth Network and Youth Initiatives Kenya) participated in this year's event. In total, 22 youths (8 women and 14 men) attended. As exhibitors, the youth groups showcased their work under Tusome and shared with other youths what it takes to deliver a successful program. The youth group representatives also demonstrated their technical and vocational education and training skills as well as selling their merchandise. As participants, the youth also experienced interactive and informative exhibits on training, entrepreneurship, and life skills.

b) Youth participation in 6th Annual Devolution Conference, 2019

This year's Devolution Conference was held at the Kirinyaga University Grounds, March 4–8. Five youths from three youth groups involved in the Tusome program participated, both as delegates and as exhibitors. As delegates, the youth had an opportunity to listen in on plenary sessions that covered devolved functions of the county governments, the successes and challenges of the different counties, and the counties' prospects. These discussions exposed the youth to available opportunities and gaps in the counties' services that they could tap into. The youth also had a chance to network with county-level government leaders, development partners, and private sector actors who were interested in working with youth groups. As exhibitors, the youth showcased their work under the Tusome program.



*The Treasurer of the Murang'a County Youth Network engaging with a visitor during the Devolution Conference
[Photo: Tusome staff]*



*One of the youths from YIKE engaging with a visitor during the Devolution Conference
[Photo: Tusome staff]*

c) Updates on Migori County Youth (Development) Forum

As noted in previous progress reports, this group had its activities suspended after its governing board was dismissed in June 2018. The group did, however, hold successful elections on December 21, 2018, and it appointed a new executive committee. The plan is to resume activities next quarter.

2.3 Supervision support and classroom observations

The following subsections cover achievements this quarter related to in-school coaching support for teachers, as carried out by CSOs and ICs.

2.3.1 ICT for education

ICT has been employed under Tusome to enrich the training and coaching experience between the CSOs/ICs and the teachers, which has translated into better learning outcomes. The following are the highlights of achievements in the quarter under review.

Uploading existing teachers' guides, pupil books, and leveled readers onto QASOs', SCDEs', and TSC-SCDs' tablets

The ICT officers from Tusome updated 40 tablets for QASOs and 16 tablets for SCDEs with the PDF versions of the teachers' guides, pupil books, and leveled readers. This was done during regular support visits to sub-county offices for sensitization and joint work plan preparations. The sub-county officers were all trained on how to interact with and manipulate books using the Adobe Acrobat Reader application installed on their tablets. Some of these officers also accompanied Tusome technical officers during regular school visits, using their tablets to observe lessons and give feedback.

Update of existing tablet-based supervision tools

Updates to the Tangerine application were a major activity this quarter. Tangerine—the core tool used for teacher support—was modified to accommodate the revised books for grades 1 and 2 that had been aligned with the CBC. The ICT team and other Tusome staff were tasked with ensuring successful updates of CSOs'/ICs' tablets during trainings.

ICT and dashboard use by education stakeholders

Many education officers in Mombasa region learned to access observations done by their CSOs through a link shared by RTI Tusome staff. They began using the data from the dashboard to guide them on where to channel more support, which had the effect of increasing teacher support.

activities in the region. Uptake of the dashboard was high because of easy access through mobile phones and tablets.

On the other hand, the dashboard report system was unstable on some occasions this quarter because of periodic upgrades and maintenance aimed at making the system more informative and simpler for users. However, when this exercise is complete, the system will be more reliable and effective.

Revise and deploy updated school list

Updating the school list was an important activity this quarter. The tasks involved adding new schools, new zones, and new sub-counties to the school list database; and revising existing school information to match the correct zone, sub-county, and county for those that were misplaced. Additionally, misspelled school names were rectified.

2.3.2 Teachers' instructional support and coaching system

The continuous support by the ICs and CSOs is also beneficial to head teachers. As administrative persons in schools, the head teachers benefit from teachers' stronger preparation of lesson plans and schemes of work, which are tools for ensuring high-quality teaching and learning. At [REDACTED] the head teacher praised Tusome for this kind of help:

"Tusome is helping the teachers to be better skilled, better organized, and more professional...I have no worries with my Tusome teachers because they scheme and plan their lessons on time." (Head Teacher, [REDACTED] Gakawa Zone, Nyeri County)

2.3.3 Tusome staff support for CSOs and ICs

In the quarter under review, trained CSOs and ICs continued to receive mentoring and guidance from Tusome technical team members who walked alongside them as they supported their teachers. The support focused mainly on giving high-quality feedback to the teachers, using the tablet, uploading data, and using the teachers' guide when giving feedback on lesson instructional delivery based on the Tusome methodology. Tusome staff supported the CSOs and ICs during lesson observations in grades 1, 2, and 3. Overall, they reported improvements in the quality of teachers' lessons. They saw evidence that teachers across the Tusome regions were making the effort to link Tusome lessons to the CBC, specifically the core competencies, values, and pertinent and contemporary issues. Staff also reported correct applications of the direct instructional model by teachers, proper implementation of formative feedback during lessons, and well-managed after-lesson reflection meetings between the CSOs/ICs and teachers. Teachers generally were receptive to feedback on how to improve their lessons. A teacher from Embu County said about her CSO's support:

"I am happy because now I have learnt something new. I now know how to retell [stories]. That is how I will be doing it with my pupils." (Grade 3 Teacher, Kanothi Primary School, Kianjiru Zone, Embu County)

The Tusome technical staff used their in-person visits as an opportunity to work closely with the CSOs and ICs to guide schools on school-based teacher professional development, as a strategy for sustaining the gains of Tusome. As described earlier (section 2.2.1), a number of schools had embarked on in-house teacher training on their own initiative, and teachers in upper grades had begun following the Tusome methodology to teach languages. Schools implementing this TPD strategy reported increased enthusiasm for the Tusome approach among their teachers, who noticed that when they followed the Tusome methodology, their pupils performed better in languages.

2.3.4 Sustainability engagement with MoE and TSC officials at county and sub-county levels

During the quarter under review, the regional teams continued with county and sub-county meetings. The main focus was to equip county and sub-county officers with technical skills to support teachers within their jurisdictions. Although there were major reassignments of county and sub-county officers across all the Tusome regions, this did not affect the uptake since those who came on board were equally conversant with Tusome.

Because of notably different levels of knowledge, skills, and experience among the field officers (region, county, and sub-county), Tusome regional teams also varied their support activities to suit individual officers. RDEs, for example, received updates on the level of uptake by specific counties under their coordination, with performance represented by the number of classroom observations by CSOs as well as the development and operationalization of the county and sub-county work plans.

For CDEs and TSC-CDs, discussions revolved around classroom observations by the CSOs, Tusome achievements to date, sustainability strategies, and a walk-through of the Tangerine lesson observation tool as well as the classroom observation dashboard. The dashboard link also was shared; it has become a preferred tool for the CDEs and TSC-CDs to monitor their counties' performance, and for data-driven decision making—which, in turn, has created a demand for results from the officers under them. Consequently, all levels have become more motivated to support Tusome's interventions and to sustain its gains. Many field officers redoubled their commitment, leading to more support to teachers across all the learning areas. This impetus was also helped by the emerging realization that children in grades 4 and 5 (the first cohorts of Tusome learners in 2015) who had learned to read under Tusome generally performed better than their counterparts in higher classes. Many commentators mentioned this across the Tusome regions. For instance, during a head teachers' meeting in Kilifi North Sub-county, Kilifi County, the head teachers reported to have witnessed that, compared to previous years in the same grades, grades 4 and 5 were performing better. The same sentiment was reported in Vuga Primary, Matuga Sub-county, where during a Kiswahili panel meeting, members were amazed to find grades 4 and 5 learners writing better "insha" (Kiswahili compositions) and English compositions than the higher classes. Tusome teachers grabbed the opportunity to share with the rest of the teachers how they teach reading and writing in Tusome classes.

2.4 Increased capacity of GoK to design, implement, and assess programs to increase reading skills

Since its inception, Tusome has been collaborating with the TSC, MoE, and SAGAs to ensure that gains are sustained. Fully sustaining the benefits will be possible only when government institutions are equipped with the necessary skills to design, implement, and assess programs that increase reading skills; and when government policies are favorable. Efforts toward this end during the quarter under review are discussed below.

2.4.1 Development of joint work plans by county education officials

As described in previous progress reports, as a sustainability strategy and in preparation for transitioning, Tusome collaborated with the MoE and TSC to initiate the development of joint MoE/TSC and Tusome work plans at the county level, for the purpose of aligning all annual activities in a single document. The focus of the work planning exercise is to organize, discuss, and plot all county education activities. The documents also are expected to contain an annual schedule of all CSO school visits and the capacity gaps of the county and sub-county officers. Having these records

will facilitate the development of capacity-building plans for CSO-support field officers. The work plans will be working documents that are reviewed as the need arises.

By the end of March 2019, 30 counties (29 of these happened during January–March 2019) had developed their county-led joint work plans, and 21 counties (Bungoma, Busia, Garissa, Lamu, Nyeri, Marsabit, Meru, Mombasa, Murang'a, Samburu, Tharaka-Nithi, Tana River, Trans-Nzoia, Kirinyaga, Laikipia, Kajiado, Kwale, Isiolo, Kisii, Mandera, and Wajir) had launched their completed work plans. Some strategies that emerged included plans for adding more teacher training, attending to textbook maintenance, grouping nonreaders and putting them through an early grade literacy (Tusome) program together, and sensitizing all teachers in primary schools—including grades 4–8—on the Tusome approach to teaching reading.

2.4.2 Orientation of newly appointed MoE and SAGA personnel to Tusome

The turnover of officers in TSC, the MoE, and SAGAs is very high. This is mostly due to normal transfers, new hiring, retirements, and natural attrition. The TSC, for instance, has expanded and created new field offices, which has meant hiring new officers who require training. This quarter the Tusome field staff set aside two days each week to reach out to the education and TSC field officers for capacity-building sessions. Tusome regional teams caught up with these officers in their offices and convinced some of them to take part in instructional support supervision under the tutelage of Tusome technical staff at the regions. Field officers who were trained included CDEs, TSC-CDs, QASOs, SCDEs, and TSC-SCDs.

The regional technical teams identified capacity gaps in M&E, use of ICT, and organizing TPD. Individual officers received tailored guidance on the various components of Tusome as well as the various tools at their disposal. In addition, the officers were shown how to track issuance of early grade learning materials, including managing buffer stocks and offsetting shortages. The latter was of particular importance given that the government has taken over the role of procuring and distributing grade 1 books. County Program Coordinators from the Kenya Primary Education Development (PRIEDE) project³ also were tasked with stepping up their monitoring of programs and projects under the MoE. The meetings brought to the fore the interests and general appreciation of Tusome's robust M&E tools and best practices. A QASO was quoted to have said:

"If all programs were managed and monitored like Tusome, there could be high gains in the education sector." (QASO, Mukurweini Sub-county, Nyeri County)

2.4.3 Tusome collaboration with development actors to leverage reading

Tusome was designed with the understanding that delivering a national literacy program would require collaborative efforts from all the literacy actors. One such actor is WERK, which has been one of the subcontractors under Tusome. WERK has been coordinating Tusome's implementation in the 1,500 APBET schools. These schools are spread across five cities: Eldoret, Kisumu, Mombasa, Nairobi, and Nakuru. Direct support to APBET institutions began in January 2015 and is set to end in April 2019. The subcontract focused on hiring, management, and oversight of 83 ICs supporting the schools.

WERK's technical staff were fully engaged as members of the larger Tusome team, including contributing to the revisions of teachers' guides and pupil books, and the development of other instructional materials, including supplementary readers. In January 2019, the National Council for Nomadic Education in Kenya (NACONEK) was given the mandate to coordinate education for APBET schools. With the mandate for APBET institutions shifting to NACONEK, there were initial

³ PRIEDE is a Ministry of Education program for improving early grade mathematics.

engagements with RTI Tusome staff to move forward with ensuring the sustainability of Tusome's gains in APBET institutions.

2.5 Improved policy environment that promotes reading skills

Tusome's design and its implementation are sensitive to existing government policies. As an MoE program, and working within the ministry's framework, the Activity continually assesses the policy environment to ensure that the necessary conditions exist for promoting early grade literacy skills within the Kenyan education system. Progress and the attendant activities under this result area are discussed below.

2.5.1 Policy guideline on copyright of Tusome materials and revision of book policy

As reported in Q1 FY 2019, RTI has been working to transfer the copyright of the Tusome books to the government of Kenya. On March 15, Tusome successfully handed over to the Ministry of Education the Kenyan copyright for all materials developed by RTI from 2013 to 2018 under the Primary Math and Reading (PRIMR) Initiative or the Tusome program. These materials include pupil books and teachers' guides for literacy instruction in English, Kiswahili, Lubukusu, and Kikamba; supplementary readers, including big books; homework books; exams; letter and number flashcards; materials for instruction in braille; and pupil books and teachers' guides for math instruction. RTI retains the copyright for these materials outside of Kenya, allowing them to be refined, improved, and used for research. While Tusome could potentially support KICD and MoE-driven revisions to these materials during the remainder of its contract, the handover of copyright for these materials greatly enhances the likelihood that they (and their derivative products) will continue to be used in schools beyond the end of Tusome. Having the copyright assigned to the government will ensure that the government can coordinate subsequent revisions, printing, and distribution, and that the Tusome teaching and learning materials will be held perpetually within the Kenyan education system.

2.5.2 Policy on reviewing reading benchmarks for Kiswahili and English, grades 1 and 2; and setting grade 3 benchmarks



*The Chief Executive Officer for KNEC, leading NASMLA Steering Committee members on the adoption of benchmarks
[Photo: Tusome staff]*

In line with improving government capacity to sustainably improve reading outcomes, this quarter the Activity supported KNEC to come up with benchmarks for grades 1 through 3, for all children, including those with special needs. Notably, although in 2012 (under the PRIMR Initiative) RTI had provided technical support to KNEC to establish grade 2 literacy benchmarks in English and Kiswahili for regular-school pupils, the process did not include benchmarks for grade 1³ or for SNE learners.

