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Acronyms and Glossary

BRMS: Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards (MoES document setting out national education priorities)
CCT: Coordinating Centre Tutor
DEO: District Education Officer
DIS: District Inspector of Schools
DRC: Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire)
EGRA: Early Grade Reading Assessment (international tool for checking learner reading ability using 9 different tests)
EGRA-Lite: A limited version of EGRA normally including 5 tests
ELEP: Early Learning Education Programme
LCD: Link Community Development
LCDU: Link Community Development (Uganda)
Mgt: Management
MoES: Ministry of Education and Sports
NPS: Non-project School or Control School
P1, P3: Denote Primary Class 1 and Primary Class 3
PLE: Primary Leaving Examination - conducted in P7
PS: Project School – either a TOLSIP or ELEP School
PTA: Parent Teachers’ Association
RTI: Research Triangle Institute
SHRP: School Health and Reading Project (USAID funded project being delivered by RTI across half the districts in Uganda between 2012 and 2017)
SMC: School Management Committee – the official governing structure of all public schools
SIP: School Improvement Plan
SPAM: School Performance Appraisal Meeting
SPR: School Performance Review (an LCD school functionality instrument)
Tangerine: The data analysis platform for EGRA
TOLSIP: Tullow Oil/Link Community Development School Improvement Project
USAID: United States government aid agency
1. Executive Summary

Link Community Development Uganda (LCDU) has been implementing two innovative projects in sixteen government primary schools in the two districts of Buliisa and Hoima over the last year. The Tullow Oil/Link Community Development School Improvement Project (TOLSIP) has been funded by Tullow Oil and the Early Learning Education Programme (ELEP) by TrustAfrica. While these two projects have different funders they have similar objectives, operate in the same two districts and have been delivered by the same LCDU team.

This report has been commissioned by Link Community Development International (LCDI) to report back to the funders on the effect of their funding and to measure the impact of the intervention on the performance of learners in the 16 schools and the improved functionality of these schools. This report uses the findings in a baseline report undertaken by the same consultant in May 2014 to create the basis for determining the impact of the project on the target schools and learners over a period of seven months (May – November 2014).

This summative evaluation draws on School Performance Review (SPR) and Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) results as well as primary data collection in a sample of the schools, the district offices and in LCDU. It also makes use of documentation generated during these two projects.

The key findings are that:

- A total of just over 20 hours’ one-on-one support during 2014 for each Grade 1 and Grade 3 teacher in the rural schools that were part of the project, irrespective of their training and teaching experience was adequate to improve their learners’ literacy skills significantly. All the five target schools which received the most focused literacy support saw large increases in their literacy scores over a period of seven months. This level of improvement was not seen in the control schools.

- While all district and school based personnel believed that the project has impacted positively on school functionality, improvement in school functionality was not consistent as measured by SPR. Any conclusion is tentative as it appears that early improvement by schools in the first stages of the TOLSIP Project was often lost or at best plateaued in the later years. However, this may be more a factor of changes in the SPR data collection personnel and the number of indicators used than any real reflection of the schools.

- Classroom observations and interviews with educators indicate that the LCD intervention has improved learner performance, however this is not clearly and consistently reflected in Primary Leaving Exam (PLE) results for these schools. Interventions in support of early grade reading and mathematics are only likely to influence PLE results in another three or four years.

- LCD’s role in support of often neglected rural primary schools is valued by the staff in those schools, the communities served by the schools and the two district offices.

It is anticipated that the model used by LCDU to improve the EGRA results, with limited but targeted support for the teachers in P1 and P3, will be relevant to other projects in Uganda which are exploring ways to maximise reading skills amongst young learners. Foremost among these projects is the USAID funded School Reading and Health Project (SHRP).
2. Introduction

Link Community Development Uganda (LCDU) implemented an intervention strategy in sixteen government primary schools in the Buliisa and Hoima Districts of Uganda during 2014. This work, which is funded by Tullow Oil (Uganda) and TrustAfrica, prioritises school and management functionality and early grade literacy as interventions likely to best improve the overall performance of the schools. The literacy focuses on local language competence and the learning of English in grades 1 – 3. This element of the project was only introduced fully in 2014. The two linked projects are known as the Tullow Oil/Link Community Development School Improvement Project (TOLSIP) and the Early Learning Education Programme (ELEP).

This report is the second of two evaluation reports that have been produced by this consultant in 2014 – 2015 on the ELEP and TOLSIP Projects. The first report, released in May 2014 was designed as a baseline for this report, with particular reference to the literacy intervention. This report, which is more substantive, forms a summative evaluation on the impact of the ELEP and the TOLSIP Projects. Its findings should assist in improving understanding of what interventions increase reading skills in lower primary schools and how improved school functionality impacts on educator practice and pupil learning in rural primary schools in Uganda.

This evaluation has two main aspects: the assessment of school and management functionality; and early grade literacy. The former was measured using LCD’s signature School Performance Review (SPR) instrumentation and methodology. The literacy was measured in P1 and P3 in both Runyoro, which is the predominant local language in Hoima District, and English using Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA). These findings are supplemented with interviews and observations in a sample of the project schools.

3. The Projects

3.1 Introduction

This section will profile the two projects under review in this report, TOLSIP and ELEP, as well as the districts in which they are located.

This report will only briefly detail the objectives of the two projects and profile the two districts in which the two projects function. These are covered in detail in earlier reports (see Ezati, Ssentamu and Okurut 2010; LCD Annual Reports to Tullow Oil (LCD 2009; 2010; 2011; 2012; 2013; 2014a) and TrustAfrica (LCD 2014b)).

3.2 Buliisa and Hoima Districts

These districts are in the west of Uganda, abutting Lake Albert and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Prior to the discovery of oil in both districts in the early 2000s they were largely peripheral to the Ugandan economy as the population depended to a large extent on small scale subsistence agriculture and fishing. A significant proportion of the population of both districts, but particularly Buliisa, are semi-nomadic relying on following the fish around Lake Albert, pastoralism or shifting agriculture. Commercial crops are few and most, such as tea, are found in Hoima District.
The population of Buliisa is 113,569 (Government of Uganda 2014). A mere 7,285 live in urban areas – the small town of Buliisa. In contrast Hoima has a population of 286,705 (Government of Uganda 2014) of whom 106,284 live in urban settlements. Hoima town is the 9th largest town in Uganda with a population of 100,000. This is the result of a growth rate of over 10% over the previous decade as oil industries, banks and also other service industries have grown up hoping to cash in on the oil and the growing population which contains many people who have migrated to the town from other regions hoping to take advantage of the oil industry.

3.3 Tullow Oil Link Community Development School Improvement Project (TOLSIP)

TOLSIP has been running for over five years in schools in Hoima and Buliisa Districts with the support of Tullow Oil, and is now in its third phase. The present phase is the final phase of what became a three phase process. The first phase (2009 – 11) involved 8 schools; the second phase (2012 – 13) 56 schools and this last phase (2014) 8 schools. All three phases focused on the two oil bearing districts of Buliisa and Hoima, where Tullow Oil has assets. The project has generally focused on the schools nearest the oil bearing areas which are along the shores of Lake Albert. These are areas which, as Ezati et al (2010) explain, have traditionally been ignored by government and prior to TOLSIP the schools in these communities had received very little external attention.

The third phase of the project is aimed at improving the performance of 8 schools. The core of the intervention uses the School Performance Review (SPR) process, which is described below, to inform school management and governance training and the support and training of teachers, in order to improve school functionality and performance. A lower primary literacy element has been introduced into the programme in the last year. However, owing to the complexity of home languages spoken by learners as well as the mismatch between teacher language skills and the home languages of the learners in most of the 8 schools, and the limited orthographic development of Alur and Lugungu, the two main home languages of the learners in these schools, this element of the programme was not central to the intervention.

3.4 Early Learning Education Programme (ELEP)

ELEP is a more recently launched project working in another 8 schools in the same two districts. It was deliberately linked by LCD to the TOLSIP intervention. However, while it includes SPR and educator training along with support of the education district office, it also has a strong focus on early grade literacy in the home language and English. In recent years the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) in Uganda has introduced a policy (MoES 2008) which increased emphasis on P1 – P3 being taught in mother tongue. In P4 English is introduced as the language of teaching and learning. The theory behind the policy is that once learners have become literate in their home language they will find it easier to gain literacy in English. There have been a number of initiatives launched in the last few years to enhance the teaching of literacy in the large number of languages used in Uganda. For a number of languages the starting point has been to develop a valid orthography of the language before readers can be developed and the language taught. RTI, through the SHRP project funded by the USAID, has been in the forefront of this endeavour.

LCDU has been working with RTI and the SHRP Project to ensure that ELEP and TOLSIP add value to the larger MoES - RTI led project. The aim for the literacy focus is that LCDU’s work should assist the MoES better understand the school functionality and early grade teacher support needs in order for the deepening of the impact of the work that RTI and the MoES are doing with literacy.
The hypothesis that drives the ELEP and present TOLSIP intervention is that early grade teachers who work in schools which have short term intensive classroom support provided along with school management support will see a more rapid increase in literacy levels of their learners compared to those teachers who have no such school-based support. This assumption is tested in this report.

Early on in the 2014 delivery process a challenge arose. LCDU undertook a survey of the language profile of the learners and the teachers in the 16 schools which are part of the combined project and found that their language profiles are complex (see Annex in Prew 2014b). While a minority of five schools had Runyoro predominating, the remaining 11 schools were either predominantly Alur or Lugungu speaking or had no language dominating. Alur, which is spoken by under 30,000 people in Uganda, is not presently recognised as a national language and so there has been no official attempt as yet to develop its orthography, while Lugungu’s orthography is still being developed. Three decisions were taken as a result of this survey:

- Three project schools where Alur is the predominant home language of the learners and there are no teachers available who speak Alur, were swapped for schools where Lugungu and Runyoro dominate. This was done with the support of the relevant district office.
- The early grade literacy intervention would be particularly intense in the five schools where the majority of learners speak Runyoro and where these schools have adopted Runyoro as the language of teaching and learning in P1 to P3. The other 11 schools would all receive literacy teaching support but the learners would not be assessed using the EGRA.
- LCDU would work with the relevant Language Boards, the district office and linguistic experts to determine the best way to support the 11 schools where the dominant language lacks a developed orthography or where there is a mix of home languages amongst learners. This led to LCDU conducting an adaptation workshop to develop EGRA instruments for use with Lugungu and Alur speaking learners.

