

TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY IN UGANDA

DECEMBER 2002



TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY IN UGANDA

VOLUME 1: EVALUATION REPORT

KATHLEEN LETSHABO, PH.D

December 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 OBJECTIVES OF UGANDA BTL.....	2
1.2 DESCRIPTION OF BTL PILOT	2
1.3 BTL MONITORING.....	3
2.0 DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION	4
2.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS	4
2.2 OVERVIEW	4
2.3 APPRECIATING THE CONTEXT	5
2.4 IN-DEPTH ASSESSMENT: ELITE AND FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS.....	6
2.5 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	7
2.6 CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS	7
2.7 LEARNER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT TEST	7
2.8 DATA COLLECTION.....	9
3.0 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	10
3.1 BTL CLASSROOMS: ARE THEY CHILD-FRIENDLY?	10
3.2 TEACHING AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.....	15
3.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF LITERACY.....	17
4.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF BTL	22
4.1 IMPLICATIONS OF COST	22
4.2 ESTIMATING THE COSTING FOR NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION	24
4.3 MAINSTREAMING BTL INTO UGANDAN EDUCATION SYSTEM	25
5.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
5.1 ISSUES AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL.....	28
5.2 MOE/POLICY LEVEL	29
5.3 SUMMARY	30
APPENDIX A – LIST OF CONTACTS	31
REFERENCES	I

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AGEI	African Girls' Education Initiative
BTL	Breakthrough to Literacy
CCTs	Center Coordinating Tutors
CFS	Child Friendly Schools
COPE	Complementary Opportunities for Primary Education
ESIP	Education Strategic Investment Plan
ITEK	Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo
LAB	Learner Activity Book
LEA	Language Experience Approach
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
MML	Maskew Miller Longman
NBTL	New Breakthrough to Literacy
NCDC	National Curriculum Development Centre
PEO	Principal Education Officer
PRP	Primary Reading Programme
P1/P2/P3	Primary Grade 1/2/3
TAB	Teacher Activity Book
TDMS	Teacher Development and Management Systems
TOT	Trainer of Trainers
TSM	Teacher Sentence Maker
TRC	Teacher Resource Centre
TTC	Teacher Training College
UNEB	Uganda National Examinations Board
UPE	Universal Primary Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In May 2001, the Ministry of Education and Sports and its partners, UNICEF, ITEK, and NCDC embarked commenced activities for a pilot project for teaching Local Languages, using a methodology called Breakthrough to Literacy (BTL). BTL was originally developed to teach functional literacy skills to learners in their first language. It is an approach that brings into the classroom language that children are already experiencing in the home, works with children to recognise familiar spoken words when translated into a written code, and to generate written language. The learning environment in a BTL classroom is organized into social and ability groups which are required to perform tasks interactively in a relaxed and highly stimulating atmosphere.

BTL Uganda aims to develop literacy functional skills in young learners, such that 85% of girls and 85% of boys are able to read and write in a Local Language by end of P3. It also promotes other important features of the Uganda education landscape; that of establishing child-friendly learning environments in all lower primary schools and learning centers and ensuring that learners demonstrate proficiency in at least 3 selected life skills by end of P3. These and other generic features of the BTL approach were piloted in 100 P1 classes representing regular primary schools and COPE centers. Three local languages of Alur, Dhophadhola, and Luganda were selected for the pilot, which was conducted in four districts of Nebbi, Tororo, Kamuli, Masaka, and at the Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo (ITEK) demonstration school in Kampala

BTL Pilot

Pilot implementation of the BTL programme was coordinated by ITEK, and supported under the auspices of TDMS, which has the overall responsibility for teacher training and development in Uganda. BTL piloting activities included developing BTL curriculum and supporting materials in the three languages, training of trainers at the national, regional and district level, training of teachers and headteachers, sensitization of parents in BTL piloting communities, monitoring learning and formative evaluation in BTL classrooms, and a summative evaluation towards the end of the first year of the pilot period. The BTL methodology has been a resounding success, both in terms of increase reading proficiency in the piloting schools, an in several aspects of promoting child-friendly learning environments.

Achievement on Reading Literacy

The mean of **all** BTL learners, including those who did not attain the required reading proficiency, is 50.7 percent, compared to 26.0 percent for the non-BTL group. Compared to their grade cohort, the BTL learners have outperformed the non-BTL P2s by more than 40 percentage points (50.7% BTL, compared to 10.2% non-BTL). The non-BTL learners are most deficient in reading comprehension, the most important skill for future learning, unfortunately. The BTL methodology was found to work equally well with boys and girls (mean of 50.9 and 50.6, respectively).

According to their teachers, about 90 percent of BTL learners have “brokenthrough” (Stage 2 and 3 learners). This means that they are able to read with understanding, simple text at the P1 grade level, in their local language. More than half of that number (55.4 percent) have reached the Stage 3 reading ability level, which means that they have attained the ability to compose stories. The literacy test results indicate that the mean for the Stage 3 learners is 62.3 percent, with more than 50 percent of the learners scoring 73.6 percent or better (the median score). BTL Stage 3 learners performed better than P3 and P4 in non-BTL schools (means of 19.6 percent and 39.2 percent, respectively). Stage 3 learners are being compared with these cohorts because they are the group that has had the most success with BTL learning objectives.

Teaching and Learning Environment

BTL classrooms have been shown to be child-friendly as a result of observing the learning environment is inclusive of children of diverse backgrounds; enrolments and participation in BTL schools surpasses that of non-BTL schools; participation of boys and girls has been active, equitable, and was tailored to meet specified needs. There also has been a heightened interest and participation of parents in children’s learning activities, and in their involvement in school activities. More importantly, parents have come to view the school as a place that reinforces children cultural heritage.

The BTL classroom climate is generally reported to have improved in a number of ways. For instance, learner-centred and cooperative teaching and learning approaches are being used extensively, where learners take more responsibility for their work and regulate their time and attention between the tasks they have to perform. Children have developed an ability to handle a variety of activities that have to go on at the same time without getting distracted, e.g. drawing objects, counting them, and writing down their number in a sentence. Also, there is evidence of

mutual respect by teachers for the ability of the learners and their efforts, with teachers actively promotion leadership skills, as well as the life skills of communication, and critical thinking. On the whole, children seem to enjoy learning. They also take delight in having pictures, teaching aids and some of their creative writing displayed in the classroom.

The successes above notwithstanding, most schools are still lacking in the basics of providing a healthy environment and in providing a safe environment. For instance, toilet facilities are inadequate; First Aid Kits are not available in most schools, or not kept in a visible place in cases where schools have them; most schools are not fenced-in. Also, the school may need to invest some time in devising deliberate strategies to maximize participation of parents in the actual classrooms activities, so that they may channel efforts to assist learning in a systematic manner.

Recommendations

In view of the success that BTL has had with the pilot Local Languages, this evaluation recommends that plans be made to adapt the methodology, to “Ugandanise” it for maximum effect in the Ugandan context. The adaptation should, among others, specify the outcomes at each stage clearly, develop BTL kits using locally available materials, increase contact time by teaching foundation level subjects with this approach, and, enhance the cultural elements in the methodology. It is envisaged that this strategy will help cut down on cost of developing BTL materials, thereby enhancing its sustainability. In the meantime, as many schools as can be accommodated under the present arrangement should be taken on board. These should be schools that teach the 3 pilot local languages. The original 100 schools should be “lead schools” that can be followed up until P3, where we aim to have 85 percent of the children having attained mastery in reading and writing.