The objective of the latest benchmarking activities was therefore to develop benchmarks for regular-school pupils in grades 1 and 3, plus benchmarks for HI and VI learners in grades 1 and 2. For regular-school pupils

and VI learners, the process targeted the establishment of benchmarks for English and Kiswahili. However, for pupils with hearing impairments, the objective was to establish benchmarks in signing fluency for English.

³ The grade 1 benchmarks as currently used in Tusome were estimated from grade 2 benchmarks.

The process for establishing benchmarks for these learners was undertaken by engaging relevant stakeholders through a workshop and session briefings. The first instance, a one-day workshop on February 22, 2019, was coordinated by the National Assessment Centre, a center within KNEC that is in charge of the National System for Monitoring Learner Achievement (NASMLA); RTI Tusome staff provided technical support. The workshop participants included representatives from the National Assessment Centre, USAID, PTTCs, primary schools, and other education actors. In total, 46 stakeholders (20 men and 26 women) participated.

Briefing sessions with KNEC's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and with the NASMLA Steering Committee followed the workshop. Those leading the two briefings walked the KNEC CEO, and later the NASMLA Steering Committee, through the process of benchmarking. This review culminated in the adoption of the benchmarks.

Table 3 shows the newly adopted benchmarks for grades 1, 2, and 3 for regular and SNE learners. The stakeholders set the regular grade 1 English low benchmark at 20 correct words per minute (cwpm) and the high benchmark at 35 cwpm. In Kiswahili, the low and high benchmarks were set at 10 cwpm and 30 cwpm, respectively. For grade 3, the regular English benchmarks were 40 cwpm (low) and 80 cwpm (high), whereas in Kiswahili, they were 30 cwpm (low) and 55 cwpm (high).

The benchmarks for grade 1 VI and HI learners were based on correct letter fluency, represented by correct letters per minute (clpm). For VI learners, in English, the low benchmark was 10 clpm, while the high benchmark was set at 15 clpm. Similarly, in Kiswahili, the low and high benchmarks for grade 1 VI learners were 10 clpm and 15 clpm, respectively. For the HI learners, the low benchmark level was 15 clpm while the high benchmark was 35 clpm.⁴

By grade 2, VI learners will be expected to read between a low benchmark level of 15 cwpm and a high benchmark level of 20 cwpm in English. However, in Kiswahili, the low benchmark level was set at 10 cwpm and the high was set at 15 cwpm. Lastly, for grade 2, the low benchmark level for HI learners was 10 cwpm while the high was 15 cwpm.

Table 3. Adopted benchmarks

| School type and grade | Subject and level | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|------|
| | English | | Kiswahili | |
| | Low | High | Low | High |
| Regular – grade 1 (cwpm) | 20 | 35 | 10 | 30 |
| Regular – grade 3 (cwpm) | 40 | 80 | 30 | 55 |
| Blind (VI) – grade 1 (clpm) | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 |
| Deaf (HI) – grade 1 (clpm) | 15 | 35 | | |
| Blind (VI) – grade 2 (cwpm) | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 |
| Deaf (HI) – grade 2 (cwpm) | 10 | 25 | | |

Further, the proportion of learners in the different categories expected to reach the benchmarks by 2022 was established as shown in **Table 4**.

⁴ In Kenya, HI learners are taught Kenyan Sign Language and Signed Exact English, not Kiswahili.

Table 4. Percentages of pupils expected to reach the proposed benchmarks by 2022

| School type and grade | Subject and level | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------|-----------|------|
| | English | | Kiswahili | |
| | Low | High | Low | High |
| Regular – grade 1 | 35 | 25 | 30 | 12 |
| Regular – grade 3 | 35 | 20 | 35 | 10 |
| Blind (VI) – grade 1 | 30 | 28 | 27 | 23 |
| Deaf (HI) – grade 1 | 50 | 30 | | |
| Blind (VI) – grade 2 | 34 | 30 | 33 | 25 |
| Deaf (HI) – grade 2 | 30 | 15 | | |

Speaking during the NASLMA Steering Committee Meeting, one of the participants, who was representing the MoE's Director for Policy and Partnership, had this comment on the adoption:

"It is a milestone for Kenya to have benchmarks for the blind learners as well as deaf learners."

2.6 Lessons learned

Some of this quarter's activities, particularly those oriented toward performance monitoring, yielded opportunities for learning and program improvement. One such activity was the classroom observation support to PTTC lecturers during teaching practice for the teacher trainees. The support was aimed at establishing whether the PTTC trainees were able to apply the Tusome methodology in teaching literacy in grades 1, 2, and 3. Through the support, it emerged that teacher trainees posted to private schools found it difficult to apply the Tusome methodology as specified by the teachers' guides, since the schools did not receive Tusome books. Curiously, however, some of the teachers had indicated Tusome books as their references in the schemes of work and lesson plans. It also emerged that although most teacher trainees had some knowledge about what Tusome was, most had difficulty applying the methodology in classroom situations. Strategies for addressing this challenge will include organizing on-campus sensitizations on Tusome, as well as promoting peer discussions among teacher trainees.

County-led joint work planning also served as a learning opportunity for the Activity. For example, it came to light that all the departments of education at the county and sub-county levels had been longing for such a document in order to understand each other's roles better, visit schools together, and share resources where necessary. Both TSC and MoE officers at county and sub-county levels embraced the joint work plan as a coordination tool. Commenting during the launch of the Meru County joint work plan, the TSC-CD said:

"I have been thinking this is a Tusome thing, but after really understanding this activity, I came to realize it is the professional document our education sector has been awaiting, for stakeholders to work in harmony." (TSC-CD, Meru County)

Another issue that arose during the quarter's activities was the lack of cooperation between county government departments of education, MoE, and TSC. There were no platforms for bringing county governments, MoE, and TSC to the same page. The joint work plan was viewed by these departments as a way to establish the needed cooperation.

3. Activity Progress (Quantitative Impact)

With training interventions winding down, Quarter 2 of FY 2019 had few quantitative activities as compared to Q1. Nonetheless, a few activities did yield quantitative data, especially the county-led joint work planning meetings; monitoring of Youth Fund grantees; and teacher coaching and mentorship through Tusome technical staff, CSOs, and ICs.

County-led joint work planning—described in sections 2.4.1 and 2.6—was Tusome’s initiative to establish a coordinated approach to the implementation of ministry’s programs. Since October 1, 2018, 30 county-led joint work plans have been developed across the country. Of these, 29 were created during January–March 2019. The respective county teams of MoE, TSC, SAGA officers, and other stakeholders (including nongovernmental organizations) publicly launched 21 of these (see **Annex C [Table C-1]** for more details). There were also sub-county capacity-building meetings as a cascade from the county-level meetings; 84 sub-counties held such meetings, as captured in **Table C-2** (Annex C). Additionally, 64 county visits were undertaken, with 439 (345 men and 94 women) education officials attending as a means to enhance Tusome’s sustainability. Of those visits, 62 were capacity-building meetings (see Annex C).

In addition to the sustainability and transition activities, Tusome carried out performance monitoring in the form of instructional support supervision, through classroom observations; and monitoring of Youth Fund grantees. This monitoring covered teacher coaching and support by the CSOs and ICs; and support supervision by RTI Tusome staff, National Technical Team members, MoE, TSC, and SAGA officers at the national, regional, county, and sub-county levels. These and other capacity-building efforts over this reporting period are presented below.

3.1 County sustainability meetings

During the quarter, the Tusome regional teams were able to engage the county-level TSC and MoE officers of various counties to discuss the sustainability activities of Tusome. The focus during the quarter was to have as many counties as possible finalize their joint work plans. As noted immediately above, joint work planning meetings were undertaken in 29 counties, culminating in the launches of 21 county-led joint work plans. A Deputy Regional Director of Education attended one launch, representing the Rift Valley RDE in Trans Nzoia County. She commended the gains made by Tusome:

“I have personally been very keen on Tusome since the PRIMR days, and I can say it is an amazing program for literacy.” (Deputy Regional Director of Education, Rift Valley Region)

She went on to affirm the importance of ensuring that the gains in early grade numeracy, an outgrowth of PRIMR that is now implemented under PRIEDE, are not watered down; and to advocate that the two programs should be supported adequately. At a separate joint work plan launch event in Busia County, the RDE for Busia emphasized the need for the MoE and TSC to work together to sustain the gains in Tusome. Accordingly, she remarked as she presented the CDE for Busia County with the joint work plan document:

“This is a time for both the Ministry and TSC officers to come together and ensure the gains made in Tusome live on and benefit the customer, who is the learner.” (RDE, Western Region)

She went on to encourage the SCDEs to ensure the implementation schedule is duly followed so as to maximize the gains made by Tusome in improving learning outcomes for early grade learners.



RDE for Eastern Region, making her remarks during the launch of the Meru County joint work plan at Kaaga Girls High School
[Photo: Tusome staff]

During the launch of Meru County's joint work plan, the RDE for Eastern Region built a strong case for collaboration, a window that has been made possible through the joint work planning. In her view, she said, working together is a key objective of joint work planning, because it minimizes friction and instances where people exploit gaps when officers are not on good terms. She highlighted this point while also emphasizing the need to involve stakeholders, particularly nongovernmental organizations and county governments. Speaking about Tusome's contributions and the need for its sustainability, she remarked:

"We are here because of Tusome, and I want you to step up monitoring of other government programs. We are going to ensure sustainability of Tusome in Eastern Region. Officers, ensure Tusome succeeds; and colleagues in the TSC, let us crash the barriers and deliver together."
(RDE, Eastern Region)

The same sentiment was reiterated in Kirinyaga County, where during the launch of the county's plan, the CDE commented:

"Monitor programs in schools, work together with TSC as well as help them make reports based on the observations in the fields." (CDE, Kirinyaga County)

She was very happy to note that children were reading comfortably courtesy of Tusome.

3.2 Sub-county meetings

The regional teams were also able to conduct various sustainability and transition meetings across several sub-counties. In addition to discussions on sustainability, the meetings at the sub-county level focused on increased sensitization of the officers on the Tusome dashboard, and how it can be used for decision making. In all, 98 sub-county meetings were conducted in 31 counties across the country (Annex C, Table C-2). At a meeting in Kibwezi Sub-county, Makueni County, the SCDE commented on the impact of Tusome:

"Tusome has improved transition by reducing repetition... Children can now read and do well, unlike what used to happen when children could not read and were forced to repeat..."
(SCDE, Kibwezi Sub-County, Makueni County)

The sub-county level meetings promoted a common understanding, allowed the participants to discuss challenges and solutions in implementation, and created space to develop the joint work plans.

3.3 Tusome technical staff support to CSOs

During Term I of the 2019 academic year, CSOs continued to receive guidance while they were undertaking lesson observations, mostly during January and February 2019. The CSOs were supported by RTI Tusome staff jointly with county and sub-county staff as part of capacity building for MoE and TSC officers and sustainability of the lesson observation component of Tusome. Overall, 21.1% of the CSOs were supported in January 2019, 17.3% in February, and 13.8% in March, as shown in **Table 5**. (**Annex D** also presents observation dashboard data for January and March.)

Table 5. Summary of Tusome staff support to CSOs, January–March 2019

| Region | County | Total no. of zones | Jan 2019 | | | Feb 2019 | | | Mar 2019 | | | Total no. of zones supported |
|----------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | |
| Eldoret | Bungoma | 36 | 8 | 8 | 22 | 18 | 18 | 50 | 12 | 12 | 33 | 38 |
| | Busia | 17 | 8 | 8 | 47 | 8 | 8 | 47 | 8 | 8 | 47 | 24 |
| | Elgeyo Marakwet | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 62 | 8 | 9 | 35 | 24 |
| | Nandi | 42 | 12 | 12 | 29 | 14 | 14 | 33 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 31 |
| | Trans Nzoia | 20 | 8 | 8 | 40 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 8 | 8 | 40 | 20 |
| | Turkana | 17 | 4 | 4 | 24 | 7 | 7 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| | Uasin Gishu | 24 | 20 | 20 | 83 | 15 | 15 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| | West Pokot | 21 | 13 | 13 | 62 | 8 | 8 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Isiolo | Isiolo | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 63 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 11 |
| | Marsabit | 16 | 17 | 10 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 44 | 28 |
| | Samburu | 12 | 9 | 6 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 11 |
| Kisumu | Homa Bay | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 29 | 18 |
| | Kakamega | 37 | 12 | 12 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 24 | 33 |
| | Kisii | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 41 | 27 |
| | Kisumu | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | Migori | 40 | 12 | 12 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 20 | 22 |
| | Nyamira | 23 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 35 | 22 |
| | Siaya | 34 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 21 | 19 | 56 | 39 |
| | Vihiga | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 39 | 6 | 6 | 33 | 6 |
| Machakos | Embu | 20 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 5 |
| | Kitui | 52 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | Machakos | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Makueni | 44 | 17 | 11 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 16 | 30 |
| Mombasa | Kilifi | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 19 | 6 |
| | Kwale | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | Lamu | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mombasa | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| | Taita-Taveta | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | Tana River | 9 | 6 | 5 | 56 | 4 | 4 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Nairobi | Kajiado | 17 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| | Kiambu | 33 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| | Murang'a | 32 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| | Nairobi | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |

| Region | County | Total no. of zones | Jan 2019 | | | Feb 2019 | | | Mar 2019 | | | Total no. of zones supported |
|---------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | No. of zones supported | Individual CSOs supported | % of CSOs supported | |
| Nakuru | Baringo | 49 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 11 |
| | Bomet | 31 | 7 | 9 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| | Kericho | 31 | 7 | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | Nakuru | 37 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 13 |
| | Narok | 33 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| | Nyandarua | 17 | 7 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 9 |
| Nanyuki | Kirinyaga | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Laikipia | 19 | 7 | 7 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | Meru | 31 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| | Nyeri | 22 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| | Tharaka-Nithi | 23 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 10 |
| Wajir | Garissa | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 38 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 13 |
| | Mandera | 10 | 11 | 8 | 80 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 23 |
| | Wajir | 15 | 15 | 9 | 60 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 27 | 30 |
| Totals | | 1,177 | 262 | 225 | 21.1 | 225 | 182 | 17.3 | 184 | 169 | 13.8 | 671 |

3.4 Tusome staff support to ICs

During the January–March 2019 quarter, ICs also were supported while undertaking lesson observations. **Table 6** summarizes the support given to ICs by RTI Tusome staff, disaggregated by APBET city. All ICs in Kisumu and Eldoret were supported in March 2019. Nairobi APBET ICs were supported in January, February, and March 2019. On average, 22% of ICs were supported during the quarter.