4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The evaluation approach involved two separate but complementary processes: the School Performance Review (SPR) and Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA). The EGRA testing was conducted in March 2014 and then again in November 2014 in a sub-set of five of the schools. The SPR was conducted in all 16 schools in March 2014 allowing a longitudinal analysis of SPR data for schools which had been in the project over a number of years. Both approaches are explained below.

---

1 After the initial assessment of school language profiles was undertaken by LCDU it was discovered in July 2014 that in one of the schools where Runyoro is used as the language of teaching and learning the vast majority of children speak other languages as most are migrants from the DRC. It was decided to continue including this school in the five Runyoro schools receiving the full language treatment, although it meant that the final averaged EGRA results were likely to be reduced as a result of the inclusion of this school.
As both the SPR and EGRA instruments and processes have been tested extensively in Uganda with schools in these two districts and other neighbouring districts it was decided by the evaluator with LCD that there was no need to field test before undertaking the data collection.

4.2 School Performance Review (SPR)

LCD’s SPR is a data driven method of assessing the state and performance of a school. The SPR process was conducted in all sixteen schools included in LCDU’s target schools in the two districts. The data was collected in March 2014 by an LCDU team, the members of which all have two years and more experience of using the instruments.

The data was collected against ten indicators, using a set of interviews, as well as school and lesson observations and analysis of school documentation. The indicators used were:

Indicator 1. Teaching and learning process
Indicator 2 .Assessments, Reading and Reporting
Indicator 3. Pupils’ understanding and attainment
Indicator 4. Leadership
Indicator 5. Management of finances/ resources
Indicator 6. Supervision of teaching and learning
Indicator 7. Access and equity
Indicator 8. School governance
Indicator 9. Community relations
Indicator 10. School sanitation, nutrition and health.

During a one day visit to each school the team of two data collectors interviewed the school head teacher, the members of the school’s School Management Committee and the Parent Teachers Association. They also observed three teachers undertaking classroom lessons and observed the school’s infrastructure and services. Apart from the requirement that the evaluator must observe three lessons and that they should include one lower, one middle and one upper primary class, there were no other restrictions. These three classes were to be chosen from the timetable. The teacher could be teaching any subject.

A number of school documents were checked to see if they are present in the school and some of them were examined for content. These include:

- The national constitution
- The BRMS Indicators
- Accounting and Financial Regulations
- The National Curriculum
- The Teachers Code of Conduct
- The school’s mission statement
- Minutes of staff and SMC meetings
- Meeting records of school community meetings
- The school’s School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- Staff schedules of duties
- Operational school budget
- School cashbook and other financial records
- Inventories of school assets and textbooks
- School timetable
- Staff and learner attendance records
- Teacher schemes and records of work
- Learner assessments.

The school’s performance in the Primary Leaving Exam (PLE) and in setting and meeting delivery targets against its School Improvement Plan (SIP) were examined and discussed with relevant educators.

Once collected the data was entered into a dedicated database which LCD had developed and has refined over the years. This takes the data and rates the performance of the school against a four point scale for each of the 10 indicators. The four point scale is calibrated from ‘not achieved’ through ‘partially achieved’ and ‘achieved’ to ‘fully achieved’. It then generates graphics for the school representing its performance across all the indicators. As data was collected from only 16 schools in this project some of the data was entered into Excel and graphics generated. The data for each of the schools can be viewed in Annex A.

This graphic is provided to the school and used to inform a meeting of leading members of the school community, such as traditional and religious learners, education officials and NGO personnel working in the area. During this school performance appraisal meeting (SPAM) the previous SIP is examined and progress reported, while areas of concern which have emerged during the SPR are discussed and solutions sought between the school and the community. These decisions on how to solve the school’s challenges and improve its performance are then included in the school’s new SIP.

This study then uses the 2014 SPR data and compares it to previous data sets of SPR data from previous years. LCD with district officials in both Buliisa and Hoima had been collecting SPR data annually from the schools that were in the TOLSIP Project. The first SPR data set is from 2010 and the last from 2014. This allows the researcher a longitudinal picture of these schools over this period. However, there are three problems presented when comparing the data over this period:

(i) The schools which were part of the project changed, and the total number of project schools also changed. In the first phase there were 8 schools, in the second phase 56 and in the last phase 16 (including the ELEP schools). However, five of the original 8 schools which were reviewed in 2010 were included in the 2014 project.

(ii) The indicators changed over the period of the project. They remained broadly categorised as teaching and learning; school management and leadership; and governance and community involvement. However, the original 18 indicators were reduced to 10. This makes any direct comparison of scores problematic.

(iii) Link and district personnel changed and perhaps inevitably the way the data collectors assessed the data will have changed. While LCD tries to reduce this risk by breaking down each indicator into the component parts which feed into the overall indicator score, some of them are relatively subjective. These include judgements on such sub-indicators as the way a lesson is presented and on the engagement of the school with its local community.

Mindful of these challenges this report analyses two sets of data: the SPR data from the 5 schools which were part of the project in 2010 and were still part of it in 2014; and the 2012 and 2014 SPR results for the 16 schools in the last phase of the project.
4.3 Early-Grade Reading Assessment

EGRA is a way of assessing a P1 to P3 learner’s reading ability along a scale that measures from non-reader to competent reader. The method has been used in at least 20 countries across Africa for the past few years, and is currently being used to evaluate learner performance in reading in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Zambia, as well as across half the districts in Uganda through the USAID funded SHRP project. Using EGRA in this project allows learner results in five schools in Hoima to be compared to learner results across Uganda, as well as with control schools and over time in the same schools. EGRA is generally administered using tablets or other mobile devices and entered onto ‘Tangerine’, a dedicated electronic data collection software. Tangerine is designed to enable recording of learners’ responses in oral reading and comprehension skills, as well as to capture interview responses from learners, teachers and other stakeholders on the home and school context. Use of Tangerine simplifies preparation and implementation of field work and can reduce measurement and data entry errors. However, given the small size of the sample of learners and schools in this project it was decided to undertake the data collection using a pen and paper process and then enter the data manually into a central database. The data was then collated and analysed to determine overall learner performance across the 5 schools. This process has the advantage of simplicity, as well as an apparent advantage of usability in resource-and-technology-poor environments. However, it should be noted that it also allows for greater opportunities for mistakes and human errors in data capture, data entry and data analysis.

For the summative evaluation process in November 2014 two additional primary schools which serve the same socio-economic and language communities as the five project schools in Hoima District were also EGRA tested in exactly the same way as the project schools. The only difference was that these two schools have not been part of the TOLSIP and ELEP projects and have had no external input assisting the teachers of P1 – P3 in their teaching of home language or English.

The English instrument being used in the EGRA process in the five plus two Hoima schools was adapted and piloted to ensure that it is appropriate for the Ugandan context by RTI during 2013. The Runyoro instrument has also been informed by RTI’s review of the orthography of the language and represents the latest thinking on the language. Following a review of Runyoro orthography the instrument was adapted in a workshop involving selected stakeholders with knowledge of the language and how to teach language to young learners. This adaptation process should have helped ensure the tools accurately measure what children know in the specific context while verifying the validity and reliability of the instruments and providing an opportunity to address technical issues before data is collected. By agreement with RTI in Uganda LCD was given permission to use the protocol and test items in both English and Runyoro, which were used in the national SHRP testing process. The advantage of this is that the instructions and process are well-tried and have been refined in Uganda based on field testing with learners.

Over the years the multiple sub-tasks in EGRA have been whittled down to form ‘EGRA-Lite’ which collects the most significant data, given the language capacity of the learners in any particular environment, while taking less time than the full EGRA. Normally EGRA-Lite involves four of five sub-tests. LCD decided on using five of the sub-tests for the data collection process in Hoima in both March and November 2014, based on use in other projects and advice from RTI. The tests were:
- Letter sound knowledge
- Segmenting words
- Non-word decoding
- Oral passage reading
- Vocabulary (English) or listening comprehension (Runyoro).

The first four tests were conducted in both Runyoro and English, while for the fifth test the Runyoro EGRA used a listening comprehension and the English EGRA measured the learners’ understanding of simple instructions, so tested their ability to recognise and respond to basic spoken vocabulary.

In the baseline 24 learners were tested from each school. This was made up of fourteen learners who were sampled from P1 and ten from P3, with a balance of genders in each sample. The varied size of the sample relates to the drop off in learner numbers from P1 to P3. While the P1s were in their first term in school in March and in their third term in November, the P3s have been in school for well over two years, and where they have repeated a year, over three years. All of the learners study in single grade classes. Each learner selected was tested in both English and the language of learning and teaching in these schools, which is Runyoro.

In the endpoint EGRA the same process was followed in selecting the learners. However, on advice from Michael Costello, who was instrumental in developing the EGRA methodology, the sample size from P1 was reduced to 10. While the same classes were sampled as in the baseline the learners may have been different as a randomised approach was used on both occasions. The same numbers and randomised approach to sampling the 20 learners tested was used in the two control schools.

The tests were conducted by the same two young Runyoro speaking female researchers in both March and November 2014. Both had been trained in the EGRA methodology by RTI in January 2013 with a refresher course in early 2014 and again in October 2014, and both had undertaken a series of EGRA testing under RTI guidance in a number of districts in the west of Uganda where Runyoro predominates.

At the start of the EGRA process the learner must provide verbal agreement based on a clear statement of intent in both English and Runyoro read out by the researcher for the test to go ahead. The statement provides learners with assurances that the results are confidential as well as explaining to them what is involved in the testing process, while it is explained that the process is not to be taken too seriously – it is more of a game. No learner refused to be tested. Each subtest has its own clear rubric and tells the researcher clearly what to say to the learner and how to respond and record their responses. The same subtests were used in March and in November, although the contents of each subtest were not the same in the two tests. This is standard EGRA procedure.