The report also recommends that the BTL undertake a study tour to Zambia where full scale implementation of BTL commenced in 2002. The team can draw lessons on the Zambian experience of implementing their language policy, as well as adapting the BTL approach into NBT. In order to ensure that BTL activities receive adequate attention, a BTL focal point, with the responsibility to plan for expansion of BTL, up to nation-wide implementation, as well as devise monitoring and evaluation strategies, is required at the Ministry of Education and Sports.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Government of Uganda adopted a National Language policy in 1992. The White Paper on the implementation of the new language policy prescribes that the medium of instruction for learners at P1 to P4 be their local language, with English being taught just like any other humanities subject in the curriculum (Ministry of Education and Sports, 1992). This necessitates that learners be highly literate in their local languages. Indeed, the main objective of teaching Local Language is that learners may express themselves effectively in their languages. This is desirable, for pedagogic and practical considerations, as well as to enhance appreciation of children's cultural identity. The general aims of teaching a Local Languages course are, therefore, to enable each learner to:

1. communicate proficiently in a Local language,
2. demonstrate permanent functional literacy in that language,
3. develop and/or promote cultural heritage, and
4. demonstrate awareness and respect for languages and culture other than their own.

(National Curriculum Development Centre, 1999).

At the initiative of UNICEF, the Ministry of Education and Sports has identified a methodology for teaching literacy skills to first language speakers, Breakthrough to Literacy (BTL), to pilot Local Language teaching in Uganda. Originally conceived as an approach for teaching of English as a first language, BTL is an integrated reading and writing approach based on language-experience approach (Mckay, Thompson, & Schaub, 1970). The philosophical basis for BTL is that by age six or seven when children come to a formal school, they have already developed their listening and speaking capabilities in the home language. Literacy learning then takes the form of translating spoken language into a written code, and to read the written word. BTL applies the fundamental pedagogic principle of moving from the known to the unknown in that it uses the child's life experiences and knowledge of language to help young learners acquire functional literacy.

BTL has a number of distinct identifying features, namely, the use of a language experience approach; a learner-centered focus; integration of the four language skills of listening, speaking reading and writing; organizing the learning environment into small social and ability groups; and, an in-built continuous assessment monitoring mechanism. Because of its learner-centeredness and interactiveness, BTL has produced good results in teaching reading and writing to children with learning difficulties. Even though it was first used in the teaching of English, it has achieved great success with African languages, particularly the Bantu languages because of their highly phonetic and syllabic structure.

In the context of Uganda, the Ministry of Education has been piloting BTL for teaching Uganda Local Languages curriculum to learners who are predominantly first language speakers. BTL was perceived to be a teaching and learning approach that has the potential to provide the necessary foundation in increasing retention at the lower levels. Its emphasis is to promote achievement of learning outcomes for boys and girls by raising reading and writing proficiency for P1 to P3 in regular schools, as well as Levels 1 and 2 for COPE learners. Within the UPE and ESIP framework, the literacy skills foundation that BTL promotes is necessary for raising learning achievement at P4 to P7 levels. The Uganda BTL approach addresses the issue of improving the quality of education through the Child-Friendly Schools Framework (CFS), hence BTL schools should of necessity be child-friendly schools.

Under the CFS framework, a child-friendly school is a **rights-based** school. Indicators of being rights-based are the active involvement of the school in promoting and monitoring rights of all

children, including children that are traditionally excluded from education opportunities (poor children, orphans, children with physical disabilities and/or children with special learning needs), and being gender-sensitive by making a deliberate attempt to ensure that boys and girls are given equal learning opportunities. A child-friendly school is **effective with children**; it has a learner-centred curriculum, promotes quality learning outcomes, and is equipped with teachers that are incisive and responsive to learners. A child-friendly school is also **parent-friendly**; it deliberately creates opportunities for parents to play a role in the teaching and learning process, and develops linkages with the community as evidenced in active community participation in school activities. Other attributes of being child-friendly that the BTL approach is set up to promote are a **healthy school environment**, and a **safe school environment**.

1.1 Objectives of Uganda BTL

Specific objectives for Uganda BTL are:

1. To establish child-friendly learning environments in all lower primary schools and learning centers in each of the selected districts; and
2. To ensure that 85% of girls and 85% of boys are able to read, write and demonstrate at least 3 selected life skills by end of P3.

1.2 Description of BTL Pilot

BTL was introduced on a pilot basis in Uganda in the three local languages of Luganda, Alur and Dhopadhola in June 2001. It was introduced in 100 selected P1 classes in Child Friendly Schools, representing both COPE centers and UPE schools, in the four districts of Nebbi, Tororo, Kamuli, Masaka, and at the Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo (ITEK) demonstration school in Kampala. Each pilot school was supplied with the BTL kit consisting of one teacher's manual; one teacher's occupational task book; one teacher's sentence maker and word cards; one teacher's sentence holder; four conversation posters; phonic posters; a word store; 50 learners' sentence makers and word cards; 50 learner's sentence holders; and a set of 12 graded readers. Each learner is supposed to have 2 exercise books, one to be used as a story book, an another for occupational writing tasks.

Pilot implementation of the BTL programme was supported under the auspices of the Teacher Development and Management Systems (TDMS), which has the overall responsibility for teacher training and development in Uganda. TDMS activities are carried out from area coordinating centers that serve clusters of primary schools. Coordinating centers are headed by a Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs). In the pilot districts, CCTs who have BTL pilot primary schools in their catchment areas have been trained in the use of the BTL methodology, and are expected to carry out the following responsibilities in BTL schools.

- To ensure that schools have made the necessary arrangements to accommodate BTL classes.
- To observe BTL classes provide the on-the-spot assistance.
- To sensitize parents and headteachers to provide pencils and books for the BTL classes.
- To encourage improvisation in situations where the materials are not enough.
- To collect data/information on how BTL methodology is being implemented.
- To organise and train other lower primary teachers in the use of the BTL approach in the teaching of mother tongue and area language.
- To conduct routine monitoring of the implementation of BTL methodology.
- To develop a model school in the catchment area.
- To plan with the teachers and enhance effective learning during BTL lessons.

Several BTL training and awareness campaigns were held. The main facilitators at these training sessions were from Molteno, South Africa, and their NCDC counterparts. The training session that was held in May 2001, prior to the commencement of BTL, introduced the BTL approach and prepared them for Stage 1. One hundred and eighty-one trainees attended the session; 94 teachers, 21 COPE instructors, 45 headteachers, 9 CCTs, 11 Education Officers, and 1 CORE PTC principal. Others who participated in the training included 3 writers (Luganda, Adhla, and Alur); members of the ITEK CFS steering committee, representatives from NCDC, UNICEF, and from the Ministry of Education and Sports. The August/September 2001 training was geared for Stages 2 and 3, while subsequent refresher courses brought similar groups of people together to attend to different stages and problem encountered in the pilot implementation. A total of 354 educators and parents have received awareness and/or in-service training on the BTL approach. As part of the broad implementation strategy, some CCTs mobilised headteachers and teachers who received BTL training to form BTL committees. These committees organised refresher workshops, conducted class visits whereby teachers helped each other to improve on their teaching, and assisted the CCTs in monitoring BTL classes. With the TDMS in place, it is believed that tutorial, monitoring and counseling support on the implementation of the BTL can be sustained through existing structures.