Table 6. Summary of Tusome staff support to ICs

| Region | APBET city | Total no. of clusters | January 2019 | | | February 2019 | | | March 2019 | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | No. of clusters supported | Individual ICs supported | % of ICs supported | No. of clusters supported | Individual ICs supported | % of ICs supported | No. of clusters supported | Individual ICs supported | % of ICs supported |
| Eldoret | Eldoret APBET | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| Kisumu | Kisumu APBET | 10 | 7 | 6 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 100 |
| Mombasa | Mombasa APBET | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nairobi | Nairobi APBET | 53 | 13 | 13 | 25 | 18 | 15 | 28 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Nakuru | Nakuru APBET | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | | 83 | 20 | 19 | 23 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 20 | 17 | 20 |

3.5 Youth Fund grantees: Monitoring visits and support

The Youth Fund is an intervention arm of Tusome that works with youth-led organizations to promote early grade literacy activities in communities. The Youth Fund grantees have been operating in six of the Tusome regions, with 23 youth groups on board.

Only 10 of the 23 youth groups still had ongoing activities this quarter. These groups are based in Bungoma, Garissa, Kisii, Mandera, Migori, Mombasa, Murang'a, Nairobi, Wajir, and West Pokot counties. Six groups were visited for purposes of support monitoring: DAYO, Garissa County Youth Bunge Network, Kesho Organization, Kisii County Youth Development Forum, Mombasa County Youth Bunge, and Murang'a County Youth Network.

4. Opportunities and Constraints

Discussed below are some of the opportunities and constraints that were experienced in the January–March 2019 time frame.

4.1 Opportunities

School-based teachers' professional development. Training new teachers who missed the Term 1 2019 training in December 2018 played a key role in ensuring that the teachers acquired the necessary knowledge and skills, hence assuring continuity in learning.

Launch of joint work plans. Building on the opportunities presented by the development and launches of the county-led joint work plans, Tusome leveraged that energy by cascading the joint work planning to sub-counties.

Adaptation of Tusome teaching and learning materials. The SNE adaptation workshop that was conducted during the quarter helped to further strengthen the collaboration between KICD and Tusome. The MoE's Directorate of SNE and KICD were very active in planning and implementing the adaptation workshop. For instance, for the first time during Tusome, KICD offered three of its own graphic designers to work with Tusome graphic designers on the material. The KICD designers thereby had the opportunity to learn a lot from the Tusome designers. This collaboration will leverage Tusome's efforts to develop teaching and learning materials for both SNE and regular learners.

CBC rollout. The rollout of the new curriculum in the 2019 school year in all primary schools (both public and private) put pressure on the MoE to ensure that CBC-aligned materials were in schools. This accelerated implementation created an opportunity for Tusome to fill the void. The government adopted Tusome's CBC-aligned materials as the approved materials for English and Kiswahili for grades 1, 2, and 3. As a demonstration of its commitment to the sustainability of Tusome, the government printed and distributed grade 1 Tusome books (Kiswahili and English) to all public primary schools and 1,500 APBET institutions through its own procurement system. The books were distributed to public schools and Tusome-targeted APBET institutions in January 2019.

Youth Fund interventions. The complementary activities by the youth groups, under the Youth Fund, continued to promote Tusome's uptake beyond the school level. The youth groups used various activities, including radio talk shows, to ensure parent/caregiver involvement in pupils' reading and to increase their sense of ownership of Tusome.

4.2 Constraints

Turnover of CDEs. Although Tusome received support from all education stakeholders, from the Regional Coordinators of Education to classroom teachers, the turnover of CDEs across the country almost slowed down progress in working toward sustainability.

High teacher attrition. Teacher attrition is a persistent problem in APBET institutions. This is especially true in the first term of each academic year, when teachers are prone to leave their stations for December holidays and never return, as they acquire employment elsewhere. This forces the schools to hire new teachers who, in most cases, are not Tusome-trained, hence affecting performance and continuity.

CSO retirements and/or transfers. During this quarter, 8 CSOs (4 men and 4 women) retired and another 19 (15 men and 4 women) were transferred. Vacancies mean that many teachers go without support, which influences the quality of learning in the affected schools.

GoK's commitment to supporting APBET institutions. While there has been a lot of traction toward sustainability in public schools, this momentum has been slower in APBET institutions. The existing government structure, through NACONEK, does not guarantee inclusion of all APBET schools in the government system, or subsequent support beyond the existence of Tusome. The institutions thus remain unsure whether the MoE will accord them the support they have been enjoying for the past five years from USAID funding under Tusome.

Skills gap between the CSOs and sub-county officers (both TSC and MoE). The Tusome technical team distinctly noted inconsistent support to the CSOs by the SCDEs, QASOs, and TSC-SCDs. This is the category of officers who should be supporting the day-to-day implementation of MoE/TSC programs. This lack of support is largely due to officers' technical skills (or lack thereof). The officers often say that they feel inadequately equipped compared to the CSOs and teachers, who have had more trainings.

Grade 1 book shortages. Teachers were finding it hard to teach CBC-aligned Tusome lessons because in some schools, the grade 1 books that were to be supplied by the GoK either were insufficient or had not been delivered at all.

Late teacher training for some counties. December 2018 disruptions to teacher training, as reported last quarter, required the Term 1 trainings for Makueni, Marsabit, Narok, and Turkana counties to be completed in January 2019, for the affected zones.

5. Performance Monitoring

Performance monitoring in the quarter under review mainly involved the following activities:

- classroom lesson observations;
- updating of enrollment data across all public and APBET primary schools (including SNE schools—for hearing and visually impaired learners);
- updating of the PTTC database;
- monitoring of Youth Fund grantees' interventions; and
- tracking of sustainability indicators.

All these activities were aimed at ensuring fidelity to Tusome methodology, tracking progress toward the Activity's outcomes, and ensuring that data being reported are of good quality. In Tusome, progress on learning outcomes is monitored primarily through the routinely collected classroom observation data. The data are recorded using Tangerine, which captures the number of

support visits as well as pupil performance—reported in terms of oral reading fluency—at various levels (national, county, and zonal or cluster). The CSO's or IC's (and sometimes others') Early Grade Reading Assessment results from three randomly selected pupils are uploaded into a cloud-based database. Tusome technical staff analyze the data and share the cumulative results monthly, through a web-based dashboard, with relevant stakeholders in the MoE and TSC. The data also are validated for accuracy by checking the observers' global positioning system (GPS) coordinates. GPS verification is among the conditions that must be met before any reimbursement can be processed for the CSOs and ICs. Other analyses are conducted from time to time to draw lessons that inform day-to-day management decisions.

The Tusome M&E team also monitored the activities and tracked the progress of deliverables required of the various youth grantees under the Tusome Youth Fund, as well as reviewing relevant documents received from the grantees as part of the approval process. The documents reviewed included activity reports, quarterly and final reports, and supporting documents required before issuance of milestone payments. Thirteen round 1 Youth Fund grantees were cleared for potential participation in the second round of interventions.

Activity trackers also helped in monitoring the performance of various undertakings in the Tusome regions. For example, the M&E team used digital trackers for classroom observations, sustainability measures, training attendance, support given to Youth Fund grantees, and reflection meetings. Data from these platforms aided in decision making during the planning and implementation phases of the respective activities.

Another critical performance monitoring activity during the quarter under review was an endline study to determine the impact of Tusome interventions in APBET institutions. It began on March 1, 2019. The introduction of new APBET institutions as part of the Tusome add-on award in December 2016 provided an opportunity to measure and compare the achievement levels of two different Tusome cohorts in these low-cost private primary schools. Given that the new APBET institutions (phase 2) were drawn from the same geographical regions as the existing schools (phase 1), it was theorized that the phase 1 institutions that joined Tusome in 2015 would perform better than phase 2 institutions (those that joined in January 2017). A baseline study in March 2017, which covered 180 APBET institutions, was the first arm of the impact evaluation; this quarter's evaluation was a follow-on to the baseline assessment.



*A child reading a story aloud as an assessor follows along, during a field visit for assessor training at Park Road Primary School
(Photo: Tusome staff)*

In addition to measuring any impact of the program's interventions on learners from APBET institutions, the endline study will seek to determine factors that influence the effectiveness of the Tusome's interventions on grades 1, 2, and 3 learners from low-cost private schools. It will further assess the extent to which the duration of the intervention influenced the effectiveness of the program. As at baseline, 180 sampled APBET institutions from the five cities (Eldoret, Kisumu, Mombasa, Nairobi, and Nakuru) were targeted for the study.

Although quantitative data from the APBET endline study had not yet been analyzed as the quarter ended, anecdotal

evidence indicated that Tusome has transformed the early grade reading ecosystem in these schools. Tusome has changed teachers', parents', and learners' attitudes about education; motivated learners to read; and helped struggling learners read at KNEC benchmarks and with understanding. These schools treasured the support they had received from the program, including teacher trainings,

classroom observation support by the ICs, and provision of teaching and learning materials. The support laid a good foundation for these children's later reading and learning.

Annex E contains Performance Data Tables that document progress against all the project indicators.

6. Progress on Gender and Inclusion Strategy

Gender equality and inclusion remains an important strategy in the implementation of Tusome. It involves intentional monitoring to establish the extent to which the Activity's interventions are benefiting all the targeted categories of learners without discrimination on account of gender, ability, regional disparities (Arid and Semi-Arid Lands [ASAL] and non-ASAL etc.), and any other predispositions. All interventions are therefore tracked to ensure none of the different segments of beneficiaries are discriminated against through the program's life cycle. Accordingly, all the activities conducted this quarter were assessed for exclusion, and activity-related data were tracked and disaggregated by gender and other relevant inclusion criteria to ensure that no systematic exclusion was introduced during targeting and implementation of such activities.

Adaptation of Tusome's TLMs also ensured that learners from SNE schools (particularly the hearing and visually impaired) would also benefit in the long run from the CBC-aligned literacy materials.

Furthermore, the CSOs, ICs, and Youth Fund grantees were given express instructions to make sure that boys and girls benefited equally, as much as possible, from the different interventions, including through reading assessments. During such assessments, the CSOs and ICs were instructed to be deliberate in sampling boys and girls for assessment. If the first learner to be sampled was a girl, the next would have to be a boy before another girl was sampled, and vice versa. The same messages were relayed to parents/caregivers, who, through the youth groups, were sensitized on the importance of supporting their children's education and finding pride in seeing both girls and boys benefit from education in equal measure.

7. Progress on Links to Other USAID Programs

The Tusome Early Grade Reading Activity is one among several programs contributing to USAID's broader development portfolio and strategic goals in Kenya. Tusome continued to collaborate with other USAID-supported programs, especially those that are members of Partnership for Resilience and Economic Growth (PREG). This section describes how Tusome leveraged activities of selected USAID programs during the quarter under review.

PREG. During the January–March quarter, Tusome continued to participate in various PREG activities, both at the national level and within selected Tusome regions. Through strategic collaboration—with, among others, the National Drought Management Authority and the devolved county governments—PREG leverages various programs in terms of sequencing, layering, and integrating activities to alleviate diverse effects of drought, human conflict, and marginalization. This type of cooperation not only helps consolidate Tusome's gains in ASAL areas, but also aligns well with Tusome's gender and inclusion strategy. As an example, in Isiolo Region, the Activity participated in meetings and site visits with other partners in January and February 2019. The meetings and visits were strategic not only to USAID's strong recent calls for collaboration, but also to Tusome's ongoing efforts to sustain the interventions.



A Tusome M&E Officer with PREG partners at the head teacher's office in Merille Primary School, Marsabit County
[Photo: Tusome staff]

At one of the PREG events—a visit to Merille Livestock Market in Marsabit County—partners explored the site's progress on sequencing, layering,⁵ and integrating activities. In the meeting, an upsurge of trade in the market was reported, pointing to a breakthrough in layering of activities. The partners reported that Tusome had also contributed to this success, albeit indirectly. Provision of adequate learning materials relieved parents who use the market of the cost of purchasing CBC-aligned English and Kiswahili books in

the early grades.

The PREG partners also visited Merille Primary School, one of the schools in the area supported by Tusome. This was an opportune moment for the partners to understand Tusome approaches and interventions. In addition to briefing partners on Tusome's impact at his school, the head teacher narrated external factors that negatively affect learning outcomes. Particularly, he singled out poor infrastructure, increasing absenteeism resulting from hunger, negative attitudes towards education, and—interestingly—the nearby market built by partners. “During market days—every Tuesday—learners attend to livestock [at home] while parents troop to the market,” the head teacher argued.

The partners also toured Manyatta Zebra Primary School to identify areas of collaboration and partnership. The head teacher cited constant human–wildlife conflict at the school. Northern Rangelands Trust, a partner investing in wildlife conservancy, was tasked with exploring possible solutions, including fencing the school. As was the case at Merille Primary School, the school also lacked basic infrastructure, including an office for the head teacher. The World Food Program was asked to assess the school feeding program to help keep pupils nourished and healthy.