In March in all but one of the schools the tests were conducted at two tables with the researchers based at their tables set far apart in the open air, each testing a learner. The remaining learners to be tested were seated some distance away waiting for their turn. In the remaining school there was enough room to test in an empty classroom with the two desks set far enough apart that there was no interference between the two tables. In the November data collection process three of the seven schools had space for the testing to be conducted inside a classroom.

4.4 Project Impact Data Collection

As well as the collection of SPR and EGRA data the evaluation included a review of the training and support to teachers that LCDU provided as well as the support that the district offices received as part
of the LCDU intervention. To ascertain the nature and impact of these interventions the following data was requested or generated:

- Project reports which were produced for funders and for internal LCD reporting and accountability purposes;
- The two literacy specialists (the first specialist left in August 2014 to take up an overseas scholarship and so a second was recruited) and the Buliisa LCD coordinator each generated a written testament to what they had been doing in the schools to support the schools and teachers to improve lower grade literacy results and school performance;
- Observation of a sample of one early grade literacy lesson in the four sampled project schools and two lessons in a project school which was known to be doing exceptionally well. Each lesson was observed for 40 minutes using a protocol (see Annex D);
- Data from learning walks around each of the four sample project schools visited during the evaluation and data sheets filled in by the schools during the visits (see Annex D);
- Interview data from:
  - One district education officer and one education officer;
  - A sample of 25% of head-teachers in each district whose schools were included in the project;
  - Focus groups of early grade and upper grade teachers from among the project schools; and
  - LCD facilitators and managers.

The full list of those interviewed is included in Annex C, along with the interview tools (Annex D). In summary, four school managers, one school governor, fifteen teachers, two district officials and five LCD staff members were interviewed for this evaluation. Each interview took an average of 40 minutes. The interviews were used to triangulate information provided by the LCDU facilitators and that drawn from LCDU documentation. Collectively these varied sources of data, along with the outcome data provided through the SPR and EGRA, provide a comprehensive picture of the two projects and their impact on the schools where they have been operating.

4.5 Profile of the Project Schools Visited in this Evaluation

The four project schools which were visited were selected purposively based on their engagement and relative success with the project, or in one case relative failure to make progress while part of the project. The objective was to get some understanding of why some schools engaged and progressed well with the project and a minority of schools – mainly in Buliisa – failed to do so.

The table below summarises the basic data pertaining to the four schools.
Table 1: Data for the Four Sampled Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Buliisa</th>
<th>Hoima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment Total</td>
<td>557*</td>
<td>841*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 enrolment as % of P1 enrolment</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 female enrolment as % of P7 enrolment</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition rate as % of enrolment</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of orphans enrolled</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of trained teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE % pass rate (2014)</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE % of girls passing (of all learners who sat)</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE: No of Division 1 passes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE: No of Division 2 passes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE: No of girls with D1 and D2 passes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Both Buliisa schools were still registering learners at the start of the year.

The schools were also reviewed during the evaluation on their infrastructure, services, safety, and environment. This provides a useful profile of the sort of environment the learners are exposed to and so puts into some perspective what LCD is trying to do with the schools.

Table 2: Infrastructure, Operational Features and Safety of the Four Sampled Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Buliisa</th>
<th>Hoima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid classrooms with lockable doors</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has headteacher office and staff room</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure room with bars</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed and safe school environment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in class and teaching during visit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate number of classrooms for teachers</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes small enough to teach</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate clean toilets</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change room for girls</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet for disabled learners</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner access to clean water in school</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has functioning electricity supply</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Y = yes; N = no; M = mostly
5. Findings: School Performance Review

5.1 Introduction

The next three sections present the findings from the study that was undertaken on the TOLSIP and ELEP Projects from November 2014 to February 2015. This first section examines the SPR data and what it says about improvements in the project schools. School Performance Review data was regularly collected during the course of the TOLSIP Project from 2009 - 2014. The Trust Africa Project was able to benefit from this data, as it provided a historical picture of the performance of schools in both Buliisa and Hoima Districts. It is this data and the SPR data from 2014 which is analysed in this section.

5.2 2014 SPR Data

The 2014 SPR data was collected from the 16 project schools across the two districts. The results were analysed. While none of the schools gained ‘fully achieved’ against five or more of the indicators, some of the schools in both districts indicated some good practice scoring ‘achieved’ and ‘fully achieved’ against a number of indicators (see Annex A for the 2014 results of each school). However, the main finding in 2014 was that most schools had the majority of indicators on ‘not achieved’ and ‘partially achieved’, particularly for the important indicators related to school management, support supervision, classroom practice and learner assessment and attainment (Indicators 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6).

Generally in 2014 the Buliisa schools scored better than the Hoima schools on governance (see Figures 1 and 2) but otherwise scored significantly lower than Hoima schools on classroom teaching, support supervision of teachers and management of finances. All the schools scored poorly on assessment and reporting, pupil understanding and attainment and school leadership. When these three indicators are averaged across the 16 schools, collectively they did not attain a mean of ‘partially achieved’ (i.e. a rating of 2 out of 4) on any one of these three indicators. This is worrying, as these are key indicators of successful schools and are areas on which LCDU has been working with these schools. The other indicators were fairly similar across both sets of schools and were mainly averaging just above ‘partially achieved’ across all the schools.

Figures 1 and 2 show the consolidated mean data for the 8 project schools in each district by district.
Six of the Hoima schools and four of the Buliisa schools had at least one indicator rated as ‘not achieved’. This means that area of school functionality needs attention to be considered reasonably
functional in those schools. These low scoring indicators include in some schools indicators of learner assessment and attainment and those applying to school management. After the intervention this is a concern. As school management is based in part on the evidence of policies, regulations and systems in place, one would expect that all these would have been put in place by this point in the intervention.

One of the schools in Buliisa scored 2 or below for all 10 indicators indicating that there are serious problems in this school. This school requires intensive support in order for the school to improve.

5.3 Comparison of 2010 and 2014 SPR Results

As the number of indicators changed between 2010 and 2014 from eighteen to ten it was not possible to compare indicator with indicator in the five schools which presented data from 2010 and 2014. Instead the total number of marks each school scored on each indicator was added and then divided by the number of indicators in that SPR process. This gives an average SPR functionality score for each school for 2010 and 2014. These are presented below.

Figure 3: Comparison of SPR Scores for Schools which were in the TOLSIP Project in 2010 and 2014

What is striking about Figure 3 is that the scores of the five schools have changed little between 2010 and 2014 and that those that were doing comparatively poorly in 2010 were still doing comparatively poorly in 2014 – with the poorest performing school scoring substantially less in 2014 compared to 2010.

This is a worrying and unexpected finding given the high regard that LCD’s intervention is held in within both districts and the positive findings in the main external evaluation of the TOLSIP Project (Ezati et al 2010). The range of training and support programmes that LCD implemented in the schools (which are discussed below) certainly impacted on the schools, so it is not clear why the average scores remained remarkably static. The next sub-section which compares the SPR data from 2012 and 2014 may provide some clues.

However, there is evidence from early on in TOLSIP that the project impacted positively on most indicators in its first year of operation (2009 to 2010) including the very problematic retention of
children in school and particularly of girls, hence the assertion by independent evaluators that “the girl-child has been the major beneficiary of the TOLSIP reforms” (Ezati et al. 2010: 6).

5.4 Comparison of 2012 and 2014 SPR Data for the TOLSIP/ELEP Schools

When we compare the 2014 SPR results against previous years’ SPR results we find that in Hoima (for which comparative results are available) there are no clear trends between 2012 and 2014. All 8 schools have seen some scores dropping and some improving. Even relatively high performing schools, such as St Peters’ Kisaaru, saw reduced scores in 2014, in critical areas including assessment, pupil understanding and management systems. Some of these are somewhat mystifying. While it is quite possible that a school could do better one year than the next at learner assessment and teaching and learning, or engagement with the community, it is harder to explain why a school which scored well in school management – which is largely assessed on the basis of the evidence of policies and procedures being in place – should a few years later score worse. As it is unlikely policies and procedures which were in place have disappeared other causes need to be identified. Possible explanations like the transfer of head teachers or teachers did not occur during this period – in fact the staff of these 8 schools was unusually stable. It is though possible that the SPR team has got tougher. This data collection team, which is made up of LCD staff, DISs and CCTs, is likely to become tougher as expectations grow. This could lead to more rigorous interpretation of the descriptors for each indicator grading. However, there are other possible explanations. These include:

- Schools are getting used to the SPR and so the shock of the early rounds of data collection and SPAM have reduced and they are no longer concerned about getting poor scores
- Schools realise that no sanctions are brought against them for low scores so are less committed to achieving high scores in the SPR
- LCD staff have been increasingly implementing SPR in a ritualised way and so it has lost the edge and the inclusivity of community it used to have. LCD staff admit that the intensity of the SPR in the early stages of the TOLSIP project has not been maintained. This is due, reportedly, to movement of school and LCD staff and limited funding.

5.5 Points for Discussion on SPR

The results from both sets of comparative data presented above should be of concern to LCD and need explaining. Whatever the cause LCD needs to investigate why after substantial improvements in the project schools after they were first exposed to SPR and LCD’s intervention in 2009 – 2011, they have tended to stabilise and even slide back in the last few years. While some possible explanations have been proffered in the last sub-section the reasons may be more complex. However, the issue of how the SPR data is presented and the engagement with community members at the School Performance Appraisal Meeting (SPAM) seems to be critical. LCD documentation indicates that the SPAM involves an open meeting to which the whole school staff and community are invited. In this project the SPAM has, according to the LCD facilitators, become an increasingly elitist and bureaucratic process involving a limited number of local dignitaries who may not even have children in the school. Apparently this was driven by financial restrictions as an open meeting with no control over the number who might attend creates challenges for planning and budgeting. However, without knowledge of performance the parents cannot hold their school accountable and feed into the SIP process.
It was also noted during the evaluation that the nature of the SPAM had changed. LCD documents make clear that a graphic presentation of each school’s performance should be presented and that this should be the heart of the SPAM. However, LCD facilitator and district officials report that during the course of the project the SPAM has become a broader meeting where the results of the SPR may not even be presented clearly in graphic form and where the SPR data is one item in a longer meeting schedule. The risk in this approach is that the SPR loses its original impact. This may help explain why some school managers and teachers failed to mention SPR when asked to list the key elements of the LCD intervention during the evaluation interviews.