1.3 BTL Monitoring

Several national monitoring activities were conducted in all the piloting districts. Monitoring of Stages 1 and Stage 2 was undertaken in August and in October/November 2001, respectively, while monitoring and school based support for Stage 3 was conducted in May, 2002. As part of the monitoring exercise, all the participating schools and districts were supervised at least once in a school term. A self-administered check-list for BTL for teachers was used for data collection. These data were analyzed and summarized into reports that were sent to all UNICEF, NCDC, Ministry of Education and Sports, and to all other stakeholders.

Monitoring reports confirmed that teachers in BTL classrooms and their respective head-teachers/supervisors were trained in all three BTL stages. Another 100 officers, CCTs and district officials, received basic training and sensitization to the BTL methodology. A core team of trainers has been identified who will take the process forward by phasing within each language zone, each district, and to other parts of the country. On the quality of the work that was going on in BTL classes, monitoring reports confirmed the following successes;

- Child-centred innovative methodologies were operating in most of the BTL classrooms/centers.
- Children were able to read all words in the sentence makers in some schools (e.g., Kalagala COPE) as early as August, 2001.
- Teachers were using teamwork approach, and dividing their classes into manageable groups.
- Children's work was displayed on the wall; progress record cards for reading and writing were displayed.

An non-exhaustive list of difficulties that were highlighted in monitoring reports included an influx of under-aged learners, some as young as 3 years old; lack of resources; lack of support from the district as in the case of Kamuli; continued enrollment of newcomers that tended to slow down the progress that teachers were making with the children; and lack of clarity on the competencies that are required to promote a learner from Stage 2 to Stage 3.

2.0 DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The concept paper and planning documents for BTL stipulate the need to assess all programme activities by conducting an on-going formative evaluation of lessons through monitoring stage, and to assess the overall impact of the BTL program in a summative evaluation exercise. This evaluation was intended to provide feedback to stakeholders (the learners, teachers, programme developers and administrators, funding agencies, etc). Indicators of impact, or BTL effectiveness in other countries include increase in enrolment and attendance due to the fact that learners enjoy school more, decreased dropout rates, and increase in reading proficiency, and in the number of learners that master grade-level reading and writing skills. Some of the indicators were estimated in the evaluation. The evaluation also observed the instructional environment in BTL to determine whether it is conducive for learning basic literacy under BTL conditions.

2.1 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was organized around the following questions:

1. Are BTL schools/classrooms child-friendly schools/classrooms?
 - a) Are the children enrolled in school? Are they coming to school (i.e., how many days did they attend between June 2001 and May 2002)?
 - b) What is the profile of the learners (characteristics of the learners that attend; e.g., are their parent(s) alive; did they attend preschool; do they have guardians other than their parents)?
 - c) Is there a greater demand for schools with BTL program? (E.g., increase in BTL classes; increase in class sizes; other anecdotal evidence).
 - d) What is the level of participation of parents in their children's learning? (e.g., are parents willing to perform certain tasks for the school, to invest in their children's education by buying any exercise book, or spend money on BTL classes)?
2. Is the classroom an enabling environment for learning and acquisition of skills? (e.g., Is the classroom set up as required by the BTL materials; Do children perform the tasks interactively; are they motivated to perform their work; are they taking responsibility for certain tasks?).
3. Is the home an enabling environment for learning and acquisition of skills? (e.g., Do children get supervision with their homework?; Do they have siblings and/or other children in the home who assist with their homework?).
4. Are the girls and boys attaining reading and writing numeracy and lifeskills? (Are they meeting the stipulated learning targets, i.e., reading, writing, lifeskills and numeracy? How many children have attained mastery)
5. Who are the teachers in the lower classes? What is the profile of the P1 and P2 teacher? (Level of preparation; how well do they teachers interact with the children)?
6. Is the BTL operational curriculum the same as the one that is intended for Ugandan schools? If not, does it exceed the expectations of the intended curriculum, or fall below them?
7. What follow up strategies are being put in place for sustainability of BTL? (capacity development; adaptation, development and improvisation of the BTL kit; cost of financing the program; linkages to higher institutions of learning; mainstreaming BTL into Ministry of Education and Sports processes and procedures, etc.).

2.2 Overview

The BTL evaluation was carried out using the team approach and elements of participant observation research, where some of the members of the evaluation teams were informants on certain aspects. In one of the initial activities, the external consultant, held a meeting with the commissioners of the evaluation, the **BTL Reference Group** (hereafter the Reference Group), which group was responsible for overlooking the process and products of the evaluation. The initial meeting with Reference Group formalized the selected of two sub-committees, the Assessment Working Group, and the Survey Development Working Group. Initial meetings with the two working groups were undertaken so as to delineate preparatory tasks for the live evaluation.

The **Assessment Working Group** worked under the leadership of UNEB, and was directed by the lead consultant. The group conducted an analysis of the P1 Local Languages, Numeracy, and Lifeskills curriculum to ascertain its congruency with the objectives of the BTL programme, and selected objectives for testing. A test plan that proposed a single test that integrates all three learning areas was produced. A learner achievement test was developed in English and translated it into the target languages of Luganda, Alur, and Dhophadhola, and a grading scheme for the test, and prepared for personnel for test administration and grading. The **Survey Development Work Group** was responsible for a content and sensitivity review of the draft evaluation instruments (questionnaires, and interview schedules) developed by the consultant. The review process entailed going through the evaluation questions to ascertain whether the instruments addressed all evaluation questions, as well as vetting them for language difficulty and gender appropriateness.

A three-pronged methodology that was proposed for the evaluation. First, a context study of the Uganda and the BTL programs was conducted. This formed part of the inception report. Elite interviews and focus group interviews of the main actors in programme development, implementation, and monitoring were conducted, some during the evaluator's initial visit, and others during the data collection week. The third component of the evaluation was basic literacy assessment of several cohorts of learners, both BTL and non-BTL learners, observations of BTL and non-BTL classrooms, as well as self-administered surveys for different kinds of people who work with BTL, and stakeholders.

2.3 Appreciating the Context

A context study was necessary to situate the Ugandan BTL in its proper context, and to bring the consultant and the reference group to the same understanding of the expectations of the evaluation. To this end, historical and background information was collected from policy, and other relevant Ugandan documents. Information gathering meetings with individuals and some members of the Reference Group were also conducted. Reports used for this part of the study include BTL teacher training reports (May, 2001; August, 2001; November, 2001; and May 2002); report on school-based support (May, 2002); monitoring reports (August, 2001; October, 2001; and May, 2002). The consultant also visited a BTL demonstration school in order to further enhance understanding of BTL as is practiced in Uganda.

Attempts were also made to understand Ugandan BTL from the point of view of BTL developers, the Molteno Project, South Africa. Molteno was responsible for the developing the programme, as well as training of trainers who then cascaded the BTL skills to teachers and other education personnel. Items for the interview included peculiarities of Uganda BTL as compared to other programs they have developed, from a development point of view; their perceptions on the implementation Ugandan BTL strategy, lessons learned from the Ugandan

pilot; and their assessment on the success of the Ugandan BTL. Information on this section was obtained via email.

