

# Implementation Models:

## Evidence and lessons from randomised evaluations

**Table 1:** This table highlights some of the adaptive learning and targeted instruction implementation models evaluated in various contexts and shows differences in implementation methods.

Intervention	Who taught TaRL classes?	Intervention length	Where/When did TaRL classes take place?	Which children participated?	Special characteristics	Results
<a href="#">Balsakhi, India 2001-03</a>	Tutors	Two school years for two hours a day.	During the school day, children with lower basic skills pulled out of class for remedial instruction	Children with lower initial basic skill levels in grades 2 to 4	This model pulled children out of their regular classes, targeting only children who had lower basic skill levels.	<p>Average test scores (overall) increased by 0.14 standard deviations in the first year, 0.28 standard deviations in second year</p> <p>Children who were sent to the Balsakhi gained the most (0.60 standard deviations on overall test score in the second year)</p>
<a href="#">Extra Teacher Program, Kenya 2005-07</a>	Government teachers and locally hired contract teachers	Over the course of the school year	Children grouped by level during the school day throughout the year	All grade 1 children	The Kenya intervention was not a TaRL programme. It asked teachers to assess and rearrange grade 1 classes by level but did not include other key aspects of the TaRL approach.	<p>Tracking by initial achievement increased test scores at all ability levels; students in tracking schools scored 0.14 standard deviations more than students in non-tracking schools</p> <p>Effects of tracking persisted for one year after the programme ended</p> <p>Civil-service teachers were 11 percentage points more likely to be in class and teaching when they are assigned to the top section in tracking schools than when they were assigned to non-tracking schools.</p>
<a href="#">Community-based classes, India 2005-06</a>	Volunteers	Two school years	After-school classes	Children in the village aged 7 to 14 who opted to attend	To encourage community awareness and participation in learning, Pratham organised community meetings and small-group discussions between teachers, administrators, and community members and trained community members to assess children using a simple reading test and create report cards on enrolment and learning in the village. This community mobilisation on its own did not improve learning outcomes. Only the addition of the volunteer-led reading camps successfully improved learning. However, because the camps took place after school, only eight percent of the children attended classes.	<p>Children who could not read at the beginning of the intervention were 7.9 percent more likely to be able to read letters</p> <p>Children who could only read letters, but not words, were 3.5 percent more likely to read at least paragraphs or words, and 3.3 percent more likely to read stories.</p>

Intervention	Who taught TaRL classes?	Intervention length	Where/When did TaRL classes take place?	Which children participated?	Special characteristics	Results
<a href="#">Read India 2008-10</a>	Government teachers, supported by volunteers in Bihar (2008)	One month	Summer camps	Grade 1 to 5 children who attended camps	Government teachers in Bihar were provided with training, materials, volunteer support, and were paid for additional time to implement TaRL during a one-month period during the summer holidays. Attendance was low, with only 23 percent of the children attending the summer camp.	Reading scores: 0.08 standard deviations Mathematics score: 0.08 standard deviations  Effects on reading concentrated on children at letter-reading level or below at baseline
	Training, materials, and volunteer support to government teachers in Uttarkhand (2008-2010)	Approximately 50 days over the course of the school year	Children grouped by level during the school day	Grade 1 to 5 children	Government teachers were provided with combinations of training, materials, and volunteer support in Uttarkhand. The provision of material only, material plus teacher training, or training, materials, and volunteer support did not improve learning outcomes. Volunteers tended to take on some of the teachers' regular responsibilities, but did not implement TaRL.	No impact on average scores
	Training, materials, and volunteer support for government teachers in Bihar (2008-2010)	Approximately 60 days over the course of the school year	After-school classes	All grade 1 to 5 children	This intervention took place in Bihar and provided either (1) material only, (2) a combination of teacher training plus material, or (3) a combination of teacher training, material, and volunteer support. In intervention 3, volunteers conducted TaRL classes after the school day.	No overall impact of (1) material only and (2) material plus teacher training  The intervention with teacher training, materials and volunteers improved overall average test score by 0.11 standard deviations
<a href="#">Teacher Community Assistant Initiative, Ghana 2012-2013</a>	Teacher Community Assistants	Two school years	After-school classes targeting children with lower basic skills; and remedial classes for children with lower basic skills during the school day for one hour.	Targeted to grade 1 to 3 children with lower basic skill levels	The National Youth Employment Programme (NYEP) provided an existing framework through which to recruit and fund the team of TCAs and was supported by the Ghana National Association of Teachers (GNAT) in recruiting TCAs.	0.12 to 0.18 standard deviations increase for children tested in grade 3 and grade 4 who were in the programme for two years or more
	Government teachers	Two school years	During the school day	All children in grades 1 to 3	Teachers were given training and materials to target lessons to the learning levels of the children in their classes. However, the government supervisory structure was not altered to help teachers take on this new approach and teachers tended to inconsistently implement the intervention. The researchers noted that a stronger mentoring and monitoring system might help teachers to fully and consistently implement the intervention.  In the second year of the intervention, teachers were asked to regroup classrooms according to level rather than grade.	0.08 to 0.17 standard deviations increase for children tested in grade 3 and 4 who had been in the programme for two years or more

Intervention	Who taught TaRL classes?	Intervention length	Where/When did TaRL classes take place?	Which children participated?	Special characteristics	Results
<a href="#">Learning Enhancement Programme, India 2012-13</a>	Government teachers	One school year	In-school during a dedicated TaRL hour	All grade 3 to 5 children	<p>An already-existing team of government supervisors, called ABRCs were equipped to take on mentoring and monitoring roles for TaRL implementation. By clarifying mentoring and monitoring roles, providing in-depth training, and practice in the classroom, teachers implementing TaRL had a strong support system, enabling them to consistently implement the approach.</p> <p>Additionally, the Government of Haryana created a dedicated hour for TaRL, during which teachers regrouped grade 3 to 5 classes by learning level rather than age or grade.</p>	<p>Basic oral Hindi score increased by 0.15 standard deviations</p> <p>Basic written Hindi increased by 0.135 standard deviations</p>
<a href="#">Learning Camps, India 2013-14</a>	Volunteers and Pratham staff	40 days (in 20 or 10 day bursts), and a 10-day booster summer camp for three hours a day	Intensive camp during school time	All grade 3 to 5 children	<p>Although this model was implemented by village volunteers supported by Pratham staff, it was implemented during the school day, therefore avoiding the problem of low attendance experienced with many out-of-school models.</p>	<p>0.60 standard deviations increase (for children in the 20-day burst model) to 0.70 standard deviations (for children in the 10-day burst model)</p>