6. Findings: Literacy in Early Grades

6.1 Introduction
The second outcome from the TOLSIP and ELEP Projects in 2014 was the EGRA data, which was designed to test foundation phase learner literacy levels in home language and English in a sample of the project schools. This section presents those results. The first sub-section profiles the learners who were tested, while the second sub-section details the findings from the baseline. Although these were presented in the baseline report to LCD (Prew 2014b) it is critical that they are included in this report to allow the reader to be able to compare the reading ability of learners in November 2014 compared to the baseline in March 2014. The latter sub-section presents the endline EGRA test data from November 2014.

6.2 Profile of the Learners Tested
The age profile of the learners varied considerably between schools and within schools. One of the schools saw learners tested in March close to the age appropriate profile, so most P1s are 6 or 7 and over half the P3s are 8 or 9. However, even in this school by P3 we see the age range extending with the age appropriate 8 and 9 year olds learning with learners of 10 and 11 years of age. However, in the other schools, most of the P1s were already 7 years or older, with a small number being 10 years old or more, and a few being as young as 5. By P3 the age range was from 8 to 14, with most learners being 11 – 13 years of age. This indicates that the learners either started school over-age, or have repeated a class before reaching P3 or have possibly dropped out for some time from school, or have experienced more than one of these conditions. In March nearly 10% of the P1 learners were not able to provide their age, and surprisingly a few learners in P3 also were not able to tell the researcher their age.

The endpoint profile of learners tested was similar to that in March. Not surprisingly, having spent over half a year longer at school, fewer learners did not know their age – only 5 in total – all from P1. Five of the sampled 70 P1 learners (7%) were still 5 years old at the end of their P1 year. This indicates that they may have been four years old at the time of the baseline, and are seriously underage for P1. The oldest P1 learners were 11 and all three of them were male and schooling in the project schools. The oldest P1 learner in the control school sample was 8. In P3 the oldest learners were 14 in the project schools and 13 in the control school sample. This indicates that generally the enrolment in the control schools is somewhat more in line with policy than in the project schools. By P3 three quarters of the sample in both control and project schools were overage.
6.3 Baseline EGRA Data from March 2014

The baseline in March 2014 established the literacy competence levels of learners in the five target schools in Hoima District (see Prew 2014b). The results were discouraging, particularly those for the P3 learners.

A key finding was that after over two years in school 32% of P3 learners could not identify a single letter sound in English and 6% could not identify any in Runyoro. As it was found that after only two months in school 39% of P1 learners could identify at least one letter sound in English and over 50% could recognise at least one letter sound in Runyoro, it appeared that little progress had been made between P1 and P3 across the schools. The baseline report posited that the dismal P3 results may indicate that,

“if learners do not make the conceptual leap to understanding the relationship between a letter and a sound in their first few months in school then they are unlikely to gain that understanding by P3”.

Figure 4: Baseline Data - Proportion of Learners Failing to Make Any Correct Letter Sounds by Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>Overall (P1&amp;P3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the number of letter sounds that the learners could recognise was extremely low. As figure 4 shows while P1 learners were able to recognise an average of 3.4 letter sounds in Runyoro, this had only increased after two more years in school to an average of under 10 by P3. The situation was even worse in English with P3 learners only able to recognise the sounds of an average of just over four letters.
Linked to the ability to articulate letter sounds in Runyoro and English is the ability to sound an invented word using Runyoro or English pronunciation of the word. Learners are shown some examples which the researcher models for them to show what is required. Not surprisingly during the baseline none of the P1 learners could enunciate any word in either language, but surprisingly about three quarters of P3 learners could not do so either (see Figure 6). This indicates that they had not learned how words in either language are constructed from sounds.

**Figure 6: Baseline Data – The Proportion of Learner who could Not Read any Non-Word Correctly by Language**

Words in any language are made up of a series of discrete clusters of letters which make distinct sounds which are joined to make a word. Learning to read involves working out what these letter clusters sound like and how they link together. The segmented word test requires the learners to identify these cluster sounds in segmented words. The learners were asked to listen to a word spoken by the researcher and then say what sounds it is made from. The learners found this much easier to
do in Runyoro than in English. In fact almost none of the learners – even in P3 – could correctly segment even one word in English even though there was no time limit set for the exercise (see figure 7).

Figure 7: Baseline Data – The Average (Mean) Number of Words Learners Correctly Segmented by Language

When the learners were asked to read a passage in Runyoro and another passage in English the researchers found that the learners in P3 struggled to read more than an average of under 3 words in English and remarkably only 2 words in Runyoro. This would indicate that the learners are very rarely if ever asked to read full words in a sentence, let alone a story. This seems to be particularly true in Runyoro. This may reflect the fact that most schools will have more readers available in English than in the home language.

Figure 8: Baseline Data – The Average (Mean) Number of Words of a Passage Learners Correctly Read in a Minute by Language
When asked a number of comprehension questions about the passage they had just tried to read almost no learners could respond correctly to any of the questions in Runyoro, and not one learner answered any questions correctly in English, as illustrated in Figure 9.

Figure 9: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of Comprehension Questions Learners Answered Correctly by Language

![Figure 9: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of Comprehension Questions Learners Answered Correctly by Language](image)

In a final set of test the learners were asked in English to respond to simple instructions by indicating parts of his/her body, objects in the environment and show understanding of spatial terms. This was clearly more in line with what they learn in class as the results were better, as shown in Figure 10. The surprise is that the P3 learners could only average less than two more correct responses on average than the P1 learners. Both P1 and P3 learners tended to get the same things correct. So many of them could identify their ‘mouth’, a ‘pencil’, ‘paper’, and ‘desk’. These are clearly words they hear the teacher using from the moment they arrive at school. However, their vocabulary advances little after that. Very few of the P3 learners could follow instructions telling them to place a pencil ‘on the paper’, ‘next to the paper’ and so on.

Figure 10: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of English Vocabulary Instructions Learners Executed Correctly (out of 20)

![Figure 10: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of English Vocabulary Instructions Learners Executed Correctly (out of 20)](image)
The final item in Runyoro required the learners to listen to the researcher reading a passage and then they were asked three questions about the passage they had just heard read to them. The P1 learners were able to answer, on average, half the questions correctly while the P3s could answer over two thirds correctly. The learners clearly found this sub-test easier as it does not require any reading skills.

**Figure 11: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of Runyoro Listening Comprehension Questions Learners Answered Correctly (out of a possible 3)**

![Figure 11: Baseline Data - The Average (Mean) Number of Runyoro Listening Comprehension Questions Learners Answered Correctly (out of a possible 3)](image)

### 6.4 Analysis of the Baseline EGRA Test Results

The baseline report (LCD 2014b) showed that while the P1 learners’ literacy results were much on a par with P1 learners in much of the country as illustrated by the EGRA results from other SHRP districts, the P3 learners were generally not as proficient at doing the tests as P3 learners in these other districts. The baseline report noted that the learners in the project schools in Hoima district learn little after their first term or two in school. One would expect a much greater difference between P1 and P3 learners in all the tests. This implies that after the first few months of school a few learners, who have learned how to read slowly progress, but a sizeable number – and it would seem to be a majority of learners in these schools – were failing to learn to read in the early months of P1 and then never learn.

LCDU realised that if the teachers were monitoring the progress of their learners the children who are failing to read could be identified and remedial action taken. LCDU accepted the baseline report’s argument that while such an intervention would require focus on P1 and P3 and require considerable engagement with the P1 teachers - and to a lesser extent the P3 teachers – the pay-off would be much less learner failure and drop-out in P4 and later grades. LCDU reported that from experience and the EGRA results it was fairly clear that while remedial action was needed in relation to the reading skills of learners across the five schools, the teachers lacked the knowledge of how to teach reading skills and how to develop the reading skills of their learners once they had learned the basic skills of recognising sounds and words.
Research in other African countries, such as South Africa (e.g. NEEDU 2013) has shown that many lower primary school teachers fail to extend their learners with progressively more extended reading and writing tasks, both in home language and in English. As a result in P3 when teachers should be teaching story writing and the development of full paragraphs as well as free guided reading in both languages they are often still teaching the same sounds in the same way to the whole class, as in P1. This was observed during the baseline school visits. This is partly a result of teachers not being able to create differentiated learning tasks which are appropriate to various levels of ability in the same class. The result is that learners who learn to read in P1 do not develop their skills as would be expected and so in all probability are finding school boring by P3.

It was this realisation that LCDU managers claim informed the LCDU model of intervention in support of literacy skills. It is essentially a teacher development model. This is described in the next section.

6.5 The Literacy Intervention Model

The baseline report found that the LCDU approach is multi-dimensional and while having standard elements – such as SPR and the literacy training – was reactive to school realities. As a result no two schools experienced the project in exactly the same way. This was the same for the literacy approach as for the other elements of the model. This is seen as a strength as it allows LCDU to shape the intervention to the specific needs of each project school.

The salient elements in the literacy model LCD developed are represented diagrammatically below in Figure 12.

Figure 12: Literacy Intervention in Project Schools in Hoima and Buliisa Districts

The starting point was the baseline EGRA data collection and analysis which informed the model. LCDU management report that following the EGRA results presented in the baseline report (Prew 2014b), the organisation decided to put in place an intensive teacher development approach for P1 and P3 teachers in all the 16 project schools with some additional focus on the transition to teaching in English in P4. Following the baseline EGRA tests and the audit of the language profiles of the 16 schools, which are discussed in the baseline report (Prew 2014b) LCDU worked with two Centre Co-ordinating Tutors\(^2\) (CCTs) based at the Bulera Core Primary Teachers’ College in Hoima and who specialise in literacy in Runyoro. Meetings were also held with the DEOs in the two districts. The result of these discussions

\(^2\) CCTs are employed in the core primary teachers’ colleges while being allocated a cluster of schools where they also have an office from which they are meant to provide classroom and management support to schools in their cluster (Prew 2014a). As they also do some lecturing at the college and many are former lecturers many of them have specialisations, such as literacy or a specific subject.
was agreement on the model that LCDU would implement in the schools, which would start with a one day workshop in each district for the teachers of lower grades.