In the inception report, some of what obtains in the Ugandan context was contrasted for similarities and differences with other programs in the region. During the final phases of the study, a review of Zambian BTL and NBTL was made and compared to Uganda on issues of sustainability of BTL. The context study meant to enable the evaluator to assess the assumptions underlying development of the Uganda BTL program; the suitability of the BTL programme for learners the three language groups, and to situate Luganda, Dhopadhola and Alur BTL courses within their socio-cultural context.

2.4 In-depth Assessment: Elite and Focus Group interviews

Elite interviews were conducted with individuals who are most knowledgeable with BTL in Uganda. These were meant to provide in-depth understanding of the processes of BTL, the perceptions of what BTL stands to achieve, and the expectations of stakeholders is necessary. Interviews were obtained from individuals from the Institute for Teacher Education, Kyambogo (ITEK); National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC); and the Ministry of, all of them educators in managerial positions. Interviewees were asked to describe their involvement in the BTL programme; their perceived efficiency of BTL as an approach for acquisition of literacy skills; the degree of congruence between the BTL project goals and implementation, and the National Curriculum goals; problems that may hinder the success of BTL; and, the preparations that need to be made if BTL were to be implemented in all primary schools in Uganda.

Focus group interviews were held with different groups, namely teachers in BTL classrooms, Head Teachers in schools with BTL classes, and community-advocacy groups (see Appendix B for interview schedule). Focus group interviews afforded interviewees the opportunity to discuss interactively with the evaluators and each other, their experiences, expectations, and attitudes on the BTL initiative. The evaluators also had an opportunity to do in-depth probing on aspects on BTL encountered in the document review, as well as verify aspects gleaned from other sources.

Teachers in BTL Classrooms

Four focus group meetings were held for teachers from schools in three of the four BTL pilot districts as follows; Nebbi (Apar ario COPE, Kelle, Omoyo and Owiny); Masaka (Ggulama, Kabusegu, Kigeye COPE, and Nakateete); Kamuli (Kamuili Boys, Kamuli Girls, Rev. Nayenga, and Bulogo COPE). Teachers were probed on the suitability and effectiveness of the BTL to the Ugandan context; whether or not they are experiencing increased professional satisfaction in their jobs as a result of their involvement in BTL; whether they relate better with learners in the BTL class as compared to the non-BTL classes they have taught previously; whether progress that the learners have made is below, or exceeds their expectations; and, the adjustments that need to be made in their school to regularize BTL in their school.

Head Teachers

Two focus group meetings of Head Teachers were conducted. The evaluation will take advantage of the regional head Teachers' meetings that are convened periodically at social centers. Head Teachers will be probed on the suitability and effectiveness of the BTL to the Ugandan context; whether they have observed any changes in the professional conduct and attitude of the BTL teachers, as compared to their typical conduct, and the conduct of non-BTL teachers; training and other school-based support for their BTL teachers; whether progress that

the learners have made is below, or exceeds their expectations; and, the adjustments that need to be made in their school to regularize BTL in their school.

Centre Coordinating Tutors

Centre Coordinating Tutors (CCTs) are, for all intents and purposes, education extension workers. One or two focus group meetings of CCTs will be conducted. They will be asked about their perceived suitability, effectiveness, and sustainability of the BTL in the rural areas from which they operate; whether the demand for training and other school-based support has gone up with the introduction of BTL; whether progress that the learners have made is below, or exceeds their expectations; and, the adjustments that need to be made in their school system to accommodate BTL in all primary schools.

Community and Advocacy groups

It will be important, during the course of the evaluation, to interview community groups for possible areas of input into BTL, and to ascertain if any BTL advocacy work is necessary. These groups will be asked to share their perceptions and explanation for low literacy rates in the education system; their knowledge, if any, and perception of the BTL project; evidence that they would like to have if they are to promote adoption of BTL as the literacy approach for Uganda; preparations that need to be made if BTL were to be implemented in all primary schools in Uganda, and plans for partnerships with NGOs and the private sector and advocacy work to be done to ensure sustainability of BTL.

2.5 Questionnaire Survey

The questionnaires survey was used for cross validation of data obtained from the context study, from interviews and focus groups, and from learner assessment data. Even though the survey will utilize a sample that is more representative of those involved in the BTL pilot. self-administered questionnaires required respondents to provide information about their satisfaction with different aspects of the BTL pilot programme. Whereas the in-depth study was aimed at understanding what issues were important in bring the BTL approach to P1 classrooms, the survey methodology would provided information on the extent to which different stakeholders, agree or disagree on the issues, share certain views and perceptions, and how strongly those views are held. Questionnaires for BTL teachers, P2 teachers at non-BTL schools, Head Teachers at BTL schools, and CCTs were developed by the evaluator. The Survey Development Work Group reviewed the questionnaires to ascertain adequate coverage of all BTL evaluation questions, as well as to ensure that the language used is at clear, free of cultural and gender bias.

2.6 Classroom Observations

To get a more complete understanding of the learning situation, one member of the evaluation team was responsible for collecting data on learner behaviours in BTL classroom, and compare them with those in non-BTL classrooms. Observations in the BTL classrooms examined the extent to which classroom use the prescribed BTL methodology. In particular, classroom observations covered classroom management practices, use of the BTL methodology and materials, and learners responses to the BTL course. In non-BTL classrooms, teachers were asked to provide information on the methodologies they use to teach reading and writing, the materials, as well as the manner in which learners respond to these.

2.7 Learner Performance Assessment Test

The Assessment Working Group (AWG) was responsible for producing the learner achievement test, developing the grading scheme for the test, and training personnel for test administration and grading. This group comprised two test development specialists from UNEB, three language testing specialists (one each for Luganda, Dhopadhola, and Alur) also from UNEB, two BTL teachers, one non-BTL teacher, one TOT, one early childhood curriculum specialist from NCDC, and the lead BTL consultant. UNEB had the overall responsibility of coordinating this group, with the local consultant supporting it throughout the duration of the evaluation.

The process to be followed by Assessment Working Group was to conduct an analysis of the Uganda P1 curriculum in the learning areas of Local Languages, basic numeracy skills, and the Lifeskills learning areas, to ascertain congruency with the objectives of the BTL programme, or the lack thereof. After delineating the content for P1, a content map was constructed. A content map is, for this purpose, a two-way matrix that delineates the curriculum content against the dimensions that the curriculum aims to attain. The content is expressed in instructional objectives, preferably terminal objectives. This content analysis culminated into the development of a test plan, where the Assessment Working Group made deliberate decisions on which objectives to sample for testing, the relative weighting of the cognitive/affective dimensions, and the format on which they will be tested.

An attempt was made to develop a test that integrates all three learning areas of literacy numeracy and lifeskills. However, items assessing numeracy skills were discarded from the final version of the test since they were too few to generalize to the domain. Even though the group was required to develop the three literacy tests simultaneously rather than translating one language form into the two other languages, the final test was translated from English into the three language groups. As was anticipated, translation of L1 equivalent phrases introduced extraneous difficulty in some of the tasks. The test comprised of three tasks as follows;

- a) Dictation: Task 1 was a dictation task involving language reception and production skills. Three sentences of content were prepared. During testing, the administrator read the sentences out loud the learners a number of times, following which they were asked to write them down. To perform well in this task, learners had to recall what was dictated, as well as translate it accurately into text.
- b) Picture story writing: In Task 3 learners were presented with a picture showing a typical scene. The test administrator discussed the picture briefly with the learners and assisted them to produce the first sentence of the story. Learners were then required to write four sentences, describing what is taking place in the picture. This task assessed both the learners' ability to write in narrative form as well as their creativity, which was assessed both as a literacy skill, and a lifeskill of creative thinking.
- c) Reading Comprehension: A short paragraph was presented to the learners and asked to read them silently. Each learner was then taken aside and asked three questions about the text. Two of the questions required literal recall, while the third question required some degree of inference. The task will assessed learners' comprehension skills, as well as a lifeskill of communication and confidence in responding to the test and the interaction with the administrator.