“I could see the futility of providing excellent learning materials if these pupils cannot stay in school. Health and nutrition need to be looked into to ensure Tusome succeeds in this school, and this is why partners need to come together.” (An officer from Africa Lead – Feed the Future)

Technical Working Groups for the health, nutrition, livestock, and education sectors were formed to further enhance collaboration. Tusome became the Education Technical Working Group Lead for Marsabit and Isiolo counties.

8. Progress on Links with Government of Kenya Agencies

Tusome continued to have a cordial working relationship with the government (national as well as the county governments) at all levels. Significant linkages remained operational among the

⁵ Layering: An approach that aligns existing goals with new partnerships at the local levels to increase leverage and impact. The idea is that multiple “layers” (i.e., different implementers) of investments in a single place generate extra impact. For example, at the same school site, Tusome might offer its early grade reading activities while other partners—based on their capacity and specializations—implement a water, sanitation, and hygiene program; and build or improve latrines.

stakeholders within the regions, and more stakeholders came to understand their roles and showed willingness to support teachers. Communication and collaboration with the MoE, TSC, and relevant SAGAs—including KICD, KEMI, KISE, and CEMASTE—were heightened, culminating in the development of the county-led joint work plans. While TSC remained a critical agency in charge of teacher employment and performance management, the other agencies had responsibility for the day-to-day implementation of the curriculum; its design was the exclusive role of KICD. The strong collaboration between Tusome and KICD, for instance, resulted in the government using its own resources to develop, print, and distribute CBC-compliant Tusome grade 1 learning materials.



The Governor of Elgeyo Markwet (right) and the Uasin Gishu Governor (second from right) listen closely as they are oriented to the Tusome program during the Devolution Conference
[Photo: Tusome staff]

were led by the President of Kenya and the Deputy President, who officially opened and closed the three-day conference, respectively. Tusome was allocated space under the USAID tent, and was represented by the Chief of Party; the Senior Grants Manager; the Education Assistant for Nanyuki Region; and three delegates from the youth groups: West Pokot County Youth Network, Youth Initiatives Kenya (YIKE), and Murang'a County Youth Network.

The Tusome booth received high-profile visits from governors, senators, and several other delegates. A delegate from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation commented as he visited the Tusome booth:

"I have always known that something special is happening in Kenyan schools because of the accolades I hear in the international arena about Tusome. I am so glad I can now understand how this magic happens!"

Some delegates were interested in the Tusome tablets initiative, Tusome textbooks, SNE braille books, and Youth Fund interventions. USAID's Deputy Mission Director, who visited all the USAID implementing partners' booths, was especially excited to know that Tusome was working with the youth. Stopping at the Tusome booth, she remarked:

"This is what we want to see happening in the society. Every program should find a way of working with the youth. Good work, Tusome, and thank you."

9. Progress on USAID Forward

Tusome recognizes the strategic role that local institutions play in the success and sustainability of programs. Working with these institutions and building their capacity to promote early grade reading is partly why Tusome has been successful, and why the uptake has been good even at scale. During the quarter under review, the Activity continued its partnership with WERK and Youth Fund

grantees. The roles and contributions of these partners to the success of Tusome are discussed below.

Women Education Researchers of Kenya. WERK has been a strategic partner of Tusome since its inception. Although this partnership is due to end on April 30, 2019, the two organizations have strongly helped each other. Tusome benefited from the mentorship and coordination that WERK provided in delivering reading interventions in APBET schools; WERK benefited from continuous capacity building of its staff throughout the life of the project.

Tusome Youth Fund grantees. The Youth Fund grantees have been operating in six out of the nine Tusome regions. Through their grassroots engagements, Tusome's interventions became more visible within the target zones and clusters. Round 2 of Youth Fund grants is expected to begin in the April–June quarter.

10. Sustainability and Exit Strategy

As was mentioned in the Q1 progress report, the overriding focus in FY 2019 is transition and sustainability of the gains made in early grade literacy, as the ultimate measure of success. To build momentum for the sustainability of Tusome's interventions in the counties, the technical team met at the county level with MoE/TSC teams. These meetings aimed to ensure that the transition of the Activity would be smooth, and to ensure the flow of benefits beyond the life of Tusome. Through these meetings, 30 county teams (MoE/TSC) developed work plans that will guide them in implementing Tusome activities, which have been mainstreamed into the county work plans alongside the duties and responsibilities of other actors. For the counties that already had work plans, the USAID Tusome technical team cascaded the sustainability meetings to their respective sub-counties. During the joint work-planning meeting in Kisumu Central, the SCDE commented,

"The Tusome team has done a wonderful job; thus, the ball is in our court. We have no further excuses to give because all we need has been provided. Ours is to ensure that such a good program remains on its feet."

Capacity-building sessions for the county and sub-county officers were an ongoing activity in all the Tusome regions. Most gained a better understanding of the program than before, and a good number slowly came to appreciate their role in instructional support supervision through classroom observations. The RDEs also were supportive and quick to pass information down to the CDEs, and saw that Tusome's activities across the counties took place without interruptions. With good guidance from the RDEs, sustainability going forward is more likely.

11. Subsequent Quarter's Work Plan

The following are some of the key activities planned for the April–June quarter, per the FY 2019 work plan:

- Finalize CBC-compliant SNE materials approved by KICD
- Print final approved leveled readers
- Print KPA and Tusome leveled readers
- Deliver TLMs and leveled readers to zones
- Award Youth Fund round 2 grants
- Monitor grantees' implementation

- Arrange instructional support and coaching for SNE teachers
- Monitor implementation of joint county work plans

11.1 Cash flow and budget details

The cash flow table below (*Table 7*) is derived from the financial table also provided in this section of the report (*Table 8*). The cash flow report reflects expenses and forecasts as of March 31, 2018.

Table 7. Cash flow report and financial projections (in US dollars)

| Quarter (Q) | Quarterly outflows | Cumulative outflows | Obligated funding | Net cash flow |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| As of Q2 FY 2019 | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ |
| Q3 FY 2019 | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ |
| Q4 FY 2019 | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ |
| Q1 FY 2020 | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ | ██████ |

Table 8. Budget details (in US dollars)

Total Expected Costs: [REDACTED]
 Cumulative Obligated Funds: [REDACTED]
 Cumulative Expenditures: [REDACTED]

| Obligation | Invoiced expenses as of Dec 31, 2018 | Q2 FY 2019 actual expenditures (Jan-Mar 2019) | Q3 FY 2019 projected expenditures (Apr-Jun 2019) | Q4 FY 2019 projected expenditures (Jul-Sep 2019) | Q1 FY 2020 projected expenditures (Oct-Dec 2019) |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Program Implementation | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Labor | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Fringe Benefits | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Services | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Computer Expense | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Telecommunications | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Shipping and Postage | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Travel (Domestic and Foreign) | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Local National Fringe | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Workshops/Training | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Office Lease and Utilities | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Offsite Allowance | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Miscellaneous Business Expense | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Insurance Expense | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Equipment | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Materials | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Subcontractors (WERK, Volunteer Service Overseas [VSO]) | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Consultants | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Value-Added Tax | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |

| Obligation | Invoiced expenses as of Dec 31, 2018 | Q2 FY 2019 actual expenditures (Jan-Mar 2019) | Q3 FY 2019 projected expenditures (Apr-Jun 2019) | Q4 FY 2019 projected expenditures (Jul-Sep 2019) | Q1 FY 2020 projected expenditures (Oct-Dec 2019) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Tusome Youth Fund | | | | | |
| Grants | | | | | |
| Tusome Partnership Fund | | | | | |
| Subcontractors (Dalberg, Worldreader) | | | | | |
| Materials | | | | | |
| Services | | | | | |
| Indirect Costs | | | | | |
| Fixed Fee | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | |

| Budget notes | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Labor | Forecasted labor includes home office and local national (LN) labor. Monthly labor costs decrease in Q4 FY 2019, reflecting closure of the Tusome regional offices. |
| Services | Q2 FY 2019 includes distribution costs for grade 2 books. A portion of costs for the APBET endline study hit in March 2019; the remaining costs for the APBET study are forecasted in Q3. Q3 FY 2019 also includes book distribution costs for grade 3 supplementary leveled readers (estimated at ██████). KICD review fees for revised materials are forecasted for Q4 FY 2019. |
| Computer Expenses | Computer expenses include monthly Office365 expenses for LN staff. The reduction in Q3 reflects the closures of the Tusome regional offices. |
| Telecommunications | Telecommunication costs include monthly telephone and internet expenses (including cell phone service for LN staff and landline for offices). |
| Shipping & Postage | Q1 FY 2020 includes shipping of project files to the US for record retention, estimated at ██████ |
| Travel | In-country travel costs for Q2 include RTI staff travel for the Term I 2019 trainings. Forecasted travel includes CSO transportation reimbursement for classroom supervision through July, as well as regional staff travel. Foreign travel for Q3 FY 2019 includes three trips: one trip for the Home Office Project Manager to travel to Nairobi to support finalization of the grade 3 leveled readers; one trip for the Senior Production Manager to present at CIES; and one trip for home office operational support for closeout of the regional offices. Q1 FY 2020 includes one trip to support closeout activities as well as repatriation of the DCOP–Operations and his family. |
| LN Fringe | Q3 forecasted LN Fringe includes severance and other allowable payouts for Tusome regional office staff, as well as renewal of medical insurance for current staff. The medical insurance benefit applies only to staff who are currently employed by the project. Allowable LN termination payouts are also included in Q4 FY 2019 and Q1 FY 2020 to align with staff terminations as the project scales down for closeout. |
| Workshops | Q2 FY 2019 includes trailing costs for the Term I IC and CSO training and teacher training as well as joint work planning by the sub-counties. Q3 includes the final trailing costs for the teacher training (an estimated ██████ to hit in April as the final teacher payments) and the SNE materials adaptation workshop (██████). Q1 FY 2020 includes a lessons-learned closeout and transition event and a sensitization of APBET proprietors on maintaining Tusome approaches. |
| Office Lease and Utilities | Includes rent and utilities payments for the Tusome Nairobi and regional offices. The regional offices are forecasted through the end of Q3, with utility payments made one month in arrears. |
| Offsite Allowances | Q3 FY 2019 costs include residential lease and education allowance payments for two expatriate staff through December 2019. Q1 FY 2020 costs include shipping of household effects for repatriation of the DCOP–Operations. Allowances for the other expatriate advisor |

| Budget notes | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | will be billed based on the actual level of effort (LOE) % spent on Tusome. At the end of each year, his billed allowances will be reviewed against actual LOE and any reconciliations made, and cost adjustments submitted to USAID. |
| Miscellaneous Business | Actual foreign currency gains are reflected under the Miscellaneous Business Expense line. RTI does not forecast estimated FX gains/losses, therefore the forecast for Q3 FY 2019 – Q1 FY 2020 is zero. |
| Equipment | Q2 FY 2019 equipment costs are for 3 software licenses for Elastic Stack for the data dashboard utilized by Tusome and the MoE, and purchase of a mobile phone for the DCOP-Operations. |
| Materials | Q2 FY 2019 costs include printing of grade 2 pupil books and teachers' guides. Grade 3 supplementary leveled readers are forecasted in Q3 under the Partnership Fund, as the team anticipates working with the KPA to procure grade 3 leveled readers at heavily discounted prices. |
| Subcontractors | Forecasted expenses are costs for subcontractor WERK for coach management. WERK's subcontract will close in Q3. |
| Consultants | Q2 costs include labor and travel expenses for international consultant STTA to facilitate the writer's workshop and support the development of Tusome-produced grade 3 leveled readers. Q3 & Q4 include remaining costs for the consultant's finalization of the leveled readers, as well as local consultant costs to support the APBET and SNE endline study. |
| VAT | The forecast includes billable VAT per the VAT protocol issued July 6, 2018. Accruals include VAT incurred but not yet billed, as well as VAT and customs duties incurred in 2015 on the importation of grade 1 books. The latter is pending a determination of allowability by USAID. If determined unbillable, this amount will not be billed to USAID. |
| Grants | Forecasted grants payments are for the Youth Fund grantees. The forecast includes the second round of awards starting in Q2. |
| Indirect Costs | Calculated per award conditions. |
| Fixed Fee | Invoiced fixed fee to date is based on actual fee billed per the deliverable schedule in Section F.8 of the contract. Forecasted fee is based on the total remaining unbilled fee per the F.8 schedule in Modification 16. |

11.2 New subaward details

No new subawards were issued during this reporting period.

12. Activity Administration: Personnel

There were two promotions and one new recruitment during the January–March quarter. The details—including name, position, effective date of promotion/hire, and location—are highlighted in *Table 9*.

Table 9. Tusome hires/promotions from January 1 to March 31, 2019

| Previous position | New position | Date of hire / promotion | Location |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Finance Specialist | Promoted to Finance Manager | November 1, 2018 | Nairobi, Kenya |
| Training Specialist – Nakuru | Promoted to Regional Education Program Officer | February 1, 2019 | Nakuru, Kenya |
| Not applicable (new hire) | Communication Specialist | March 25, 2019 | Nairobi, Kenya |

Annex A. Success Stories

When one pupil was not doing so well, a Tusome pupil came in handy

Story by [REDACTED]



*A mother of two students at Kiangoma Primary School, Kirinyaga County
[Photo: Tusome staff]*

Going by its name, Kiangoma Primary School may not be a great place to be—after all, it means “a place inhabited by the devil.” The County Director of Education for Kirinyaga County wondered why the school would not change the name. *“I have been telling them to change the name. It doesn’t augur well for them.”* However, other than the name woes, a titillating story has been unfolding.