These workshops, which were held in May 2014, were facilitated by the two CCTs (with their knowledge of Runyoro orthography and the training that RTI had provided on literacy teaching), and LCDU staff and consultants (with knowledge of literacy teaching and classroom management). At the end of the workshop the attendees agreed to implement various changes in their classrooms. These changes included the teaching of letter sounds and not names, the use of readers, setting more substantial written work, use of instructional materials in literacy classes and encouraging learners to talk more by grouping desks while also allowing the teacher room to monitor each group’s and learner’s progress in reading.

Following the workshop the LCDU literacy specialist reports that she visited each of the schools to monitor compliance with the agreed changes in their classrooms. She reports that every teacher who attended the workshop had implemented group work and that other teachers of lower grades had followed suit. She then conducted regular visits to each school and project literacy teacher. She reports that in these visits she followed a set format. Following a brief courtesy and information sharing meeting with the head teacher (if present) she would observe each P1 and P3 teacher (and occasionally P2 teacher) delivering an hour-long literacy level and use a template to record her observations. The observations generally focused on:

- The introduction to ensure it followed agreed set steps which encouraged the teacher to share with the learners what the lesson would be about and should be attention grabbing with songs and stories, as well as linking to the previous lesson;

- The mode of delivery to ensure that the teacher used appropriate methods and that the content was organised logically and developed over a number of lessons. This is seen as a key area of concern, making sure that the content is simple, accessible, makes sense, and is presented effectively so that learners move forward and do not go round in circles repeating the same content lesson after lesson;

- The relevance of the content was evaluated to ensure it was appropriate for the grade and in line with the thematic curriculum and MoES guidelines and was progressing and linking theme to theme;

- The classroom environment was evaluated with a focus on the desk and seating arrangement, displays on the walls of children’s work and learning aids, as well as cleanliness of the classrooms. Teachers were encouraged to use the classroom space creatively. This included allowing learners to practice forming letters in chalk on the floor and chalk-board, where there is a shortage of paper and slates;

- Learner exercise books were checked during the lesson to see the quality of their writing and if the teacher marked their work. This was to encourage the teacher to have contact with individual learners to cater for their individual difficulties and help them;

- The most important focus was on the progress of the learners in grasping what was delivered and their understanding of the literacy concepts. She evaluated the ability of learners to identify letter sounds, syllables, words and read simple sentences on their own with minimal help from the teacher or without any assistance by P3.

In the words of the LCD specialist,
“My strategy was that for beginners in primary one, knowledge of letter sounds was vital as a basic requirement to build on. Thus if the learners grasped this, I would advise the teachers to move the children to the level of syllables by forming sounds from a combination of letters including both vowels and consonants. Then I moved them onto assisting learners in forming words and finally sentences. Each lesson observation would look out for a combination of teacher’s activities and the response of the learners from which I would get ideas on how to help the teacher and the direction to take”.

In one of the five schools she describes in detail her analysis, saying,

“In School K I realised that the primary three learners progressed very fast and were able to read in local language but much as the learners were able to read I realised that understanding was still missing, so I advised the teacher to introduce simple stories which learners would read and then have to answer questions related to the story to check understanding of what was read”.

Once the lesson was over the specialist spent half an hour to an hour with the teacher providing positive feedback. Particularly with P1 teachers it was essential to do this in the classroom as soon as the lesson was over in order to be able to refer with actual examples to the classroom environment and materials to ensure understanding. Sometimes for the feedback she brought the other relevant teachers into these sessions – particularly the P2 and P3 teachers. This allowed for the sharing of experiences and good practices and collective problem-solving. The feedback sessions also allowed the specialist to get the teachers to agree on what they would be focusing on next for improvement; this would be the basis of the next visit in a month’s time. Again, in the specialist’s own words,

“For instance if we identified the challenge as poor hand writing, guidance would be given along this line on how to help the learners improve and in the next follow-up, I would check if there is improvement; if not we would device a another way until both learners and the teachers improved”.

During the first phase of the project each P1 and P3 teacher in the target schools worked with the specialist for an average of 6 hours.

In August the literacy expert left the project and in September a second local literacy specialist was appointed. He consciously built on the work of the first co-ordinator in the same project schools and set about making the visits very structured. In the third term (September to November) he visited each of the five schools 8 times. He would spend the whole day in each school working with the P1 and P3 literacy teachers. While in the school he followed the following visit format:

- Meet the head teacher and ensure that the visit is welcomed
- Review the P1 literacy teacher’s preparation for the lesson to be observed and discuss it with the teacher
- Observe the full one hour lesson without interference
- Review the lesson with the teacher and discuss what the teacher did well, what she could have done differently and agree strategy for improvement (creating the basis for the next support visit)
• While in the classroom, look at the classroom environment and seating arrangement, discuss it with the teacher and look at the learners’ work in their exercise books

• Review the literacy teacher’s preparation for the lesson to be observed and discuss it with the teacher

• Immediately after observing the teaching he would hold a workshop with the P1, P2 and P3 teachers. In the workshop he would discuss what he was seeing in the school. He would also make instructional materials and learning games with the teachers; these enhance reading and writing. He would demonstrate how to use them both through micro-teaching and by demonstration with a class. He also ran workshops on how to assess learners’ literacy and how to use assessment results to help the weak learners by integrating them with more advanced learners in groups or taking them out for pre-reading tasks;

• Meet again with the head teacher to discuss the challenges and set targets for literacy in the school which could be managed at the school level.

So, during this second phase of the intervention each P1 and P3 teacher reportedly got 8 weekly two hour support visits amounting to 16 hours support. This means that in the two phases most P1 and P3 teachers in the target schools received 22 hours of support spread across the year. In his support supervision visits the second specialist particularly focused on areas identified by the first specialist. He found that, “there were ways of teaching reading that would engage the learners effectively, use of literacy learning games and puzzles, use of instructional materials and pair and group work”.

The co-ordinators reported that they measured impact and success by:

• Head teacher co-operation and agreement that they would support the methods and “be able to adopt the new reading and writing skills being taught” while also supervising the P1 – P3 teachers

• Teachers improved their methods of teaching reading and writing while engaging learners more effectively with a positive impact on learner confidence levels

• Instructional materials improved the classroom environment

• Teachers became supportive of the weaker learners

• Learners became visibly more interested in reading and writing and were increasingly able to form words from letters and sentences from words until they were able to read and write simple short stories in local language in Runyoro.

The first specialist summarised the project and why it had impact by saying,

“Teachers earlier were not acquainted with the management of the literacy hour and most of them did the reading for the children and never gave them chance to practice on their own. From the literacy teaching workshop, teachers learned how to handle the literacy hour and how to help the children learn how to read and write. The biggest input then after the training was follow-up to see what the teachers did in practicing what they had learnt. Follow-up was the biggest contributor to the success because teachers need to be continuously helped and updated with information. It showed the level of commitment by the project towards promoting literacy and also encouraged the teachers to become committed because they knew someone is concerned about how they did their work and the quality of work they did”.
However, the two specialists noted that progress in literacy teaching across all 16 schools was hampered by considerable learner and persistent teacher absenteeism, under-age learners in some P1 classes, a lack of readers in local languages and lack of teachers with knowledge of Alur in the areas of Alur speaking learners. At the start of the project lack of materials also hampered progress but LCD provided some and the teachers were assisted in developing their own materials. LCD did not provide readers and the schools did not receive readers from any other source: the project relied on the work of the specialists and the learning aids provided to make its impact.

6.6 Endline EGRA Data from November 2014

Following the support provided to the teachers a second EGRA testing process was implemented in early November 2014. The following figures indicate the progress that had been made in the schools between the baseline and the endline – a period of 7 months.

**Figure 13: Percentage of Learners Not Able to Recognise any Letter Sound in English and Runyoro.**

As we already noted the baseline results for both P1 and particularly P3 were very worrying. However, seven months later, after the intervention described above only 2% of P1 learners were unable to recognise any letter sounds in English and Runyoro. This indicates that P1 learners by the end of P1 were performing considerably better than P3 learners during the baseline – when 32% of P3 learners could not recognise any letter sound in English and 6% in Runyoro. This pattern is repeated time and again through the subtests.
More P1 learners could segment words in both English and Runyoro than were able to in P3 during the baseline. However, it should also be noted that P3 learners were much better able to identify letters and segment words in the endline compared to the baseline.

At the same time as basic literacy competencies have improved in both P3 and particularly P1, fluency rates of the P1 learners across the five schools had improved. Again, it should be noted that the scores of the P1 learners in the endline are considerably better than those of the P3 learners tested in the baseline.
The ability to read non-words also indicated considerable improvements in both P1 and P3 learners over the seven months of the project. While not a single learner in P1 could correctly read a non-word during the baseline, and about three quarters of P3 learners also failed in either language, by the endline almost all P3 learners and a sizeable proportion of P1 learners were able to do so. This indicates considerable improvement during the course of the project in understanding how words are constructed from clusters of sounds. The difference between P1 and P3 learners is shown clearly in the average number of non-words that were read in the time (see Figure 18). On average P1 learners could only read just over two words in either language in a minute, while on average P3 learners were able to read well over 15.

**Figure 17: Percentage of Learners Unable to Read a Single Nonword in English or Runyoro**
Of even more interest is the impact of the project on the ability to read for understanding. Again, we see a similar pattern emerging as described above with the simpler tests. By the end of the intervention in 2014 more P1 learners could read a word in the passage than P3 learners in the baseline, but at the same time P3 learners had improved dramatically during the year with only 4% being unable to read any word in the passage. Interestingly, considerably more learners in P1 (and P3 in the baseline) were able to read at least one word in English than could read one word in Runyoro.