The test was pencil-and-paper and performance-base in some part. Scoring rubrics were developed not only for clarity and ease of scoring, but also to bring scorers to the same understanding of what constitutes mastery performance. Also, in order to enhance uniformity in assessment administration procedures, a test administration script was prepared. The assessment instruments and procedure were trial tested for clarity of the tasks, task difficulty, and the time it takes for the learners to complete the test.

The assumption behind the development of the test was that all learners are in Stage 3, hence all learners in the sampled schools will be tested. A sample of BTL P2s were targeted for assessment. The test was also administered to a sample of learners in P2, P3 and P4 in non-BTL schools. The scores of the Stage 3 learners in the BTL schools are compared with the scores of Grade 2, Grade 3, and Grade 4 in non-BTL schools to ascertain grade equivalence in reading programs, if any in the next section.

2.8 Data Collection

Sampling was at level of the school, both BTL and non-BTL learners. In most cases once the school is selected, all BTL classes in that school will be tested. In the case on non-BTL schools, only one class per grade (P2, P3, and P4) in each school was tested. The estimated population of BTL learners in the Uganda pilot was 10 000. The target sample size was 10 - 15 percent of the population. In addition to the data that was collected in the process of understanding the Ugandan context, four evaluation teams will be deployed to the four districts.

Each evaluation team was made up of 4-5 persons, including the team leader. Two people were responsible for administering the test, while one person was responsible for collecting data from the teacher (enrolment and attendance data, and the self-administered teacher questionnaire). Another person was assigned the responsibility of collecting data from the head teacher, the CCTs, and other education personnel. Even though 1060 learners were tested, only 640 were included in the quantitative analysis due to errors in coding. The comparative sample from non-BTL schools will be about one-fourth of the BTL sample.

3.0 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation was investigating the BTL pilot project as a means of local language acquisition within the UNICEF framework of friendly schools. The results of the evaluation have been organized in headings that correspond questions that the evaluation set out to investigate.

The first heading addresses the issue, “child-friendliness” by describing the characteristics of the learners, their age, prior school attendance, and whether their home environment includes parents and/or guardian. Anecdotal evidence on enrolment, attendance and general impressions on demand for BTL is also explored. The discussion on the teaching and learning environment describes the characteristics of the teachers, the learning environment, the curriculum content, and the interactions between these factors. A brief discussion on the home environment addresses the issue of whether the home provides an opportunity to enhance learning by way of supervising homework, and availing additional literacy materials to the learners.

The question of whether children in BTL classrooms are experiencing success in reading and writing is central to this evaluation. After taking the same test, scores of BTL learners are presented and compared with those of learners in non-BTL schools. Scores are disaggregated by sex, district, and subscores of different tasks. An attempt is made to link, at least in part, factors in the school and home to achievement of literacy.

The heading that concludes this section addresses issues of sustainability of BTL. Here we report findings on the issue of suitability of BTL materials to the Ugandan context, and explore the need for adaptation of materials. Mainstreaming the cost and functions of BTL is also explored.

3.1 BTL Classrooms: Are they Child-friendly?

Learner characteristics

The evaluation sample comprised of 20 schools across the four districts that are piloting the BTL approach. There were 10 regular BTL schools, 5 COPE schools that were also using the BTL methodology, and a sample of 5 non-BTL schools, to be used as a control group. A total of 1060 students were tested. Table 1 shows the total number of learners who made the evaluation sample, by sex and school type.

Table 1: Total number sampled for evaluation

	Boys	Girls	All examinees
BTL	391 (51.7)	364 (48.3)	755 (100.0)
Non-BTL	96 (31.5)	209 (68.5)	305 (100.0)
All examinees	487 (45.9)	573 (54.1)	1060 (100.0)

All BTL learners (755 of them) were nominally in a P2 class, but pursuing BTL P1 curriculum. The non-BTL learners, P2s (79), P3s (119) and P4s (107), were pursuing a traditional reading and writing curriculum. Even though a total of 1060 students were sampled as shown above, scores of 420 learners from Tororo district were disqualified, due to coding errors. The remaining 640 learners came from 12 schools, 9 BTL and 3 non-BTL. Findings that use student data this is quantitative will be confined to only those 640 learners. All learners will be included

in findings using qualitative data.

The mean age of 640 learners who were tested was 10.1 years. As expected, COPE learners were older than the regular school children with a mean age of 12.6 years while the mean age for BTL learners in regular schools was 8.9 years. The differences in the age of learners of different categories were significant.

About 50 percent of those who reported on preschool participation (500 of 640) indicated that they had attended preschool. Compared to preschool participation in developing countries (27.6 percent in Botswana, for instance) a lower level of preschool participation was expected. Reporting on prior preschool attendance becomes even more suspect if we consider that performance on the BTL test, both for BTL and non-BTL learners, favours those who reported that they did not attend preschool. It is not clear how “preschool” was interpreted at the different schools and centres since a number of learners, especially COPE learners, may have attended formal school before.

On the whole, learners who are enrolled in primary schools in the four districts had a normal home background. 85.8 percent of the learners were living with either or both of their parents, while only a small proportion (6.6 percent) was living with distant relatives. Only 4.4 percent of them were orphans with both parents being deceased, while 17.6 percent of them had only one living parent. Given what is known about the number of HIV/AIDS orphans in Uganda, it was surprising to have such a low number of orphans in a random sample of young learners. One explanation for this result could be that learners choose alternative and more flexible schooling options such as COPE and BEUPA. These programmes more accommodative of learners who have adult responsibilities than a regular school setting. However, there is always a distinct possibility that orphaned children are not being afforded the opportunity to participate in education as is the case in other countries when foster parents engage them care-taking of their younger children, or in economic activities.

Enrolment and attendance, and demand for schooling

BTL has coincided with a period of UPE implementation where parents are allowed to send children to school at a minimum cost to them. While it was clear that parents were taking advantage of the UPE dispensation, it was also clear that they were impressed with the progress that their children were making in reading and writing under the BTL methodology.

It was not possible to collect formal enrolment data during the evaluation. However, there was ample evidence from qualitative sources to enable the evaluator to conclude that BTL is in high demand, and that it influenced attendance. For example, Nakateete Primary School in Masaka enrolled 270 P1 learners, most of whom were coming to school regularly. When asked during focus group meetings whether BTL should be extended to all schools in Uganda, communities, parents, teachers, and other educators in all four districts were unanimous in their demand that BTL be extended to all schools in Uganda because of its success in enabling children to read and right.