One of the parents at the school was not pleased when her son, who is now 13 years old, had to repeat grades 1, 3, and 5. The head teacher, who has since been posted to another school, was hoping that more time in class would somehow turn around the situation for the boy. The mother confided that her 13-year-old, now in grade 6, could not even write his name—until recently. She added that her elder daughter, now in Form 1, could not save the situation, as the son *“was not comfortable when taught by her.”* The boy had first enrolled at the school at the preprimary level. Although the County Director of Education suspected that the boy could have some special needs, the mother was quick to disagree. *“He has no special needs. He is very jovial at home. He also likes to accompany me to the farm.”*

This mother had been frequenting the school to monitor her son’s progress. However, to her surprise, help seems to have come from the most unlikely quarter—and closer to home, for that matter. At the beginning of 2018, when the son was in grade 5 and his younger sister was 9 years old and in grade 2 at the same school, their mother began to notice something remarkable. The children were getting closer than ever. Throughout the year, the bond grew stronger. The siblings amazed their mother. But it didn’t stop at that. She noticed how her daughter was helping her brother to write his name and read out words. Amazingly, the young daughter was using segmentation, starkly different from what the boy was used to, and he liked it. According to the current head teacher, *“it is the Tusome approach that’s enabling this girl to effectively assist her brother in reading.”* The mother said that her son can now write his name and has come to love reading.

Amazed with story, the Kiine Zone Curriculum Support Officer (CSO) confirmed the possibility, noting another case of a grade 7 boy who was also helped to read by a grade 1 teacher who used the Tusome approaches. The teacher of the girl who was tutoring her brother said that *“word segmenting when teaching how to read is very effective, as opposed to reading the whole word.”* She further explained how the girl loved reading, and rated her as one of the best pupils in her class. The assertion

was confirmed by the CSO when she assessed the girl. She was able to fluently read an English story, at 60 correct words per minute!



*The two siblings having a conversation with the Kiine CSO, the head teacher, and the girl's teacher, as their mother listens
[Photo: Tusome staff]*

"We help each other. I ask her questions and she also asks me," the young teenager confidently said as the head teacher and his mother encouraged him. Inspired by his little sister, the boy said he hopes to attain at least 200 marks out of the possible 500 on the examinations at the end of Term 1, which put a smile on his mother's face. In the opening examination done in January 2019, he scored 141 marks. He later improved to 172 on the midterm examinations. When that happened, his mother revealed how he came running home, thrilled by the results.

Annex B. Summary of Key Achievements by Youth Fund Grantees (January–March 2019)

Note: A 10th organization, Migori County Youth (Development) Forum, had its activities suspended effective June 12, 2018. However, the group successfully held elections on December 21, 2018. With the new executive committee coming on board, the Forum's groups are expected to resume their activities during April–June 2019.

| No. | Name of organization | County | Tusome region | Activities accomplished in Quarter 2, FY 2019 | Key outcomes | Planned activities for next quarter |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---------|---------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Bungoma Youth Bunge Forum | Bungoma | Eldoret | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation and submission of final report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report documenting the group's activities during the contractual period | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • |
| 2 | Dream Achievers Youth Organization | Mombasa | Mombasa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation and submission of final report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report documenting the group's activities during the contractual period | |
| 3 | Garissa County Youth Bunge Network | Garissa | Garissa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning meeting for each zone on reading exhibitions, with CSOs, teachers, volunteers, and Garissa County Youth Bunge Network staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting held with CSO and teachers to agree on the dates, venues, and clustering of the schools for 2 reading exhibitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize the final report |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading exhibitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 reading exhibitions conducted involving the 12 target schools | |
| 4 | Kisii County Youth Development Forum | Kisii | Kisumu | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of supplementary readers in consultation with RTI Tusome staff and the KICD "Orange Book" | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved list of supplementary readers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold one sensitization meeting with parents/caregivers of the 16 selected schools • Procure and distribute 3,430 supplementary reading materials (214 books per school) as per the needs of the 16 schools in Nyakembene Zone • Conduct one reading exhibition • Compile and submit final report |

| No. | Name of organization | County | Tusome region | Activities accomplished in Quarter 2, FY 2019 | Key outcomes | Planned activities for next quarter |
|-----|---|----------|---------------|--|--|---|
| 5 | Lamu Youth Alliance and Lamu Community Educational Trust Fund | Lamu | Mombasa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radio talk show | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 radio talk shows held | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record and share 5 audio stories (in both Kiswahili and English) with teachers and parents Print and distribute 1,000 Tusome stickers to sensitize parents to support literacy Compile final report |
| 6 | Mandera County Youth Bunge Forum | Mandera | Garissa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning meeting for each zone on reading exhibitions, with CSOs, teachers, volunteers, and Mandera County Youth Bunge Forum staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting held with CSO and teachers to agree on the dates, venues, and clustering of the schools for 2 reading exhibitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize the final report |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading exhibitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 reading exhibitions conducted at the zonal level involving the 11 target schools | |
| 7 | Murang'a County Youth Network | Murang'a | Nairobi | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Murals targeting learners in grades 1, 2, and 3 at 12 target schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 murals created (one in each target school) | |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading exhibitions at the 12 target schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 reading exhibitions conducted; learners in the 12 target schools were engaged in interactive reading and writing sessions. Read-aloud sessions as well as spelling and writing activities were done | |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent engagement forums | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 sensitization forums held with parents on creating a good reading environment at home and their role in improving literacy through parent Reading Champions and motivational speakers | |
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compilation and submission of final report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final report documenting the group's activities during the contractual period | |

| No. | Name of organization | County | Tusome region | Activities accomplished in Quarter 2, FY 2019 | Key outcomes | Planned activities for next quarter |
|-----|---------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 8 | West Pokot County Youth Network | West Pokot | Eldoret | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two radio talk shows using local radio stations to reach more parents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 radio talk shows conducted through North Rift Radio | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on supplementary reading materials distributed to grades 1, 2, and 3 Report on purchase and distribution of 42 lockable bookshelves to the 21 target schools Report on review meeting held with board members, CSOs, and representatives from other partner organizations working in the education sector Compile and submit the final program report |
| 9 | Youth Initiatives Kenya (YIKE) | Nairobi | Nairobi (Korogocho Cluster) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobilization and planning for reading exhibitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 reading exhibitions conducted at 5 venues (Rehema Day Care, Chodong, Mission of Hope, St. John School, Brandley) for the 20 APBET schools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce and distribute animation videos in 20 schools to aid pupils in reading (3 videos per school) Finalize the final report |

Annex C. Summary of County and Sub-County Meetings, FY 2019

Table C-1. County capacity-building meetings and support visits

| Counties, by MoE regions | Jan 2019 | | | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | | | Mar 2019 | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Central Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kirinyaga | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Murang'a | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Nyandarua | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyeri | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Coast Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Kwale | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Lamu | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mombasa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Taita-Taveta | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tana River | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 |

| Counties, by MoE regions | Jan 2019 | | | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | | | Mar 2019 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Eastern Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 |
| Isiolo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kitui | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Machakos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Makueni | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Marsabit | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Meru | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tharaka-Nithi | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 2 |
| Nairobi Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Eastern Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mandera | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 0 |
| Wajir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 57 | 3 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 85 | 3 |

| Counties, by MoE regions | Jan 2019 | | | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | | | Mar 2019 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Nyanza Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kisii | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 2 |
| Kisumu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Migori | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyamira | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Siaya | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 2 |
| Rift Valley Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bomet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elgeyo-Marakwet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| Kajiado | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Kericho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lalikipis | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nakuru | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nandi | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Narok | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Samburu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trans Nzoia | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 6 |

| Counties, by MoE regions | Jan 2019 | | | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | | | Mar 2019 | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of joint work plans completed | No. of joint work plans launched | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Turkana | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uasin Gishu | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Pokot | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 32 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 30 | 7 |
| Western Region | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 5 |
| Busia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 8 |
| Kakamega | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vihiga | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 49 | 13 |
| Grand total | 21 | 20 | 3 | 2 | 66 | 28 | 23 | 23 | 5 | 5 | 74 | 34 | 20 | 19 | 21 | 13 | 205 | 32 |

Table C-2. Sub-county capacity-building meetings and support visits

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Baringo | Mogotio | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bomet | Bomet Central | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Bomet East | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Chepalungu | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Konoin | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sotik | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Embu | Embu West | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Garissa | Balambala | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | Fafi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Garissa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Hulugho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ijara | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | |
| Homa Bay | Mbita | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ndhiwa | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Isiolo | Garbatula | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kakamega | Butere | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Matungu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | Mumias Central | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | Navakholo | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Kericho | Londiani | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kilifi | Ganze | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Kilifi North | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Kilifi South | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Rabai | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Kirinyaga | Kirinyaga East | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mwea East | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mwea West | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|----------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built; men | No. of education officers, capacity built; women | Total, no of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built; men | No. of education officers, capacity built; women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built; men | No. of education officers, capacity built; women |
| Kisii | Gucha | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Gucha South | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kenyenya | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sameta | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kitui | Kyuso | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Matinyani | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tseikuru | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kwale | Lungalunga | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Matuga | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Msambweni | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Samburu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | Total | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Laikipia | Laikipia West | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Nyahururu | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Machakos | Machakos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total, no of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Makueni | Kathonzweni | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kibwezi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Kilungu | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Makindu | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mukaa | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Nzaui | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mandera | Banisa | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Lafey | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mandera Central | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mandera East | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mandera North | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mandera West | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 6 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Marsabit | Chalbi | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Moyale | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | North Horr | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Sololo | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 4 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|----------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Meru | Imenti North | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tigania East | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tigania West | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Migori | Migori | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mombasa | Changamwe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jomvu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Murang'a | Kangema | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | Mathioya | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Nairobi | Kibra | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyamira | Nyamira North | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyeri | Tetu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Samburu | Samburu Central | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Samburu East | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Samburu North | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Siaya | Bondo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Taita-Taveta | Mwatate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wundanyi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tana River | Bura | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tana Delta | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tana River | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tharaka-Nithi | Mzara | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Meru South | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tharaka South | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| County | Sub-county | Jan 2019 | | | | Feb 2019 | | | | Mar 2019 | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Total no. of meetings | No of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total. no of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women | Total no. of meetings | No. of capacity-building meetings | No. of education officers, capacity built: men | No. of education officers, capacity built: women |
| Wajir | Buna | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Tarbaļ | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wajir East | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wajir North | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 3 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand total | | 46 | 46 | 80 | 20 | 41 | 41 | 81 | 20 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 4 |

Annex D. Classroom Observation Data (Dashboard) for January and March 2019

Note: January data are included to indicate progress during the quarter. The newly adopted KNEC benchmarks are yet to be configured to include grade 3 English and Kiswahili; hence the "0%" placeholder values for grade 3 in the dashboard. The grade 1 benchmarks remain those previously estimated from the grade 2 benchmarks.

Table D-1. January 2019 dashboard (for comparison)

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| All | 12,380 (50%) | 15 (8%) | 39 (11%) | 62 (0%) | 13 (34%) | 27 (11%) | 39 (0%) |
| Baringo | 157 (23%) | 10 (0%) | 21 (0%) | 48 (0%) | 12 (14%) | 22 (1%) | 30 (0%) |
| Bomet | 141 (22%) | 8 (0%) | 20 (0%) | 41 (0%) | 8 (11%) | 15 (0%) | 26 (0%) |
| Bungoma | 242 (29%) | 10 (1%) | 25 (2%) | 57 (0%) | 8 (10%) | 22 (7%) | 36 (0%) |
| Busia | 89 (20%) | 10 (0%) | 17 (0%) | 52 (0%) | 7 (20%) | 17 (0%) | 41 (0%) |
| Eldoret APBET | 367 (502%) | 25 (32%) | 52 (30%) | 72 (0%) | 17 (54%) | 32 (18%) | 39 (0%) |
| Elgeyo-Marakwet | 198 (50%) | 14 (10%) | 26 (1%) | 48 (0%) | 12 (25%) | 23 (3%) | 27 (0%) |
| Embu | 59 (15%) | 8 (0%) | 23 (0%) | 52 (0%) | 6 (11%) | 20 (6%) | 25 (0%) |
| Garissa | 73 (25%) | 10 (0%) | 28 (0%) | 71 (0%) | 12 (33%) | 23 (6%) | 35 (0%) |
| Homa Bay | 528 (59%) | 14 (2%) | 41 (8%) | 64 (0%) | 16 (52%) | 30 (20%) | 44 (0%) |
| Isiolo | 67 (60%) | 11 (0%) | 28 (0%) | 50 (0%) | 14 (33%) | 26 (14%) | 32 (0%) |
| Kajiado | 47 (10%) | 11 (0%) | 22 (0%) | 60 (0%) | 10 (19%) | 24 (11%) | 27 (0%) |
| Kakamega | 605 (67%) | 6 (1%) | 26 (1%) | 47 (0%) | 7 (16%) | 19 (4%) | 27 (0%) |
| Kakuma Turkana | 85 (0%) | 2 (0%) | 10 (0%) | 21 (0%) | 2 (3%) | 7 (0%) | 6 (0%) |
| Kericho | 188 (34%) | 11 (5%) | 27 (0%) | 45 (0%) | 8 (17%) | 22 (3%) | 34 (0%) |
| Kiambu | 387 (78%) | 16 (4%) | 42 (8%) | 62 (0%) | 12 (33%) | 29 (5%) | 42 (0%) |
| Kilifi | 125 (21%) | 8 (2%) | 20 (2%) | 45 (0%) | 11 (26%) | 19 (8%) | 29 (0%) |
| Kirinyaga | 73 (37%) | 7 (0%) | 32 (3%) | 31 (0%) | 8 (11%) | 24 (13%) | 21 (0%) |
| Kisii | 467 (67%) | 15 (8%) | 43 (11%) | 70 (0%) | 15 (39%) | 29 (7%) | 43 (0%) |