Figure 18: Average Number of Nonwords Learners Read Correctly in English and Runyoro in a Minute

Figure 19: Percentage of Learners Who Failed to Read a Single Word of a Story by Language
It should be noted though that at the end of a year at school 70% of P1s could not read any words in Runyoro and 42% could not read any word in English. It is small comfort that these are smaller proportions than in P3 at the time of the baseline. However the fact that almost all P3 learners were able to identify at least one word – even though they could not at the start of P3 indicates that remedial measures in P3 can have an important impact.

When we look at the fluency of reading, as expected, P3 learners far outshone the P1 learners, with the P1 learners lacking the fluency of the P3 learners at the time of the baseline. This may indicate that emphasis in P1 lessons is put on recognising letters and words and not on reading. However, it is clear from the earlier tests that a large proportion of P1s have reached a stage by the end of P1 where they can read words and so can also read sentences. Teachers need to pay attention to this finding and start allowing learners to build their own sentences.

**Figure 20: Average Number of Words Learners Read Correctly of a Story in English and Runyoro**

![Average Number of Words Learners Read Correctly of a Story in English and Runyoro](chart)

Finally, the ability to understand what is being read is key to reading. It is clear that very few P1 learners after a year at school could answer any comprehension questions related to a passage that they had tried to read; while a reasonable proportion of the group can recognise words very few can string words together and make sense of them. However, while this was the case in P3 at the time of the baseline, seven months later well over half could answer a question from the English text and over 90% could answer at least one question from the Runyoro story. This is a significant improvement.
This trend is carried through to the number of questions P3s could answer; they were able to answer over double the number of questions from the Runyoro story compared to the English one.

The ability to follow instructions in English follows the same pattern as the other sub-tests with the ability of P1s at the end of their first year in school exceeding that of P3s at the time of the baseline and both P1s and P3s almost doubling the number of instructions that they could follow over the course of the project.
Finally, the last sub-test indicates that all P3 learners and almost all P1 learners can now understand a story in Runyoro and answer questions on its contents. This was significant particularly in the school where most learners are Congolese so, while being taught in Runyoro, do not have Runyoro as their home language. Significantly by the end of their third year in school the P3 learners could almost all answer all three questions set. Again the average number of questions the P1 learners could answer exceeded that of the P3 learners during the baseline.
While these results appear significant and seem to indicate that the LCD early grade literacy intervention, with an average of 22 hours spent with each teacher and a simple message and support structure, has been effective there is a possibility that these improvements are general to the system and possibly relate to other interventions. This is particularly so with RTI working with the MoES nationally on literacy, even if it does not work in Hoima District as yet. It was therefore important to administer the same tests to learners selected in the same way in control schools.

**6.7 Endline EGRA Results from the Control Schools**

When we look at a few graphics with the non-project school (NPS) learner results set against those of the learners in the project schools (PS) we can see a clear pattern emerging. In each graph the last column (labelled ‘November NPS’) is the measure for the control schools. The first column is the baseline figure for the project schools (March PS) and the middle column the endline measure for the project schools (November PS).

The full set of graphs for the control schools compared to the project schools is included in Annex B.
Figure 26: Proportion of Learners in the Project and Control Schools Who Did Not Know a Single Letter Sound

![Bar chart showing the proportion of learners in Project (PS) and Non-Project (NPS) schools who did not know a single letter sound. The data is presented for March and November. The chart includes data for English and Runyoro languages.

Figure 27: Average Number of Words Learners Read Correctly from a Story in a Minute (English and Runyoro)

![Bar chart showing the average number of words read correctly by learners from March and November. The data is presented for Project (PS) and Non-Project (NPS) schools. The chart includes data for English and Runyoro languages.]
These four graphs indicate that learners in the control schools (NPS) in November score somewhat better than the project school learners did in March, but much more poorly than the project school learners scored in November. We can tentatively assume the control school learners would have performed about as poorly as those in the project schools in March – they could hardly have performed worse. This indicates that in the project schools learners have improved their literacy skills consistently more than those in the control schools over the same period of time. Even more
significant is that the project schools outperformed the control schools in every aspect of literacy – in both Runyoro and English, in the number of learners who could provide a correct answer, in mean number of responses, and the fluency rate.

6.8 Lesson Observations

The six lesson observations of early grade literacy lessons undertaken as part of the evaluation of the impact of the project indicated that a number of lessons had been absorbed and appeared to have become part of the normal teaching practice of most of the teachers observed. However, it should be noted that the quality of the lessons varied greatly. Those in the highest performing school in the project were exemplary, while half of the lessons observed in the four schools sampled in the evaluation were not strong. However all the six teachers observed:

- Taught letter sounds and not names;
- Built words up from letter sounds and clusters of sounds;
- Had learners regularly modelling word sounds;
- Included an element of handwriting skill in the lesson;
- Set written work in the lesson;
- Checked the written work as learners wrote;
- All P3 teachers wrote up sentences and encouraged learners to use sentences;
- Corrected mistakes gently and praised correct answers with structured clapping by the whole class.

This was achieved in classes of well over 60 learners and in two cases over 120. Although half the classrooms were not organised in groups, all the teachers said that once they had all their learners registered they would organise them in groups (the school visits were being conducted at the start of the second week of the school year). However, one teacher with 125 learners in her P3 class and two teachers with smaller classes had grouped the learners and were teaching effectively. All of the teachers but one had appropriate learning aids on the wall and were using a lesson plan.

6.9 Implications of the Literacy Intervention

There is clear evidence, even if the sample size is small, that this targeted intervention which supported early grade teachers in their classrooms with an understanding of how children learn to read can impact substantially on learner literacy levels as assessed by EGRA. The classroom observations indicate that the changes required in the classroom are relatively simple. They involve teaching letter sounds, clusters of letter sounds, sentences and paragraphs in a linear fashion supported by grouping learners and using instructional materials. Clearly testing the learners assists as it provides diagnostic evidence to focus the support that teachers require.

Finally, although no proper analysis has been undertaken, RTI managers who have seen the data for the LCD project schools and those for the SHRP Project indicate that the improvements by P1 and P3 learners in the LCD project appear to exceed those of the SHRP schools. This is interesting because the SHRP Project provided its schools with readers in the local language while LCD did not, while LCD provided more classroom based support to its teachers. It would therefore appear that classroom support may be the most critical form of support required by early grade teachers to increase the
literacy levels of their learners. The LCD experience therefore indicates that real sustained improvements can be made in learner performance through improving teacher practice without improving resourcing levels of schools.

7. Governance, Management and Teacher Training and Support

7.1 Introduction

The SPR was used to inform a number of training programmes over the last year in ELEP schools and five years in TOLSIP schools. Following the SPR data collection process a series of meetings were held at school and district levels to share results with the leadership of the local communities and agree on the key elements which needed improving in each school. These priorities were then transported into the school’s improvement plan. Most of these priorities focused on specific aspects of governing or managing schools or teaching to improve learner outcomes. LCD also used these priorities and concerns to influence its own annual plan and the workshops it would deliver, along with the focus of the support supervision it would provide to each project school.

7.2 The Training Offering

The full range of training programmes mounted in Hoima and Buliisa during these projects as reported by the district and school level respondents and confirmed by the LCD staff included:

School Governance

- Training of SMC and PTA members in their roles and responsibilities, as well as financial management training for the SMC’s Finance Committee and working with both structures on how to mobilise parents and communities so that they engage with and support the school.

School Management

- Training head teachers and their deputies in basic management skills including curriculum management, leadership and management skills, human resource and financial management.

Teaching

- Training in teaching literacy – this was just in English at first and focused on P1 and P2 teachers but was later extended to P3 and mother tongue teaching, and finally, once the locus moved from centre-based workshops to school-based interventions the support and training was extended to all primary teachers.

- Training in teaching numeracy – this followed the same trajectory as the literacy training, starting with centre based training for lower grade teachers and later being extended to all teachers in their schools

- Training in managing a school library.

- HIV and AIDS training for teachers, focusing on their own knowledge and health as well as care and support of learners infected and affected. This was conducted by medical officers and LCD staff.
• Training in running a safe and hygienic school. This included sanitation, nutrition, clean water, and operating clean accessible toilets and having a room for menstruating girls to use. This programme was particularly linked to keeping pubescent girls in school and making schools a safe place to learn.

District

• Capacity building of the school inspectors in order to conduct positive inspections which would aid schools.

• Roles and responsibility training for all district education staff.

• Training of trainers training for all district staff involved in the SPR data collection and analysis process

• Development of District Education Management Information Systems (DEMIS) and training district staff on how to collect, enter, present and analyse the data and how to use a database in Hoima. In Buliisa a lack of electricity in the district office undermined the potential value of this training so it was not fully implemented.

No training was directly focused on learners although they were the assumed to be key beneficiaries of all the training.

7.3 Impact of the Training and Support

Evaluation reports that LCD undertook and that were undertaken independently (Ezati et al. 2010; Prew 2014b) indicated that LCDU was successful in reaching all of its schools and having an impact on their functionality and their attraction as learning environments. This is generally the view presented by the school-based respondents. In all schools teachers and head teachers indicated in detail the value of what LCD has been doing with them. However, not all the intended outcomes have been achieved. For instance, neither of the Buliisa schools visited has implemented group work, or even organising the desks in groups. The teachers argue that their classes are too large to make this practical. Certainly one teacher had a point. She was teaching over 120 P2 learners with about 60 of these learners sitting on the floor due to a lack of benches and desks. However, all the other teachers could have easily reorganised desks into groups, as has been done by teachers in Hoima where classes are much the same size. It seemed the teachers needed more sustained classroom based support before they were prepared to take this radical step. In Hoima project schools grouping learners is the norm, and has even spread to the classes of teachers who LCD has never engaged.