Incidents of BTL motivated transfers were cited in all four districts, (for example, from Kijonjo Primary School to Ggulama Primary School in Masaka), hence requests to introduce BTL in additional schools was, in part, an attempt to avert transfers from non-BTL to BTL schools. In some instances, headmasters of non-BTL wanted their schools to offer BTL to prevent transfers from their school to BTL schools as shown in Figure 1 below, a letter written to the UNICEF office by a head teacher who has started using the BTL methodology in his school.

Figure 1: Letter for Headteacher, non-BTL school¹

Non-BTL Primary school
P. O. Box 1019
MASAKA

Education Officer
UNICEF
KAMPALA

REASON TO APPLY FOR BTL

My pupils do not know how to read and write even as old as Standard Seven. When I discussed the issue with my teachers, they always talked of big numbers as the cause despite my readiness to provide them with all the teaching/learning materials they needed.

I did not stop at this. I talked about the issue with a number of people, teachers, head teachers and Education Officers. This was in a bid to find a solution. While doing this, one Head teacher mentioned BTL. Automatically I became interested. I tried to find out more about how it works. I went to X and Y Primary Schools to see for myself. The results were astonishing. The method provided exactly what I wanted.

However, I was told the method works for P1 and P2, yet I was talking of P.5, 6 and 7. My answer to them was very simple. We can set our standards with P1 and P2. Once it has started operating in our school, we can make all our other teachers copy its operations to teach all other subjects in all other classes.

There is a lot copy from BTL, maximum with station of pupil's knowledge (i.e. mother tongue or Area language), locally available materials, pupil's ability and group dynamites – all for fast and meaningful results.

Fortunately or unfortunately, before I had finalized my plans with the County Education Officer, Buhoto West, to take my teachers to X Primary School to see, learn and adopt the method, the District focal Point Person, Mrs X arranged this workshop (BTL workshop 12 – 17 May 2002). I had fallen in love with the method and I had use all means to talk to all persons, to see that I joined. Fortunately, my request was listened to and answered and here I am now with my primary one teacher practicing the method.

We shall try to make use of everything because our participation is **demand oriented**...
(emphasis mine).

Yours sincerely

Mr. X
Head teacher, Non-BTL Primary School

Other evidence for the demand of BTL is that teachers and headteachers had complaints about overcrowded classrooms. It was reported in the monitoring reports that in some instances, BTL teachers believed that BTL should be extended to neighboring non-BTL schools, even if is on a

¹ Names are concealed to protect the identity of schools and individuals.

“corrupted, non-official” basis. This idea was proffered first and foremost as a solution for overcrowding in their classrooms, but also because BTL, whatever the version, would help increase the reading levels in those schools.

There is ample evidence that school administrators, teachers and parents prefer the BTL methodology to the traditional approaches so far used in the schools for other reasons. One reason that makes BTL attractive in all four districts is its emphasis on acquisition of literacy skills in mother tongue. Parents and community members in Masaka observed that part of the difficulty that children faces when learning how to read may be due to the fact that they are not familiar with English language. Their preference for teaching functional literacy skills in local languages was unequivocal.

Nze ekinnuma kwe kuba nti abaana babasomesa oluzungu nga tebanaba kuyiga oluganda.

(What hurts me is that the teachers are introducing English to the children before they are confident in their mother tongue).

Because of its emphasis on the use of familiar language from the local scenes, BTL was also seen as an approach that could assist the school in transmitting cultural heritage, by using the language of the children to reinforcing beliefs and values.

Tusaba BTL egezeko esomesa abaana baffe eby’ennonno n’ebyo buwanga.

A number of individuals who were interviewed during this evaluation expressed reservations about this arrangement on one major ground; that the government local languages policy will exacerbate inequalities in that when children compete for places in higher levels of education, those who have a better command of English will be selected. These individuals also made an observation that parents in the rural areas would be unhappy about teaching in the local languages. This observation was not borne out by data, as is shown in the comments above. Reports from the field indicate that local language teaching is acceptable to parents.

Parental Participation

Data on parent was collected through teacher interviews, headteacher interviews and focus group discussions of communities in which BTL schools are situated. Those who came to the focus group meetings included community leaders and parents. Parents’ participation in their children’s learning activities was linked to several issues; their awareness about the BTL programme; discipline; and progress that learners were making in reading and writing.

Most parents were aware of the BTL approach, and reported that school authorities had carried out BTL awareness exercises before its implementation. Parents of BTL children were taking an active interest in their children’s learning as can be shown from a range of responses and suggestions that they made for improving the school. One parent expressed the role of parents as follows”

“Naffe abazadde tuyinza okubuuza abaana baffe byesbasombye ku somero ekyo nekiyamba okulondoola abaana bafe byebayiga ku somero.”
(“Our role as parents should be to be more active in talking to our children and inquiring from them about what they learn in school.”)

Another parent stated that:

“Abazadde naffe kitwetagisa okugula ebitabo n’amakalamu kisobozese abaana baffe akusoma obulungi.”
(“As parents we need to buy books and pencils so as to enable our children function well while in school.”)

Teachers affirmed the importance of parental participation in their own focus groups, and reported that learners whose parents had been sensitized on their roles under the BTL approach were having more success with the BTL methodology, and were reading better than those to those whose parents had not been sensitized. This was true also of parents who were not literate themselves, but were showing interest in their children’s work and coming to school to receive news that their children were able to read.

There were parents who expressed ignorance about the BTL activities, while others reported that they did not impose themselves in the school. Reasons for lack of awareness about BTL activities as proffered by teachers, head teachers, and parents themselves included the following;

- A high proportion of parents are not literate was high, hence children were not benefiting from parents’ intervention in homework activities as they should.
- individual parents had less interest in what was going on in school and that they hardly attend parents’ meetings.

Teachers suggested therefore, that more awareness training for parents are sensitized in order to ease their work and at the same time achieve more positive results under the BTL approach. This is in part, a good justification for the resources that were spent on parents’ awareness training. Other areas where parents thought they could assist the school in support to the children’s learning included issues of conduct and discipline measures such as discouraging absenteeism, ensuring that punctuality to be observed, and ascertaining that learners do not roam around the village during school hours.

Table 2 presents a selection of activities that promote child-friendliness in BTL schools.

CFS Tenet	CFS Indicators in BTL Schools
1. Is right-based	BTL class enrolls equal number of boys and girls; groups vote in their own leaders;
2. Supports effective learning	Learning is interactive; teaches are enthusiastic; children’s books are marked;
3. Is parent-friendly	Parents visit the school more often just to admire their children’s reading skills; community protect school property
4. Ensures a protected and save environment	School yards free of ditches, stones and other dangerous objects
5. Is a health place	Health rules and regulations; safe drinking water available

In summary, BTL schools/classrooms have been shown to be child-friendly as a result of observing the following:

- Inclusion of children of diverse backgrounds
- Increased enrolments and participation in BTL schools
- Active and equitable participation of boys and girls, and tailoring learning to meet

- specified needs
- Heightened interest of parents in their children’s learning activities, and their involvement in school activities

However, the schools are still lacking in the basics of providing a healthy environment and in providing a safe environment (e.g., inadequate toilet facilities and non-visibility and/or absence of First Aid Kits; most schools are not fenced-in). Schol and it is necessary to provide guidance to parents so that they may channel efforts to assist learning in a systematic manner. Also, the school may need to invest some time in devising deliberate strategies to maximize participation of parents in the actual classrooms activities. This will, in part, provide the much needed assistance to BTL teacher who have to keep abreast of what is happening with all groups of learners.

