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Design

TaRL Theory of Change

Children have low levels of basic reading and maths and are taught in heterogeneous classes

Training of mentors and teachers

Monitoring system support

Development of teaching learning materials

Teachers assess children and group them by leaning level

Time dedicated to foundational skills

Teachers tailor the lesson to the learning level of students

Children better absorb the lesson.

Basic reading and maths skills improve

Do learners in grades 3-5 have low levels of basic skills?

Do teachers assess learners correctly?

Do teachers use the methodology in class?

Are teachers supported by mentors?

Do teachers and learners use the materials?
### Teacher Observations (sample)

**Section B: CLASS OBSERVATION (Circle 1 for yes and 0 for no)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>2.1 What time did the observation start?</th>
<th>2.2 How many children are in each grade in the class you are observing?</th>
<th>2.3 Is the class arranged in groups?</th>
<th>2.4 Are there teaching aids for Teaching at the Right Level in the classroom?</th>
<th>2.5 Did children handle the teaching aids during the lesson?</th>
<th>2.6 What proportion of the children were having fun? or what percentage of the observation are children having fun?</th>
<th>2.7 Did the teacher use examples from everyday life or from the local context?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcomes

**Basic Numeracy Assessment (Sample-1)**

**Part -1 (Number Recognition)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL -1</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL -2</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>5156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>3525</td>
<td>6734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design

Process for Developing Assessment Tool

• Assessment tools initially created by Pratham team in Zambia

• Team of master trainers from Ministry worked on assessment tools, after training from Pratham on TaRL.
  – This group discussed how to match the tool to the expectations at grade 2.
  – Some members consulted the curriculum during this process.

• Tools were tested first in the area of the workshop and then in each of the provinces. Feedback from these trials led to updates, especially in numeracy.

• Tools were reviewed again in material review workshop, but not substantially altered.
Results

Teacher scored highly on monitoring tool

This score is made of:
Was the class arranged in groups?
Were Catch Up teaching aids in classroom?
Did children handle Catch Up teaching aids?
Were more than half children are having fun?

Was the teacher talking less than half the time?
Was the teacher sitting/standing close to children?
Could the children relate to lesson topics?
Results
Teaching Aids were in the vast majority of visits

Use of Teaching Aids

- **Chipata**
- **Katete**
- **Monze**
- **Pemba**

- **Catch Up teaching resources in the classroom**
- **Children handle teaching resources**
Results
Teachers were generally visited by mentors as frequently as expected.

![Mentoring visits made by senior teachers and ZIC](chart.png)
Results

Attendance in class was better in the intensive models

Eastern Province learners not in class

Southern Province learners not in class
Results

Teacher assessment results were close to the independent monitor assessment results.
Results

Summary

• Do learners in grades 3-5 have low levels of basic skills?  YES
• Do teachers assess learners correctly?  YES
• Do teachers use the methodology in class?  YES
• Do teachers and learners use the materials?  YES
• Are teachers supported by mentors?  YES

• Additional notes:
  – Intensive model had better teacher implementation, greater use of materials, and good support by mentors.
  – Enough evidence from the longer model that it too can work with support.
  – In-class attendance higher in intensive model, possibly due to time of year.
Lessons

What would we have done differently?

- Monitoring frequently with small samples might be more useful than a once-off, thorough (and expensive) monitoring exercise
  - Overly intensive independent monitoring at the pilot stage might influence results
  - We recommend continuing to do some independent monitoring as the program goes to scale

- Monitor how often the program is happening
  - If it’s not happening, track why not
  - Advise teams to keep their visits a surprise

- Considering hiring trained teachers as surveyors?
Questions?