A key concern expressed at Buliisa district head-quarters and by one of the head teachers in Buliisa is why the intervention that LCD has been driving has not had more impact on the PLE results in the schools where LCD works. This is not universal. In fact in both Buliisa schools visited there has been some progress, although while one of the schools has been achieving increasing Division 1 and 2 results, with a drop in failures, the other school has seen only very gradual improvement with no learners getting Division 1. Many reasons were posited for this relative lack of impact – which extends to some of the SPR indicators which have been resistant to improvement in Buliisa and Hoima schools. Many of the reasons seem to revolve around the economic life of these fishing and nomadic herding communities. Not only do families move with their cattle or around Lake Albert after the diminishing fish stocks, taking their children in and out of school, but also many families expect the older children – beyond P3 – to play a full economic role and see no value in education once the child can earn a living fishing or herding. Meanwhile girls are often left looking after younger siblings, as their mothers
seek an income away from home. In addition, according to one head teacher, girls are treated as ‘resources’ in Alur, Bahema and Lugungu communities to be married off as soon as possible. This complex situation is further complicated by the movement into these communities, particularly some in Hoima District, of children who move back and forth from the DRC. On top of all this in parts of Hoima District, for instance in the area of Kabaale Primary School, private schools have appeared. As in other parts of the country teachers report that a revolving door syndrome operates with substantial numbers of parents putting their children into private schools when they have a little bit of money, and then removing them later in the year when money runs out and putting them back in the public school. All these factors create a constant flux in enrolment week by week. In addition LCD faced the frustration of training teachers who then get moved to another school by the district office before they had a chance to share the skills they had just learned with other members of staff. Movement of head teachers can be even more detrimental to the impact and sustainability of the project elements, although it was not common during the time the project was operating.

A further factor limiting the impact of the LCD training is that while it provided support to all teachers and managers during school visits, its training normally involved one or two members of staff or governors who were meant to return to their schools and cascade that training. According to school managers this usually worked well, particularly if LCD staff then followed up with support in the school. However, like most cascade processes the transmission process is only as good as the memory and understanding of the teacher or manager passing on the training to colleagues.

However, even with all these barriers every respondent in the four sample project schools visited asserted that the relations between the school and its community had improved greatly as a result of LCD driving the SPR process and its programme to increase the knowledge levels of the SMC members and focus them on their mandated tasks.

8. Challenges in Delivery

In the interviews and project documentation a number of barriers and challenges appear, which either undermined or complicated LCD’s ability to deliver on its mandate in both projects. These included:

(i) Irregular flows of funds from LCDU’s head office to the operational staff in Buliisa and Hoima. The reasons for this are not entirely clear but seem to relate to the general financial health of LCDU over the last two years and the capability of its finance officer. On occasion this led to delays in holding such project activities as workshops and also impacted on the number of school and district staff who could attend. It also sometimes impacted on mobility of the team and appears to have led to periods of relative inactivity when staff were effectively grounded.

(ii) The funding situation has for some years led LCDU managers to engage with national projects as consultants in LCD’s name, such as the MoES’s Monitoring Learning Achievement (MLA) initiative. This brings in some funding and exposes these managers to national processes. However, it can break up delivery and takes key managers out of the office at times when they are needed to lead and manage the projects.

(iii) SPR data had been managed and analysed by a former employee who was employed as an IT specialist. When he left LCDU he carried the files with him and appears to have...
deliberately blocked access to historical SPR data. His leaving left LCDU with IT challenges particularly in regard to analysing SPR data. It also impacted on access to some of the required data for this report.

(iv) In the last year movement of staff between projects to maximise the use of skills within the team and by staff leaving to take up opportunities elsewhere has impacted on continuity and to some extent trust between LCD and the schools and district offices it was working with.

These points accepted, the general response from all clients who were interviewed as part of this evaluation is that LCDU is an essential part of the Ugandan education landscape and its demise or movement away from Hoima and Buliisa would be considered a serious and sad development. This is based on the perceived quality of LCD’s work and the collaborative way in which it works with both district staff and schools. LCDU is considered a valuable and important partner by these education players.

9. Conclusions

The following are the key conclusions from this summative evaluation:

1. There is no doubt that LCDU has added value to the schools and districts where it has been working funded through the TOLSIP and TrustAfrica interventions. Its work is valued and it is held in high regard. Although the districts of Buliisa and Hoima may not have been transformed through LCD’s efforts – as Masindi District was in the early 2000s – these districts have profited greatly by LCDU’s involvement and support and district officials and school staff believe that without LCDU’s presence their situation would be considerably worse than it is now. LCD and the district officials admit that Hoima and Buliisa Districts have challenges with their communities and levels of poverty which make it hard to compare the districts to Masindi. Both districts have highly mobile pastoral and fishing populations which find sustained use of schools difficult. Further, it should be borne in mind that schools experience interventions very differently and what works in one school well may not work in another serving the same community.

2. The School Performance Review data for the project schools is disappointing, and does not reflect the general sense, conveyed by the staff of the five project schools visited, as well as the district and LCD staff, that the project has impacted positively on the functioning and performance of project schools. There is some evidence from early on in TOLSIP that the project was impacting on most indicators including PLE performance and retention of children in school and particularly girls. However, given the changes in the indicators used for SPR over the project timeframe sustained improvement in the schools cannot be asserted.

3. LCD’s ability to impact on the performance of the schools it was working with in a sustained way was heavily influenced by these schools serving highly mobile and marginalised communities. This makes any sustained impact on PLE results – which anyway take years to manifest themselves – and enrolment problematic. However, it does
mean that improving relations and trust between these communities and schools is critical: LCD has achieved that in these schools.

4. The key addition in 2014 to the earlier repertoire of LCD activities was the intensive training and support of lower primary literacy teachers. This addition was very successful. The Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) results from November 2014 were consistently and significantly better than those of the same schools seven months earlier in the baseline EGRA and are significantly better than those for the control schools.

5. The EGRA results test and support the hypothesis that teachers who receive classroom based support get better literacy results. The support the P1 and P3 literacy teachers in the five target schools received during 2014 is detailed in the report. It amounts to just over 20 hours of mentoring each teacher during the course of the project. Improving literacy teaching and learning in the lower primary phase is critical to all other learning. Put another way a learner who leaves P3 partially literate is extremely unlikely to make up this deficit and so is almost always condemned to a life of poverty and marginalisation. This evaluator believes that the literacy initiative is a very important addition to the project and should be rolled out more generally in Uganda.

6. The EGRA results indicate an urgent need to change the way that literacy is taught in many schools in Uganda. Teachers are trained to teach letter names and not sounds. This creates unnecessary learning barriers for young children. It is not important for children to know the name of a letter; it is essential they know the sound each letter makes. Once the project teachers started teaching through letter sounds they report the learners ‘catch up’ very quickly. When this is combined with a focus on building words and sentences and grouping learners in mixed ability groups so that they can assist each other and promote ‘horizontal interactions’, the improvements are translated into real learning.

7. Uncertainties over provision and sustainability of funding particularly in the last year have impacted on the ability of the project to keep good staff and provide a joined up service that has real value at school and district level. The result is that staff get distracted by such national processes as the Monitoring of Learning Achievement data collection process. While such initiatives bring in some additional funding and help profile LCDU they also break up project delivery with a detrimental effect on impact.
10. **Recommendations**

This report ends with a few points for reflection for LCD, the MoES and the funders involved with the TOLSIP – ELEP joint project.

- More research needs to be done on the intensity and nature of support and guidance needed to make weak P1 – P3 teachers into strong literacy teachers. This is one of the most important priorities in any education system. This project report should provide evidence in support of that objective, while also providing pointers as to what worked in the small number of schools that were part of the project in the last year.

- A relatively cost-effective literacy and numeracy support intervention at P1 level in rural schools could save Uganda considerable social, economic and literacy problems later on. PLE results and poor learner survival rates in the primary cycle indicate that well over half the learners who enter school in P1 in Uganda will leave school sometime in the next years only partially literate – both in their home language and in English.

- There is a need to be consistent in the data which is collected from school level. In this project reducing the number of SPR indicators from 18 to 10 during TOLSIP may have made sense from a planning and delivery perspective, but this change means that it becomes hard if not impossible to compare data from the start of the project with the end point. This in turn undermines the ability to draw valid conclusions on the impact of the project.

- SPR only impacts substantively if its integrity is maintained. Diluting the data collection or the School Performance Appraisal Meeting format leads to the data having much less impact and ultimately impacts negatively on the ability of LCDU to drive greater school and district accountability to communities and so improved school and district performance.
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Annex A: SPR Data for Each School 2014

**Indicators**
Indicator 1. Teaching and learning process
Indicator 2. Assessments, Reading and Reporting
Indicator 3. Pupils’ understanding and attainment
Indicator 4. Leadership
Indicator 5. Management of finances/ resources
Indicator 6. Supervision of teaching and learning
Indicator 7. Access and equity
Indicator 8. School governance
Indicator 9. Community relations
Indicator 10. School sanitation, nutrition and health

**Hoima District**

---

**Buseruka P/S**

---

**Kabaale Public School**

---
Buliisa District

Avogera P/S

Not Achieved
Partially Achieved
Achieved
Fully Achieved

Bugana P/S

Butiaba P/S

Not Achieved
Partially Achieved
Achieved
Fully Achieved
Garasoya P/S

Kakooora P/S

Kisansya P/S
Annex B: Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) Results

The Annex presents the baseline and endline results for the five project schools (PS) where EGRA was conducted as well as the two control or non-project schools (NPS).