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|--|----------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| Kisumu | 302 (47%) | 12 (4%) | 37 (7%) | 66 (0%) | 10 (15%) | 27 (9%) | 36 (0%) |
| Kisumu APBET | 474 (305%) | 22 (21%) | 58 (34%) | 82 (0%) | 17 (53%) | 36 (31%) | 44 (0%) |
| Kitui | 245 (18%) | 14 (10%) | 39 (6%) | 61 (0%) | 15 (44%) | 26 (8%) | 45 (0%) |
| Kwale | 71 (17%) | 17 (3%) | 39 (10%) | 58 (0%) | 10 (27%) | 26 (11%) | 48 (0%) |
| Laikipia | 72 (24%) | 15 (5%) | 42 (17%) | 62 (0%) | 16 (55%) | 29 (12%) | 39 (0%) |
| Lamu | 27 (25%) | 13 (8%) | 26 (5%) | 32 (0%) | 13 (33%) | 27 (12%) | 21 (0%) |
| Machakos | 120 (13%) | 10 (0%) | 39 (7%) | 53 (0%) | 8 (11%) | 27 (12%) | 39 (0%) |
| Makueni | 313 (34%) | 12 (0%) | 36 (5%) | 63 (0%) | 11 (30%) | 26 (4%) | 39 (0%) |
| Mandera | 132 (66%) | 17 (0%) | 39 (1%) | 65 (0%) | 22 (91%) | 30 (2%) | 41 (0%) |
| Marsabit | 135 (78%) | 7 (0%) | 21 (1%) | 50 (0%) | 10 (26%) | 16 (1%) | 33 (0%) |
| Meru | 58 (7%) | 12 (5%) | 27 (3%) | 40 (0%) | 11 (20%) | 25 (5%) | 34 (0%) |
| Migori | 395 (62%) | 13 (6%) | 40 (10%) | 63 (0%) | 15 (45%) | 31 (14%) | 51 (0%) |
| Mombasa | 59 (59%) | 15 (6%) | 28 (2%) | 48 (0%) | 6 (13%) | 25 (16%) | 49 (0%) |
| Mombasa APBET | 400 (194%) | 21 (19%) | 50 (21%) | 78 (0%) | 19 (63%) | 41 (49%) | 55 (0%) |
| Murang'a | 164 (30%) | 10 (0%) | 37 (8%) | 59 (0%) | 9 (24%) | 22 (3%) | 35 (0%) |
| Nairobi | 41 (16%) | 15 (0%) | 38 (13%) | 64 (0%) | 14 (33%) | 22 (0%) | 24 (0%) |
| Nairobi APBET | 2,275 (214%) | 20 (17%) | 52 (27%) | 75 (0%) | 17 (44%) | 32 (17%) | 44 (0%) |
| Nakuru | 231 (33%) | 12 (4%) | 27 (0%) | 50 (0%) | 11 (32%) | 21 (1%) | 28 (0%) |
| Nakuru APBET | 205 (207%) | 22 (27%) | 49 (26%) | 65 (0%) | 17 (49%) | 30 (17%) | 34 (0%) |
| Nandi | 109 (14%) | 13 (1%) | 33 (9%) | 50 (0%) | 14 (42%) | 24 (1%) | 38 (0%) |
| Narok | 52 (7%) | 13 (8%) | 27 (0%) | 46 (0%) | 10 (9%) | 20 (6%) | 26 (0%) |
| Nyamira | 608 (148%) | 13 (4%) | 39 (5%) | 63 (0%) | 14 (36%) | 32 (11%) | 42 (0%) |
| Nyandarua | 93 (26%) | 11 (0%) | 28 (6%) | 42 (0%) | 7 (6%) | 19 (0%) | 28 (0%) |
| Nyeri | 134 (34%) | 18 (10%) | 37 (10%) | 59 (0%) | 12 (26%) | 36 (23%) | 37 (0%) |
| Samburu | 112 (66%) | 10 (0%) | 35 (1%) | 77 (0%) | 12 (28%) | 25 (1%) | 40 (0%) |
| Siaya | 549 (83%) | 11 (1%) | 36 (3%) | 64 (0%) | 10 (19%) | 25 (8%) | 38 (0%) |

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|--|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| Taita-Taveta | 107 (49%) | 10 (4%) | 25 (6%) | 42 (0%) | 6 (8%) | 20 (6%) | 30 (0%) |
| Tana River | 79 (48%) | 11 (7%) | 18 (0%) | 38 (0%) | 8 (22%) | 22 (1%) | 31 (0%) |
| Tharaka-Nithi | 283 (67%) | 14 (6%) | 38 (5%) | 58 (0%) | 9 (15%) | 27 (10%) | 33 (0%) |
| Trans Nzoia | 123 (33%) | 9 (0%) | 27 (0%) | 51 (0%) | 9 (21%) | 20 (12%) | 35 (0%) |
| Turkana | 16 (3%) | 11 (0%) | 0 | 61 (0%) | 19 (100%) | 26 (0%) | 36 (0%) |
| Uasin Gishu | 140 (28%) | 14 (5%) | 42 (5%) | 88 (0%) | 13 (43%) | 25 (9%) | 50 (0%) |
| Vihiga | 258 (61%) | 14 (2%) | 38 (3%) | 56 (0%) | 11 (29%) | 28 (9%) | 43 (0%) |
| Wajir | 94 (43%) | 12 (0%) | 29 (0%) | 51 (0%) | 5 (22%) | 21 (0%) | 28 (0%) |
| West Pokot | 6 (1%) | 11 (0%) | 20 (0%) | 0 | 0 | 4 (0%) | 44 (0%) |

Table D-2. March 2019 dashboard

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|----------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| All | 14,123 (57%) | 19 (15%) | 47 (20%) | 70 (0%) | 17 (50%) | 32 (19%) | 44 (0%) |
| Baringo | 195 (29%) | 13 (2%) | 32 (4%) | 58 (0%) | 13 (28%) | 25 (5%) | 34 (0%) |
| Bomet | 188 (30%) | 11 (0%) | 26 (0%) | 51 (0%) | 12 (25%) | 24 (3%) | 33 (0%) |
| Bungoma | 320 (39%) | 14 (3%) | 32 (3%) | 67 (0%) | 14 (35%) | 26 (5%) | 42 (0%) |
| Busia | 84 (19%) | 11 (0%) | 40 (0%) | 84 (0%) | 15 (29%) | 34 (16%) | 52 (0%) |
| Eldoret APBET | 417 (571%) | 30 (44%) | 66 (52%) | 84 (0%) | 25 (77%) | 40 (37%) | 45 (0%) |
| Elgeyo-Marakwet | 193 (49%) | 13 (4%) | 39 (11%) | 54 (0%) | 18 (54%) | 27 (9%) | 32 (0%) |
| Embu | 80 (20%) | 12 (0%) | 31 (13%) | 48 (0%) | 10 (14%) | 21 (6%) | 37 (0%) |
| Garissa | 125 (44%) | 17 (12%) | 36 (6%) | 60 (0%) | 13 (35%) | 21 (2%) | 41 (0%) |
| Homa Bay | 713 (80%) | 18 (8%) | 44 (14%) | 70 (0%) | 18 (56%) | 33 (15%) | 50 (0%) |
| Isiolo | 66 (59%) | 13 (0%) | 28 (0%) | 37 (0%) | 10 (16%) | 18 (2%) | 31 (0%) |
| Kajiado | 59 (13%) | 14 (11%) | 45 (16%) | 70 (0%) | 12 (30%) | 26 (7%) | 33 (0%) |
| Kakamega | 606 (68%) | 12 (2%) | 31 (8%) | 56 (0%) | 12 (32%) | 23 (7%) | 33 (0%) |
| Kakuma Turkana | 42 (0%) | 2 (0%) | 15 (0%) | 29 (0%) | 4 (4%) | 15 (7%) | 13 (0%) |
| Kericho | 210 (38%) | 16 (8%) | 38 (10%) | 58 (0%) | 17 (46%) | 28 (9%) | 40 (0%) |
| Kiambu | 371 (74%) | 20 (11%) | 48 (14%) | 78 (0%) | 18 (54%) | 35 (15%) | 49 (0%) |
| Kilifi | 100 (16%) | 13 (3%) | 40 (10%) | 84 (0%) | 15 (38%) | 32 (22%) | 39 (0%) |
| Kirinyaga | 15 (7%) | 19 (16%) | 61 (33%) | 55 (0%) | 12 (11%) | 40 (33%) | 46 (0%) |
| Kisii | 548 (79%) | 16 (6%) | 41 (6%) | 71 (0%) | 14 (34%) | 31 (8%) | 39 (0%) |
| Kisumu | 356 (55%) | 16 (9%) | 37 (11%) | 67 (0%) | 13 (33%) | 28 (11%) | 34 (0%) |
| Kisumu APBET | 683 (440%) | 28 (35%) | 65 (42%) | 89 (0%) | 21 (63%) | 39 (30%) | 52 (0%) |
| Kitui | 240 (17%) | 18 (12%) | 52 (24%) | 72 (0%) | 17 (43%) | 34 (19%) | 57 (0%) |
| Kwale | 77 (18%) | 15 (7%) | 31 (9%) | 23 (0%) | 14 (30%) | 22 (7%) | 33 (0%) |
| Laikipia | 98 (33%) | 14 (11%) | 49 (26%) | 76 (0%) | 14 (33%) | 27 (17%) | 42 (0%) |
| Lamu | 43 (39%) | 12 (0%) | 18 (3%) | 48 (0%) | 10 (6%) | 23 (11%) | 41 (0%) |

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|--|----------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| Machakos | 197 (22%) | 14 (8%) | 41 (17%) | 61 (0%) | 11 (24%) | 26 (12%) | 39 (0%) |
| Makueni | 226 (24%) | 14 (2%) | 44 (8%) | 72 (0%) | 16 (48%) | 30 (6%) | 45 (0%) |
| Mandera | 125 (62%) | 17 (1%) | 40 (1%) | 70 (0%) | 21 (82%) | 35 (8%) | 43 (0%) |
| Marsabit | 121 (70%) | 13 (6%) | 25 (0%) | 46 (0%) | 13 (35%) | 23 (3%) | 33 (0%) |
| Meru | 45 (6%) | 13 (9%) | 32 (4%) | 41 (0%) | 14 (33%) | 24 (7%) | 29 (0%) |
| Migori | 403 (64%) | 20 (16%) | 50 (20%) | 79 (0%) | 20 (66%) | 41 (37%) | 59 (0%) |
| Mombasa | 66 (66%) | 18 (16%) | 40 (29%) | 57 (0%) | 10 (16%) | 26 (11%) | 31 (0%) |
| Mombasa APBET | 500 (242%) | 22 (17%) | 59 (33%) | 77 (0%) | 25 (81%) | 43 (58%) | 58 (0%) |
| Murang'a | 307 (57%) | 14 (7%) | 42 (7%) | 65 (0%) | 13 (27%) | 32 (15%) | 37 (0%) |
| Nairobi | 17 (6%) | 18 (0%) | 28 (0%) | 73 (0%) | 28 (100%) | 22 (8%) | 31 (0%) |
| Nairobi APBET | 2,595 (244%) | 28 (36%) | 62 (43%) | 83 (0%) | 21 (62%) | 38 (31%) | 49 (0%) |
| Nakuru | 370 (53%) | 15 (12%) | 27 (4%) | 49 (0%) | 14 (39%) | 21 (8%) | 31 (0%) |
| Nakuru APBET | 273 (275%) | 34 (51%) | 66 (55%) | 78 (0%) | 24 (68%) | 36 (30%) | 42 (0%) |
| Nandi | 96 (13%) | 13 (0%) | 32 (7%) | 63 (0%) | 13 (39%) | 25 (6%) | 31 (0%) |
| Narok | 58 (8%) | 12 (0%) | 37 (8%) | 49 (0%) | 16 (50%) | 24 (3%) | 32 (0%) |
| Nyamira | 688 (167%) | 18 (10%) | 45 (9%) | 75 (0%) | 18 (59%) | 36 (21%) | 50 (0%) |
| Nyandarua | 220 (62%) | 16 (4%) | 43 (13%) | 60 (0%) | 17 (50%) | 31 (11%) | 38 (0%) |
| Nyeri | 109 (27%) | 18 (9%) | 39 (9%) | 69 (0%) | 16 (43%) | 27 (10%) | 35 (0%) |
| Samburu | 177 (104%) | 14 (1%) | 37 (0%) | 68 (0%) | 14 (50%) | 32 (4%) | 45 (0%) |
| Siaya | 659 (99%) | 15 (7%) | 40 (8%) | 69 (0%) | 14 (38%) | 29 (10%) | 44 (0%) |
| Taita-Taveta | 22 (10%) | 14 (16%) | 34 (11%) | 53 (0%) | 2 (0%) | 12 (0%) | 39 (0%) |
| Tana River | 59 (36%) | 14 (4%) | 28 (0%) | 45 (0%) | 16 (57%) | 22 (3%) | 35 (0%) |
| Tharaka-Nithi | 114 (27%) | 19 (7%) | 52 (23%) | 60 (0%) | 13 (35%) | 28 (13%) | 42 (0%) |
| Trans Nzoia | 51 (13%) | 11 (0%) | 36 (11%) | 49 (0%) | 14 (40%) | 27 (13%) | 31 (0%) |
| Turkana | 35 (7%) | 17 (7%) | 61 (26%) | 38 (0%) | 19 (61%) | 31 (4%) | 50 (0%) |
| Uasin Gishu | 183 (37%) | 13 (3%) | 48 (15%) | 73 (0%) | 16 (39%) | 27 (12%) | 44 (0%) |

| County | No. of classroom visits | Fluency rates and percent of learners at KNEC benchmark, by language and grade | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|--|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|
| | | English | | | Kiswahili | | |
| | | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 |
| Vihiga | 418 (99%) | 16 (6%) | 42 (7%) | 60 (0%) | 15 (45%) | 32 (19%) | 48 (0%) |
| Wajir | 128 (59%) | 12 (0%) | 32 (4%) | 54 (0%) | 13 (25%) | 20 (3%) | 33 (0%) |
| West Pokot | 32 (5%) | 9 (0%) | 21 (0%) | 38 (0%) | 17 (66%) | 19 (0%) | 32 (0%) |