3.2 Teaching and Learning Environment

Teacher characteristics

Twenty-one BTL teachers, 17 male and 4 female, participated in focus group meeting and responded to the survey questionnaire. The majority of the teachers (80.0 percent) hold an S4 academic qualification or higher. Of the 21 teachers, 5 teachers did not disclose their teaching qualification. 12 teachers had a lower primary teaching qualification, while were qualified to teacher at higher primary. Table 3 present a summary of teaching experience.

Table 3: Teaching experience, BTL Teachers

	Teaching Experience (%)	Experience at P2 (%)
1 - 5 years	20.0	55.0
6 - 10 years	30.0	15.0
11 years and above	50.0	30.0

The majority of BTL teachers (80.0 percent) had 6 years or more in teaching experience; 45.0 percent had 6 years or more teaching at the P2 level. Assuming that those who have 1-5 years teaching experience are also younger teachers in terms of their age, it would be desirable to have this cohort of teachers learn to experiment with new teaching methods before they become resistant to change. All teachers reported that they had attended BTL training and had found it useful.

Non-BTL teachers were comparable to BTL teachers on most aspects (the majority of them being women; the majority having an S4 academic qualification, etc). However, they had less teaching experience than the BTL teachers. This finding is inconclusive, however, due to the fact that only 8 non-BTL teachers responded to the questionnaire.

Classroom Environment

The classroom environment in any setting is influenced by the physical facilities as well as learning activities. In terms of physical facilities, BTL classrooms were typical of any that may be found in other places in Uganda. Some cases were reasonably equipped with furniture. In a number of instances (e.g., in Nebbi) physical conditions of classrooms were inadequate. Some

teachers complained that their classrooms did not have doors and window shutters.

Physical facilities notwithstanding, BTL classrooms have ushered a new classroom culture of cooperative learning, with evidence of having acquired a new value of democratic decision-making. Teachers reported observing new group dynamics in their classrooms, where learners democratically would unanimously vote out a group leader who didn't lead them satisfactorily, and vote in someone else to lead them. This behaviour is also an important as a lifeskill that ought to be reinforced in a deliberate manner throughout their learning career. BTL classroom climate is generally reported to have improved in the following ways;

- Learner-centred and cooperative teaching and learning approaches are being used extensively.
- The rapport between teachers and learners exhibits greater appreciation of the different role that each plays;
- There is evidence of mutual respect by teachers for the ability of the learners and their efforts;
- Learners are taking more responsibility for their work and are self-regulating in the tasks they have to perform;
- BTL encourages a variety of activities to go on simultaneously, integrated various subjects e.g. drawing objects, counting them, and writing down their number in a sentence.
- Learning is more enjoyable. There are more pictures and teaching aids that capture the attention of the learners.
- Active promotion of leadership skill, as well as the life skills of communication, confidence and critical thinking.

Other aspects of the classroom climate that have improved include the organization of classrooms, and learning resources.

Organisation and Learning Resource Materials

- Learners are arranged into ability groups as required by BTL methodology, which factor promotes collegiality and cooperation on an equal footing.
- Seating arrangement is non-typical of a traditional classroom reinforce are non-monotonous;
- Classroom is set up to be colorful; learners take pride in seeing their work displayed for all to see.
- BTL materials present a variety of learning materials, most of which are to be managed by the learners themselves
- All the BTL teaching materials were useful, with the teachers sentence holder being most useful, and the word store being the least useful.

Suggestions for BTL improvements in the classroom environment were given by teachers, headteachers and the community as follows;

- The furniture in BTL classes (desks, chairs/benches, etc.) should be suitable for both the age of the children and the array of activities that take place in the BTL classrooms.
- Provisions and necessary modification should be made for easy hanging of pictures and charts, and for storage of BTL materials.
- Teacher-pupil ratios of 1:150 are to be avoided at all costs; schools should be more creative in re-arranging their space and timetable so that BTL teachers do not have that many students at a time.
- More BTL teachers have to be trained to meet the demand for this approach.

- Those who have been practicing BTL were unanimous in their call for more monitoring support; watching other BTL teachers teach; and receiving more training on occupational tasks.

During the content mapping exercise and in discussions with Ministry of Education and Sports officials, assessment developers realized that more work still needs to go into the Ugandan curriculum. While the syllabus has a lot of activities, the relationship between the different components sometimes get lost when activities do not translate into tangible measurable outcomes. Specifically, the syllabus should be recast in an outcome-based mode, to enable proper monitoring of learning.

3.3 Achievement of Literacy

This section reports on learning gains for learners in the pilot BTL sample. Questions addressed by the investigation were whether or not girls and boys in BTL classes were attaining reading and writing numeracy and lifeskills; whether they were meeting the stipulated learning targets, i.e., reading, writing, lifeskills and numeracy; and the number of learners that was attained mastery of literacy skills.

Whole group performance on the literacy test

The mean score for the overall sample on whole test was 22.3 out of 53 possible points as summarized in Table 4. The lowest score in the test was 0, while the highest score was 53. The mean score for the each of the tasks shows a performance level of about 40 percent for each of the tasks

Table 4: Mean scores for overall sample

	N	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Overall Mean	Overall Mean (%)
Overall Test	640	00	53.0	22.3	42.1
Dictation	640	00	9.0	4.6	51.1
Sentence Composition	640	00	5.0	2.4	48.0
Picture Story Writing	640	00	23.0	9.3	40.4
Reading Comprehension	640	00	16.0	6.0	37.5
Lifeskills	640	00	14.0	5.3	37.9

Overall performance on the test was not satisfactory, with 57.3 percent of the examinees scoring below the 50 percent mark. However, this was expected in a mixed ability group that received literacy instruction using different approaches. With a mean of only 37.5 percent, reading comprehension was found to be the problematic subtest for the whole group. This task

With a mean of 23.4 for boys and 21.2 for girls, male/female performance differences on the overall test were not significant. A similar pattern was observed in the rest of the tasks where male/female differences were not significant (dictation is 4.7/4.5; sentence composition is 2.4/2.4; picture story writing is 9.8/8.7; reading comprehension is 6.4/5.6; and, lifeskills is 5.6/4.9).

Within group comparisons, BTL learners

Performance is reported by sex in a within group comparison. Even though the sex differences are not significant in both cases, Table 5 shows the performance for boys and girls in the BTL group is highly comparable, while in the non-BTL group, the boys are outperforming the girls by more than 5 percentage points. This result suggests that teachers have been successful in providing equality of learning opportunities for boys and girls in BTL classes.

Table 5: Mean scores for overall sample

	Maximum	Boys	Girls
BTL	53	27.0 (50.9)	26.8 (50.6)
Non-BTL	53	15.3 (28.9)	12.5 (23.6)

Performance was also reported by BTL stage level. Teachers indicated the stage level in about 70 percent of the cases. 55.4 percent of the BTL learners (163 of 294) had reached Stage 3 at the time of testing, 36.4 percent in Stage 2, while 8.2 percent were reported to be in Stage 1. Learner performance is presented according to BTL stage in Table 6.