### Average number of correct letter sounds learners made in a minute (out of a possible 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: PS-Programme Schools; NPS-Non Programme Schools

### Percentage of learners who did not know any letter sound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average number of words learners segmented correctly (out of a possible 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English P1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English P3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of learners who could not segment any word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English P1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English P3</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P1</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average number of non words learners read correctly in a minute (out of a possible 50)

- English:
  - March PS: 0.0
  - November PS: 4.4
  - November NPS: 1.7
- Runyoro:
  - March PS: 2.4
  - November PS: 15.5
  - November NPS: 2.64

Percentage of learners who failed to decode nonwords

- English:
  - March PS: 100%
  - November PS: 36%
  - November NPS: 2%
- Runyoro:
  - March PS: 100%
  - November PS: 70%
  - November NPS: 8%
Average number of words learners read correctly in a passage in a minute (of a possible 58 words in English/ 52 words in Runyoro)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English P1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English P3</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of learners that failed to read any word of a passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English P1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English P3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyoro P3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average number of questions from a passage learners answered correctly (out of a possible 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Runyoro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Runyoro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of learners who failed to answer any question of a passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and class</th>
<th>March PS</th>
<th>November PS</th>
<th>November NPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 English</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 English</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Runyoro</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Runyoro</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average number of English instructions learners executed correctly (of a possible 20)

- **March PS**: P1: 5.19, P3: 7.02
- **November PS**: P1: 10.3, P3: 12.9
- **November NPS**: P1: 7.1, P3: 9.1

Average number of questions learners answered correctly (out of a possible 3) from a Runyoro passage read to them

- **March PS**: P1: 1.6, P3: 2.18
- **November PS**: P1: 2.6, P3: 2.9
- **November NPS**: P1: 2.2, P3: 2.5
Percentage of learners who failed to correctly answer any question from a Runyoro passage read to them

- March PS: 27% (P1), 10% (P3)
- November PS: 0% (P1), 0% (P3)
- November NPS: 5% (P1), 0% (P3)
## Annex C: List of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link Community Development</td>
<td>Former Project Manager: TOLSIP</td>
<td>23rd January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager: Masindi</td>
<td>9th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator: Buliisa</td>
<td>9th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy Coordinator: Hoima</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butiaba Primary School (Buliisa)</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of the SMC</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1, P2 and P7 Teachers</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndandamire Primary School (Buliisa)</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2, P3 and P6 Teachers</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buseruka Primary School (Hoima)</td>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2, P3 and P6 Teachers</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaale Primary School (Hoima)</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1, P1, P3, P4, P6, and P6 Teachers</td>
<td>11th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa District</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
<td>10th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoima District</td>
<td>Education Officer responsible for LCD Projects</td>
<td>12th February 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D: Research Tools

Data Sheet for Hoima/Buliisa Primary School

Please could you fill this data sheet in as completely as possible and return it to the researcher before the end of their visit. The data you provide will be treated as confidential and your school will not be named in the report that comes from this research process.

Name of school_________________________ Position of person filling in form________________

Date _______________________ Contact no. of person filling in form ______________________

1. Number of learners registered in each class/grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number of Female Learners</th>
<th>Number of Male Learners</th>
<th>Total Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of learners present in each class/grade TODAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number of Female Learners</th>
<th>Number of Male Learners</th>
<th>Total Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Division 1 passes</th>
<th>No. of girls with D1</th>
<th>Division 2 passes</th>
<th>No. of girls with D2</th>
<th>Total Passes (% of total)</th>
<th>% of girls passed</th>
<th>Total who sat PLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Repetition Rates (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. learners repeating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Drop-out Rates (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. learners dropped out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Number of orphans in your school: ............... 

7. Do you stream learners in this school Y/N  If you answered ‘yes’ which classes are streamed? .................................................................

8. Number of teachers in the school: Total: ....... Male: ........ Female: ........

9. Please fill in for your teachers the number who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Walk Tool for Hoima/Buliisa primary schools

Take 20 minutes during the day while lessons are in progress to walk around the school. Then fill in the sheet below.

School ________________________________ Date ________________ Time ________________

1. Buildings – describe what classrooms and other buildings are made of:

2. Buildings – describe the state of the classroom windows, doors and floors

3. Buildings; Does the school have a (tick after all present)? Science lab ______ Library ______
   Computer room _____ Kitchen _____ Head teacher office ____ Admin block ______
   Staff room _____ List any other specialist rooms/buildings___________________________

4. Safety and security – describe the state of the school’s fence:

5. Safety and security – are the grounds and school buildings safe? Detail this:

6. Do the classroom doors lock?
7. Does the school have some secure rooms with bars on the windows?
8. Classes/teaching: are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All time</th>
<th>Most time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 teacher in a class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching aids on wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough desks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct chairs/tables for age level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible chalkboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded lower school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded upper school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. School Environment: Is it attractive with flowers and trees and talking environment? (describe)

10. School Environment: Does the school have playing fields and play ground? (describe)

11. Toilets: how many toilets are there: Girls _______ Boys _______ Teachers __________
   a. Are there changing rooms for girls and other provisions for menstruating girls?
   b. Are there toilet facilities for disabled learners which are open/accessible?
   c. Are the latrines kept clean?

12. Water: Do the students have access to clean water?
   a. What is the source of the water?

13. Power: Does the school have electricity?
   a. Is the electricity functioning?
   b. What is the sources of the electricity? (solar/grid/generator)
   c. Do all/some/none of the classrooms have access to electricity?
   d. Does the staffroom/admin office/head teacher office have access to electricity?

14. Computers: Does the school have computers?
   a. How many does the school have that are working?
   b. Where are they kept?
   c. Do the students have access to the computers to learn?
   d. Are the computers safe (i.e. in a secure room)?

Hoima/Buliisa Lesson Observation Tool
Instructions: On arrival at the school you will introduce yourselves to the head teacher (or if not present the most senior teacher present) and explain what you are doing. The school should already know that it is to be visited.

Get assistance from senior educator in selecting a P1 or a P3 class to observe.

Before the lesson meet the teacher and ask what the ‘objectives of the lesson?’ are. Listen to her/his objectives and note them down. Ask if there is a lesson plan and ask to see it and report on it in the grid below.

You must arrive on time for the lesson and watch ALL the lesson.

Let the teacher use the lesson plan during lesson. Review lesson briefly with the teacher after the lesson.

Sit at the back of the room, impacting as little as possible on the classroom, teacher and learners. Never intervene in the lesson, however bad or disorganised it is. However, if there is group, pair or individual work you may walk around the classroom and see if the learners are a) understanding the instructions; b) able to respond to the task appropriately.

Keep careful notes during the lesson of what the teacher and learners are doing on the form below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Planning and organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives communicated clearly at start lesson to the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan is used and followed in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson and learning is reviewed at end of lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical activities are evident in plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement of Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical activities are included in lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are engaged throughout lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses praise to reward achievement and effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates environment which encourages active student involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens and responds to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differentiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caters for different learner ability in planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students allowed to work at own pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches to different learning styles (Visual; Aural; Read/write; Kinesthetic - VARK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities created for group work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses variety of questioning techniques to check student knowledge and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the teacher praise the learners and give positive feedback to all responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows students opportunities to apply knowledge and skills during lesson to a real life situation; Encourages creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atmosphere</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a stick/cane in the room?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the teacher carry/use stick during lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any laughter/fun during the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the percentage of the lesson which is:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner activity/task/writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner talk in class or in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom checklist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom environment supports learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The room is arranged appropriately for the lesson observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hoima/Buliisa DEO/DIS Interview Tool

Note age, gender.

1. How long have you been a DEO/DIS in this district? What qualifications do you have? What were you doing before this position?

2. Can you describe what LCD has been doing with your schools? (Hint at SPR, literacy, training of SMC and teachers – get a list of training)

3. Did LCD work with the district office? If so what did they do with you? With what result?

4. Did you find the work that LCD did useful?

5. Did their work with you make your teachers’ change their practice? If so what is different in their practice? If so, how do you know that their changed practice has helped pupils learn better?

6. Have you found the SPR process added value to the schools? The district? If so in what way?

7. Why do you think the SPR results for classroom teaching and learning and supervision of teaching and learning have not been improving in the schools that LCD is working in?

8. Have you found the training that LCD provided useful? If so in what way?

9. Do you think that your district will carry on using the practices / methods that you have described without LCD assistance and support? If so why and how? If not, why not?
Hoima/Buliisa Head teacher Interview Tool

Note age, gender.

1. How long have you been a head-teacher at this school? What qualifications do you have?

2. Can you describe what LCD has been doing with you and your staff and school? (Hint at SPR, literacy, training of SMC and teachers – get a list of training)

3. Did you find the work that LCD did useful?

4. Did their work with you make your teachers and / or you change your practice? If so what is different in their / your practice? If so, how do you know that their / your changed practice has helped your pupils learn better?

5. Have you found the SPR process added value to the school? If so in what way?

6. Why do you think the SPR results for classroom teaching and learning and supervision of teaching and learning have not been improving in the schools that LCD is working in?

7. Have you found the training that LCD provided useful? If so in what way?

8. Have the changed practices that you are describing influenced the other teachers in your school? If so how?

9. Do you think that you will carry on using the practices / methods that you have described without LCD assistance and support? If so why and how? If not, why not?
Hoima/Buliisa Teacher Interview Tool

Select a P1, P3 and an upper primary teacher. Interview them together.

Note age, gender.

1. What grade do you teach and how long have you been teaching? What qualifications do you have?

2. Can you describe what LCD has been doing with you? (Hint at SPR, literacy, training of SMC and teachers – get a list of training)

3. Have you found the SPR process added value to the school? If so in what way?

4. Why do you think the SPR results for classroom teaching and learning and supervision of teaching and learning have not been improving in the schools that LCD is working in?

5. Have you found the training that LCD provided useful? If so in what way?

6. Did their work with you make you change your practice? If so what is different in your practice? If so, how do you know that your changed practice has helped your pupils learn better?

7. Have the changed practices that you are describing influenced the other teachers in your school? If so how?

8. Do you think that you will carry on using the methods that you have described without LCD assistance and support? If so why and how? If not, why not?
LCD Facilitator Interview Tool

Note age, gender.

1. How long have you been a facilitator with LCD? How long on this project? What qualifications do you have?

2. How many schools have you been working with in each district?

3. Can you describe what LCD has been doing with these staff and schools? (List all training and support - Hint at SPR, literacy, training of SMC and teachers – get a list of training)

4. Do you think the schools found your intervention useful? If so why and in what ways? Why not?

5. Did their work with you make the teachers and head-teachers change their practice? If so what is different in their practice? If so, how do you know that their changed practice has helped pupils learn better?

6. Have the changed practices that you described influenced the other teachers in the schools? If so how?

7. Do you think that the SPR process added value to the schools? If so in what way?

8. What were your main challenges working in these schools?

9. What do you see as your main successes working with these schools?

10. Why do you think the SPR results for classroom teaching and learning and supervision of teaching and learning have not been improving in the schools that LCD has been working in?

11. Do you think that they will carry on using the practices / methods that you have described without LCD’s assistance and support? If so why and how? If not, why not?

Do you have the enrolment and PLE results for the schools you were working with over the last years?