Annex E. Performance Data Tables – Tusome-Wide Indicators

Performance Data Table 1a – Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with US Government (USG) support (regular)

Strategic Objective: Reading outcomes for grade 1, 2, and 3 pupils improved

| Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with US Government (USG) support | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Indicator 2 Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) reference: F 3.2.1-35; Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) reference: CDCS 2.2.0.8 | | | | | | |
| UNIT Number of primary pupils attending grades 1, 2, and 3 | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| | National | Learners in public schools | March 31 2019 | 1,569,588 | 1,647,306 | 3,216,894 |
| | Alternative Provision of Basic Education and Training (APBET) – Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret | Learners in APBET schools | March 31 2019 | 68,023 | 67,516 | 135,539 |
| | Totals | | | 1,637,611 | 1,714,822 | 3,352,433 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|
| | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 1,689,828 | 1,763,304 | | | 1,637,611 | 1,714,822 | | | | | 1,587,595 | 1,675,846 | 1,587,595 | 1,675,846 | 1,587,595 | 1,675,846 |
| Baringo | | | 27,954 | 30,557 | | | 27,490 | 29,205 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 39,490 | 40,873 | | | 37,178 | 38,740 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 98,005 | 96,002 | | | 81,104 | 82,788 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 52,017 | 51,065 | | | 43,319 | 43,728 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | 3,008 | 3,064 | | | 3,137 | 3,077 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 21,811 | 22,803 | | | 18,571 | 19,803 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 18,160 | 19,813 | | | 15,805 | 17,629 | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Garissa | | | 11,033 | 14,767 | | | 12,370 | 16,843 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 52,165 | 55,022 | | | 54,688 | 56,778 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 5,916 | 5,661 | | | 6,523 | 6,346 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 23,669 | 25,138 | | | 24,335 | 25,899 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 96,159 | 97,747 | | | 102,508 | 103,741 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 35,220 | 36,362 | | | 35,128 | 36,231 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 34,982 | 36,492 | | | 36,233 | 37,088 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 60,459 | 62,787 | | | 64,001 | 66,913 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 12,383 | 12,914 | | | 12,230 | 12,874 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 50,307 | 51,164 | | | 52,345 | 52,989 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 45,789 | 46,810 | | | 46,535 | 47,227 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | 6,445 | 6,469 | | | 6,327 | 6,136 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 56,845 | 59,295 | | | 55,227 | 58,210 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 35,765 | 37,204 | | | 38,330 | 39,932 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 14,864 | 15,836 | | | 15,636 | 16,368 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 5,760 | 5,978 | | | 6,145 | 6,341 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 41,474 | 45,214 | | | 44,729 | 49,578 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 39,393 | 43,498 | | | 39,375 | 42,081 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 15,880 | 26,138 | | | 14,912 | 24,718 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 11,369 | 11,964 | | | 11,291 | 12,187 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 46,402 | 47,445 | | | 48,194 | 48,341 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 50,186 | 50,696 | | | 49,856 | 50,315 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 10,281 | 10,404 | | | 10,510 | 10,083 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | 6,851 | 6,797 | | | 6,894 | 7,021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 29,964 | 32,194 | | | 30,926 | 32,286 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 30,917 | 30,613 | | | 32,812 | 32,433 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | 46,498 | 46,218 | | | 47,890 | 47,538 | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|---|----------|--------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 63,899 | 66,786 | | | 66,493 | 68,641 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | 3,649 | 3,752 | | | 3,775 | 3,744 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 62,975 | 62,551 | | | 36,850 | 38,966 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 49,948 | 52,961 | | | 52,334 | 55,409 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 25,961 | 26,450 | | | 28,950 | 28,260 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 20,153 | 21,270 | | | 20,562 | 21,568 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 17,540 | 17,670 | | | 17,592 | 18,254 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 9,974 | 10,780 | | | 11,302 | 11,986 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 46,379 | 48,274 | | | 48,530 | 49,525 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 10,547 | 11,052 | | | 11,608 | 11,840 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 11,134 | 11,428 | | | 11,626 | 12,355 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 14,226 | 15,310 | | | 14,701 | 15,753 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 46,682 | 46,260 | | | 39,973 | 41,584 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 41,358 | 47,133 | | | 33,250 | 38,136 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 36,632 | 38,113 | | | 29,216 | 30,792 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 32,736 | 33,568 | | | 29,153 | 29,986 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 11,769 | 16,114 | | | 11,395 | 16,795 | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 46,845 | 48,828 | | | 37,747 | 39,761 | | | | | | | | | | |

* This does not apply for indicators that cannot be disaggregated by sex.

Performance Data Table 1b – Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with US Government (USG) support (SNE)

Strategic Objective: Reading outcomes for grade 1, 2 and 3 pupils improved

| Number of learners receiving reading interventions at primary level with USG support Indicator 2 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-35; CDCS reference: CDCS 2.2.0.8 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------|-------|-------|----------|
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| Number of primary pupils attending grades 1, 2 and 3 | National | Hearing impaired (HI) learners | March 31 2019 | 1,883 | 2,119 | 4,002 |
| | National | Visually impaired (VI) learners | March 31 2019 | 415 | 444 | 859 |
| | National | Hearing impaired / visually impaired (HI/VI) learners | March 31 2019 | 53 | 70 | 123 |
| | Totals | | | 2,351 | 2,633 | 4,184 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 2,351 | 2,633 | | | 2,351 | 2,633 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 54 | 42 | | | 54 | 42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 14 | 16 | | | 14 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 81 | 77 | | | 81 | 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 137 | 133 | | | 137 | 133 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 31 | 23 | | | 31 | 23 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 14 | 14 | | | 14 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 40 | 50 | | | 40 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*; Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Homa Bay | | | 54 | 58 | | | 54 | 58 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 66 | 112 | | | 66 | 112 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 29 | 18 | | | 29 | 18 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 74 | 75 | | | 74 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 39 | 58 | | | 39 | 58 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 68 | 78 | | | 68 | 78 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 44 | 44 | | | 44 | 44 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 36 | 39 | | | 36 | 39 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 59 | 101 | | | 59 | 101 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 82 | 74 | | | 82 | 74 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 56 | 65 | | | 56 | 65 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 44 | 36 | | | 44 | 36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 17 | 14 | | | 17 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 41 | 41 | | | 41 | 41 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 52 | 56 | | | 52 | 56 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 40 | 56 | | | 40 | 56 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 42 | 60 | | | 42 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 59 | 54 | | | 59 | 54 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 52 | 49 | | | 52 | 49 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 21 | 34 | | | 21 | 34 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 58 | 40 | | | 58 | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nairobi | | | 28 | 21 | | | 28 | 21 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | | 84 | 95 | | | 84 | 95 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 115 | 124 | | | 115 | 124 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 101 | 182 | | | 101 | 182 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 18 | 9 | | | 18 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 54 | 54 | | | 54 | 54 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 42 | 42 | | | 42 | 42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 49 | 98 | | | 49 | 98 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 86 | 80 | | | 86 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 41 | 77 | | | 41 | 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 14 | 15 | | | 14 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 30 | 23 | | | 30 | 23 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 56 | 65 | | | 56 | 65 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 23 | 18 | | | 23 | 18 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 72 | 72 | | | 72 | 72 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 51 | 47 | | | 51 | 47 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 55 | 62 | | | 55 | 62 | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 30 | 33 | | | 30 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | |

* This does not apply for indicators that cannot be disaggregated by sex.

Performance Data Table 2a – Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili (regular)

Intermediate Result (IR) I: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili IR I.1 Indicator 3 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-33 | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | Number | Subtotal |
| Number of English and Kiswahili textbooks and other teaching / learning materials | National | Textbooks in public schools | December 31 2019 | 24,520,952 | 24,520,952 |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | Textbooks in APBET schools | December 31 2019 | 716,913 | 716,913 |
| | Totals | | | 25,237,865 | 25,237,865 |

Results:

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|-----------------|----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| National | 0 | 25,237,865 | | | | | 5,398,194 | 5,398,194 | 28,689,436 |
| Baringo | | 465,179 | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | 637,421 | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | 1,213,156 | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | 643,376 | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | 31,742 | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | 302,966 | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | 308,015 | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | 202,629 | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | 812,970 | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | 105,479 | | | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Kajiado | | 347,982 | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | 1,295,895 | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | 528,268 | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | 554,253 | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | 710,583 | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | 214,000 | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | 761,740 | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | 864,142 | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | 67,743 | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | 1,083,341 | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | 465,370 | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | 318,647 | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | 81,458 | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | 800,918 | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | 763,953 | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | 293,610 | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | 174,019 | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | 727,846 | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | 678,277 | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | 198,592 | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | 80,249 | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | 457,243 | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | 633,364 | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | 492,663 | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | 1,045,453 | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | 44,516 | | | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Nandi | | 781,369 | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | 686,697 | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | 365,743 | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | 304,409 | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | 284,799 | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | 167,913 | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | 667,984 | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | 168,485 | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | 161,095 | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | 278,081 | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | 581,724 | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | 533,158 | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | 511,402 | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | 473,840 | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | 253,224 | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | 610,884 | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 2b – Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili (SNE)

IR 1: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance in English and Kiswahili | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|
| IR 1.1 Indicator 3 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-33 | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | Number | Subtotal |
| Number of English and Kiswahili textbooks and other teaching / learning materials | Nationally | Hearing impaired adapted material | September 30 2018 | 6,298 | 6,298 |
| | Nationally | Visually impaired adapted material | September 30 2018 | 2,407 | 2,407 |
| | Totals | | | 8,705 | 8,705 |
| | | | | | |

Results:

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|-----------------|----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| National | 0 | 8,705 | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | 169 | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | 573 | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | 309 | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | Not applicable | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | 166 | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | 76 | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | 143 | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | 212 | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | 94 | | | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Kajiado | | 301 | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | 392 | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | 178 | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | 220 | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | 182 | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | 321 | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | 278 | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | Not applicable | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | 360 | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | 177 | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | 106 | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | 41 | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | 141 | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | 120 | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | 107 | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | 244 | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | 272 | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | 108 | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | Not applicable | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | 79 | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | 142 | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | Not applicable | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | 95 | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | Not applicable | | | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Nandi | | 565 | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | 19 | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | 114 | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | 328 | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | 377 | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | 68 | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | 78 | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | 308 | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | 191 | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | 165 | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | 333 | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | 118 | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | 77 | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 3 – Number of schools using information and communication technology (ICT) due to USG support

IR 1: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Number of schools using ICT due to USG support IR 1.1 Indicator 4 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-36 | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date, and gender | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | Number | Subtotal |
| Number of schools supported using tablets | National (public) | No. of public schools supported using tablets | March 31 2019 | 1,113 | 1,113 |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | No. of APBET schools supported using tablets | March 31 2019 | 6,013 | 6,013 |
| | Totals | | | 7,126 | 7,126 |

Results:

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|-----------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| National | 0 | 24,136 ⁶ | | 7,126 ⁷ | | | 24,136 | 24,136 | 24,136 |
| Baringo | | 703 | | 148 | | | | | |
| Bomet | | 672 | | 148 | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | 766 | | 171 | | | | | |
| Busia | | 426 | | 89 | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | 72 | | 68 | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | 390 | | 130 | | | | | |
| Embu | | 385 | | 69 | | | | | |

⁶ Previously data for all schools were reported. The figures for the January–March quarter show only schools visited by Curriculum Support Officers for lesson observations.

⁷ These numbers represent the total unique schools by county supported using tablets through lesson observations in Term I 2019.

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Garissa | | 201 | | 42 | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | 878 | | 328 | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | 109 | | 40 | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | 440 | | 55 | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | 888 | | 293 | | | | | |
| Kericho | | 547 | | 100 | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | 453 | | 190 | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | 535 | | 94 | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | 192 | | 66 | | | | | |
| Kisii | | 697 | | 297 | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | 615 | | 215 | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | 172 | | 134 | | | | | |
| Kitui | | 1,398 | | 204 | | | | | |
| Kwale | | 411 | | 80 | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | 280 | | 95 | | | | | |
| Lamu | | 107 | | 27 | | | | | |
| Machakos | | 847 | | 103 | | | | | |
| Makueni | | 896 | | 228 | | | | | |
| Mandera | | 242 | | 100 | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | 183 | | 89 | | | | | |
| Meru | | 728 | | 70 | | | | | |
| Migori | | 609 | | 241 | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | 96 | | 39 | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | 173 | | 141 | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | 509 | | 108 | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | 194 | | 39 | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Nairobi APBET | | 993 | | 697 | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | 718 | | 199 | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | 90 | | 73 | | | | | |
| Nandi | | 744 | | 158 | | | | | |
| Narok | | 676 | | 91 | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | 404 | | 255 | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | 347 | | 103 | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | 385 | | 115 | | | | | |
| Samburu | | 164 | | 76 | | | | | |
| Siaya | | 653 | | 317 | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | 212 | | 92 | | | | | |
| Tana River | | 174 | | 41 | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | 407 | | 194 | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | 365 | | 55 | | | | | |
| Turkana | | 369 | | 26 | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | 467 | | 107 | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | 385 | | 185 | | | | | |
| Wajir | | 224 | | 69 | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | 545 | | 32 | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 4a – Number of teachers / teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (grade 1, 2, and 3 regular teacher training)

IR 1: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Number of teachers / teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| IR 1.2 Indicator 5 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-31; CDCS reference: CDCS 2.2.1.4 | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| Number of grade 1, 2, and 3 teachers trained | National (Tusome regions training sites) | Training of teachers in public schools | December 31 2018 | 54,639 | 20,710 | 75,349 |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | Training of teachers in APBET schools | December 31 2018 | 3,477 | 605 | 4,082 |
| | Totals | | | 58,116 | 21,315 | 79,431 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--------|----------------|--------|------------------------|--------|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 58,116 | 21,315 | | | | | | | | | 53,752 | 19,667 | 53,752 | 19,667 | 53,752 | 19,667 |
| Baringo | | | 1,407 | 636 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 1,610 | 487 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 2,548 | 618 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 1,387 | 360 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | 214 | 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 936 | 292 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 929 | 277 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 212 | 443 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 1,584 | 953 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Isiolo | | | 155 | 174 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 775 | 452 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 2,854 | 651 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 1,399 | 330 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 1,639 | 112 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 1,146 | 613 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 596 | 186 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 1,599 | 689 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 1,583 | 457 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | 386 | 91 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 2,670 | 1,310 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 830 | 448 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 639 | 254 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 199 | 95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 2,131 | 545 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 2,134 | 630 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 184 | 644 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 178 | 301 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 2,089 | 596 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 1,236 | 694 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 350 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | 344 | 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 1,518 | 289 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 1,030 | 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | 2,309 | 387 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 2,320 | 524 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | 224 | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 1,902 | 516 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 1,151 | 779 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 915 | 316 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 940 | 224 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 1,115 | 251 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 200 | 270 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 1,346 | 629 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 533 | 163 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 259 | 218 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 970 | 376 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 1,160 | 263 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 472 | 609 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 1,604 | 195 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 1,067 | 272 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 208 | 530 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 930 | 969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* This does not apply for indicators that cannot be disaggregated by sex.

Performance Data Table 4b – Number of teachers / teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (grade 1 and 2 SNE teacher training)

IR 1: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Number of teachers teaching assistants who have successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------|-----|-----|----------|
| IR 1.2 Indicator 5 FAF reference: F 3.2.1-31; CDCS reference: CDCS 2.2.1.4 | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| Number of grade 1, 2, and 3 teachers trained | National (Tusome regions training sites) | Training of grade 1 and 2 teachers of SNE | December 31 2018 | 918 | 307 | 1,225 |
| | Totals | | | 918 | 307 | 1,225 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 918 | 307 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 36 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 21 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 30 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 15 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 23 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 18 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 3 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 29 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 7 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Kajiado | | | 10 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 33 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 28 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 21 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 9 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 9 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 40 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 28 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 43 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 15 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 12 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 44 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 42 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 5 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 26 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 29 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 11 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 31 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 15 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | | 25 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 30 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 23 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 17 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 15 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 19 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 7 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 29 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 10 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 8 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 19 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 17 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 10 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 22 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 14 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 2 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 13 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

* This does not apply for indicators that cannot be disaggregated by sex.

Performance Data Table 5 – Percent of Curriculum Support Officers (CSOs) supported by USG programs who meet the standard of 15 classroom observation visits per month

IR 1: Improved supervision, support, and delivery of reading instruction to target pupils

| Percent of CSOs supported by USG programs who meet the standard of 15 classroom observation visits per month | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| IR 1.3 Indicator 6 CDCS reference: CDCS 2.2.1.5 | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | Number | Subtotal |
| Number of schools supported using tablets | National | Proportion of public schools | March 31 2019 | 84.1 (70 / 83) | 84.1 (70 / 83) |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | Proportion of APBET schools | March 31 2019 | 11.9 (140 / 1,170) | 11.9 (140 / 1,170) |
| | Totals (average) | | | 18.8 (237 / 1,260) | 18.8 (237 / 1,260) |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|--|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| National | 0 | 16.3 | | 18.8 | | | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Baringo | | 6.1 | | 5.1 | | | | | |
| Bomet | | 6.5 | | 8.1 | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | 11.1 | | 8.3 | | | | | |
| Busia | | 5.9 | | 8.8 | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | 100.0 | | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | 3.8 | | 3.8 | | | | | |
| Embu | | 0.0 | | 2.5 | | | | | |
| Garissa | | 12.5 | | 3.1 | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | 35.7 | | 32.1 | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|--|----------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | 25.0 | | 6.3 | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | 21.6 | | 28.4 | | | | | |
| Kericho | | 16.1 | | 14.5 | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | 25.0 | | 20.6 | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | 0.0 | | 3.1 | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | 0.0 | | 13.6 | | | | | |
| Kisii | | 8.9 | | 19.3 | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | 8.8 | | 20.6 | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | 100.0 | | 75.0 | | | | | |
| Kitui | | 3.8 | | 8.7 | | | | | |
| Kwale | | 0.0 | | 10.7 | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | 5.0 | | 7.9 | | | | | |
| Lamu | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Machakos | | 0.0 | | 2.4 | | | | | |
| Makueni | | 13.6 | | 11.4 | | | | | |
| Mandera | | 10.0 | | 25.0 | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | 0.0 | | 12.5 | | | | | |
| Meru | | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Migori | | 7.7 | | 18.8 | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | 20.0 | | 15.0 | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | 80.0 | | 70.0 | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | 22.6 | | 4.7 | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | 0.0 | | 2.9 | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | 81.5 | | 75.5 | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|--|----------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| Nakuru | | 8.1 | | 13.5 | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | 40.0 | | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Nandi | | 0.0 | | 1.2 | | | | | |
| Narok | | 0.0 | | 1.5 | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | 52.2 | | 52.2 | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | 0.0 | | 2.9 | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | 4.5 | | 9.1 | | | | | |
| Samburu | | 25.0 | | 12.5 | | | | | |
| Siaya | | 26.5 | | 41.2 | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | 0.0 | | 13.6 | | | | | |
| Tana River | | 0.0 | | 11.1 | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | 8.7 | | 21.7 | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | 0.0 | | 7.5 | | | | | |
| Turkana | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | 4.2 | | 6.3 | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | 33.3 | | 36.1 | | | | | |
| Wajir | | 12.5 | | 10.0 | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6a – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Curriculum Support Officers' and head teachers' trainings)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | | |
| Number of head teachers trained | Geographic Location | | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| | Tusome regions training sites | | Training of head teachers in public schools | December 31 2018 | 4,728 | 18,254 | 22,982 |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | | Training of head teachers in APBET schools | December 31 2018 | 597 | 504 | 1,101 |
| | Totals | | | | 5,325 | 18,758 | 24,083 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--------|----------------|--------|------------------------|--------|
| | W | M | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | | | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 5,325 | 18,758 | | | | | | | | | 4,910 | 18,635 | 4,910 | 18,635 | 4,910 | 18,635 |
| Baringo | | | 92 | 608 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 99 | 579 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 187 | 607 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 83 | 353 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | 30 | 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 64 | 317 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 92 | 283 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 11 | 160 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 153 | 736 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|-----------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Isiolo | | | 22 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 60 | 345 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 170 | 702 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 87 | 427 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 163 | 305 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 120 | 429 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 61 | 150 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 121 | 562 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 143 | 480 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | 84 | 68 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 250 | 1,058 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 65 | 319 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 69 | 221 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 26 | 77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 171 | 697 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 150 | 744 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 7 | 205 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 21 | 143 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 157 | 560 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 124 | 464 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 60 | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | 77 | 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 134 | 377 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 268 | 187 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | 369 | 307 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 186 | 586 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | 37 | 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 153 | 597 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 83 | 566 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 91 | 335 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 70 | 297 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 137 | 280 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 15 | 139 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 117 | 535 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 55 | 203 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 31 | 127 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 79 | 337 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 89 | 293 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 75 | 348 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 119 | 389 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 90 | 290 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 19 | 197 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 89 | 460 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6b – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (CSOs' and Instructional Coaches' [ICs'] trainings)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| Number of CSOs and ICs trained | National | CSO training | December 31 2018 | 393 | 945 | 1,338 |
| | APBET (Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru, and Eldoret) | Instructional Coach training | December 31 2018 | 40 | 47 | 87 |
| | Totals | | | 433 | 992 | 1,425 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 433 | 992 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 12 | 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 6 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 15 | 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 5 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 5 | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 6 | 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 4 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 13 | 39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Isiolo | | | 2 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 8 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 16 | 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 8 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 17 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 4 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 5 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 29 | 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 16 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | 4 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 9 | 42 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 3 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 11 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 8 | 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 10 | 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 0 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 3 | 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 17 | 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 13 | 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | 4 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 19 | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 13 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | 27 | 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 10 | 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 8 | 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 8 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 8 | 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 4 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 12 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 2 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 11 | 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 3 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 2 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 8 | 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 10 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 3 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 11 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 8 | 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 5 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 2 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6c – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (MoE / SAGA officials in CSOs' and ICs' trainings)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|------------------|-----|-----|----------|
| IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | | | |
| Number of MoE / SAGA officials trained | Geographic Location | | Activity Title | | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| | Tusome regions training venues | | MoE/SAGA officials in CSOs' and ICs' trainings | | December 31 2018 | 222 | 386 | 608 |
| | Totals | | | | | 222 | 386 | 608 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 222 | 386 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 5 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 6 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 6 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 6 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 5 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 4 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 7 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Kakamega | | | 5 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 4 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 10 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 5 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 4 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 6 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 4 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 2 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 4 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 2 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 3 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 3 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 4 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 6 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 7 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 3 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 4 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 23 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 4 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 3 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 5 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 2 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 4 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 5 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 6 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 3 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 4 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 3 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 8 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 4 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 5 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 3 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 4 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 5 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6d – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Quality Assurance and Standards Officers' [QASOs'] training)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|-------------------|-----|-----|----------|
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | | |
| Number of MoE / SAGA officials trained | Geographic Location | | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| | Tusome regions training venues | | Quality Assurance and Standards Officers' training | September 30 2018 | 111 | 377 | 488 |
| | Totals | | | | 111 | 377 | 488 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 111 | 377 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 2 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 3 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 4 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 3 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 2 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 0 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Kakamega | | | 3 | 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 3 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 8 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 5 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 1 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 2 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 1 | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 4 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 1 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 5 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 1 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 5 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 17 | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 5 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 2 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 3 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 1 | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 1 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 1 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 2 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 4 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 3 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 2 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6e – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Teachers' Service Commission Sub-County Director [TSC-SCD] training)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|----------|
| IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | | | |
| UNIT Number of MoE / Autonomous Government Agency officials trained | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | | Activity Title | | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| | Tusome regions training venues | | TSC-SCD training | | September 30 2018 | 41 | 117 | 158 |
| | Totals | | | | | 41 | 117 | 158 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| National | 0 | 0 | 41 | 117 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 4 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Isiolo | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kakamega | | | 3 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 1 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 0 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 6f – Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (Sub-County Directors of Education [SCDE] training)

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|-------------------|----|-----|----------|
| IR 2.1 Indicator 7 FAF reference: F 3.2.1 – 03 | | | | | | |
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | W | M | Subtotal |
| Number of MoE / SAGA officials trained | Tusome regions training venues | SCDE training | September 30 2018 | 43 | 225 | 268 |
| | Totals | | | 43 | 225 | 268 |

Results:

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
| | W | M | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | |
| | | | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | |
| National | 0 | 0 | 43 | 225 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baringo | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bomet | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bungoma | | | 1 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Busia | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eldoret APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Embu | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garissa | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Homa Bay | | | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isiolo | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kajiado | | | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Kakamega | | | 3 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kericho | | | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiambu | | | 3 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilifi | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kirinyaga | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisii | | | 1 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kisumu APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kitui | | | 2 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kwale | | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laikipia | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lamu | | | 0 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machakos | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Makueni | | | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mandera | | | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marsabit | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meru | | | 2 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Migori | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mombasa APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Murang'a | | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi | | | 3 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nairobi APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Additional Criteria Sex*: Women (W), Men (M) | Baseline | | Results in Prior Periods | | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | | FY 2019 Target | | FY 2020 Target | | End of Activity Target | |
|--|----------|---|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|----------|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | | | Achieved | | Target | | Achieved | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | | Target | |
| | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M |
| Nakuru | | | 2 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakuru APBET | | | Not applicable | Not applicable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nandi | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Narok | | | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyamira | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyandarua | | | 0 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nyeri | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Samburu | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Siaya | | | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Taita-Taveta | | | 0 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tana River | | | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tharaka-Nithi | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trans Nzoia | | | 1 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Turkana | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uasin Gishu | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vihiga | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wajir | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Pokot | | | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Data Table 7 – Number of target institutions that have improved capacity as a result of USG assistance

IR 2: Improved government capacity in target directorates, to sustainably improve reading outcomes

| Number of target institutions that have improved capacity as a result of USG assistance IR 2.1 Indicator 8 CDCS reference: CDCS 2.2.1.6 | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------|--------|----------|
| UNIT | DISAGGREGATE BY: Location, event, date and gender | | | | |
| | Geographic Location | Activity Title | Date | Number | Subtotal |
| Number of target institutions that have improved capacity | National | Capacity building of MoE | March 31 2019 | 4 | 4 |
| | | Capacity building of TSC | March 31 2019 | 4 | 4 |
| | | Capacity building of Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) | March 31 2019 | 1 | 1 |
| | | Capacity building of Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) | March 31 2019 | 1 | 1 |
| | | Capacity building of Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) | March 31 2019 | 1 | 1 |
| | Totals | | | | 11 |

Results:

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---|----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| National (MoE, TSC, and other SAGAs) | 0 | 11 | | 11 | | | | | |
| Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| MoE-Directors | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| County Directors of Education (CDEs) | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| SCDEs | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |

| | Baseline | Results in Prior Periods | This Reporting Period 31-Mar-19 | | Reporting Period 30-Jun-19 | Reporting Period 30-Sep-19 | FY 2019 Target | FY 2020 Target | End of Activity Target |
|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| | | Achieved | Target | Achieved | Target | Target | Target | Target | Target |
| TSC-County Director | | | | | | | | | |
| TSC Sub-County Director | | | | | | | | | |
| TSC County Staffing Officer | | | | | | | | | |
| TSC Curriculum Support Officers | | | | | | | | | |
| KICD | | | | | | | | | |
| KEMI | | | | | | | | | |
| KISE | | | | | | | | | |