Table 6: Performance by BTL stage

	N	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stage 1	24	41.0	13.1 (24.7%)	10.5
Stage 2	107	53.0	23.2 (43.8%)	13.2
Stage 3	163	53.0	33.0 (62.3%)	17.5

Stage 3 learners performed much better than those at lower stages, a confirmation that teacher judgments on BTL stages, though not accurate, are not arbitrary. However, with more than 20 percent of those who have been classified as Stage 3 attaining less than 30 percent on the test, the correlation between teacher labels of student by level and performance scores on the literacy test is less than perfect. This is in part an indication that the teachers need clearer definitions of what the different competencies on BTL stages are, and a clearer assessment procedure to promote learners to the next ability group.

Within the BTL taught learners, there were also significant differences between the COPE learners and learners in the regular schools in the overall test (29.2 compared to 26.0). While scores on the subtest were somewhat similar, the largest difference was in the picture story subtest. A possible explanation for these differences is the age of their learners. The mean age is 8.9 for the regular school learners, and 12.6 years for the COPE learners. Age is known to influence acquisition of literacy skills at the lower school levels, especially the more difficult skills such as writing.

With a one-way ANOVA, F value = 64.1, and the p value = .000, the results of the learner assessment revealed significant differences when disaggregated by district. Learners from Nebbi district outperformed the other two districts, with largest variation was in reading and picture story writing tasks, where the Nebbi learners scored twice as much as the Masaka and Kamuli learners as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Performance by district

Pilot District	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Mean in %
----------------	---	------	------	------	-----------

Nebbi (Alur)	147	1.00	53.0	36.0	67.9
Masaka (Luganda)	275	0.00	51.0	18.4	34.7
Kamuli (Luganda)	218	0.00	53.0	18.1	34.2

The explanation for this variation is that BTL was more organized in Nebbi district as was shown in the monitoring reports, both in term of receiving the materials in a timely manner, receiving the necessary in-service training, and having adequate supervision and support at the field level. However, the district that has benefited most from BTL is Kamuli district, as is shown in between group comparisons.

Comparisons, BTL and non-BTL

When test scores were aggregated by type of literacy programme, the BTL group had an overall mean of 26.9 percent, compared to 13.8 percent for all the non-BTL learners (50.8 percent, compared to 26.0 percent) as reflected in Table 8 below.

Table 8: BTL/non-BTL comparisons

	Maximum Score	BTL Mean	Non-BTL Mean (P2-P4)	Non BTL P2
Overall Test	53.0	26.9 (50.7%)	13.8 (26.0%)	5.4 (10.2%)
Dictation	9.0	5.5	2.8	1.2
Sentence Composition	5.0	2.9	1.5	1.1
Picture Story Writing	23.0	11.2	5.7	2.1
Reading Comprehension	16.0	7.3	3.7	1.1
Lifeskills	14.0	6.4	3.2	1.0

The BTL learners outperformed their grade cohort (the non-BTL P2s) by more that 40 percentage points. Table 9 below presents the results of the test by task, where each task is further divided into items, and the proportion who attained 100 percent mastery are reflected for the BTL and non-BTL groups, and for the closest grade level cohort, the P2 non-BTL group.

The BTL group outperformed the non-BTL group was in all subscores. The largest between group variance in favour of the BTL group was recorded in the areas of dictation and sentence composition. Lifeskills that were tested were those of communication and creativity. However, it should be noted that performance of the BTL group was not impressive either, given that only 41.7 percent of the examinees the reached the 50 percent mark in the total test, and that the proportion of masters was less than 20 percent in some tasks. The explanation for these results is that the test difficulty was pitched at Stage 3, a level that the learners would have reached only after completion of the BTL course. Indeed, the mastery levels for Stage 3 learners in the last column of the Table 9, are much higher than those of the non-BTL group.

Table 9: Number of learners (in %) attaining mastery

Skill Area	Items	BTL Masters	Non-BTL Masters	BTL Stage 3 Masters
Dictation/Writing	Item 1	46.7	23.4	60.7
	Item 2	34.4	17.6	40.5
	Item 3	45.0	23.0	58.3

Sentence Composition	Item 4	25.6	4.5	41.7
Picture Story Writing	Item 5	28.2	14.0	42.3
	Item 6	25.6	13.5	39.3
	Item 7	30.1	14.0	43.6
	Item 8	28.5	12.2	41.1
Reading Comprehension	Item 11	28.2	9.9	38.7
	Item 12	24.9	9.9	41.1
	Item 13	25.6	10.8	35.0
Lifeskills	Item 9	11.5	5.9	17.2
	Item 10	17.5	10.4	20.9
	Item 14	32.5	11.7	41.7
	Item 15	33.3	13.5	41.7

Table 10 below presents a comparison of BTL Stage 3 learners with the non-BTL P3 and P4 learners. Stage 3 BTL learners outperformed the non-BTL groups, in all tasks and in the lifeskills. They outperformed the P2 non-BTL learners more than five-fold, more two times better than the P3 learners, and exceeded the P4 non-BTL performance significantly.

Table 10: Comparison of BTL Stage3 with non-BTL

Skill Area	Maximum	BTL Stage 3	Non-BTL, P3	Non-BTL, P4
Total Score	53.0	32.9	10.4	20.8
Dictation	9.0	6.6	2.2	4.3
Sentence Composition	5.0	3.3	1.4	1.8
Picture Story	23.0	14.2	4.2	8.9
Reading Comprehension	16.0	8.8	2.7	5.9
Lifeskills	14.0	7.7	2.2	5.1

These results are comparable in part to the Zambian pilot experience, where NBTL learners outperformed non-BTL P2 and P3. The difference in the two cases is that BTL Uganda outperformed the P4s as well, while in NBTL Zambia the P4 learners outperformed the BTL group. Uganda Stage 3 BTL results compare well with those of similar BTL pilot evaluations in Zambia as shown in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Mean scores on literacy (in percent)

Zambia: Kasama	64.0
Zambia: New BTL	59.0
Uganda: BTL	62.3

Performance of Zambia pilots is being compared with that of the Stage 3 in the Ugandan sample because the Zambian evaluation model used the top 10 students literacy, presumably those who were functioning at the Stage 3 level. Even though the results in Uganda compare well to those in Zambia, there are indications that impact of BTL in Ugandan could have been more if it had not been for the fact that a new cohort of non-BTL P1s came in and was, in most schools, accommodated within the resources of the actual piloting group.

While it is true that BTL has increased learning gains in all the district, we also need to note that BTL gains have not been uniform across districts. Table 12 below shows that Kamuli district has

experience the greatest gains, while Masaka has benefited the least from BTL.

Table 12: Performance on the total test by district and type of programme

	BTL Mean %	Non-BTL Mean %	Difference Mean %
Nebbi (Alur)	70.0	59.6	10.4
Masaka (Luganda)	37.3	29.4	7.9
Kamuli (Luganda)	52.5	12.6	39.9

Some of the problems that were reported by the monitoring teams in Masaka could be responsible for the apparent lack of impact in the district. These include regular absenteeism on Mondays due to failure to contribute money for the construction of toilets, and a delay in UPE capitation grant in several schools (including the 3 BTL piloting schools).

It has been demonstrated in an unequivocal manner that the BTL approach has been more effective than the traditional approaches, and that learners in the BTL classes are attaining their literacy skills at a faster pace. These results confirm the findings of monitoring reports, teachers' views, as well as anecdotal reports from other educators and parents. The evaluation has provided overwhelming evidence on the following:

- BTL learners in the first grade of the course have attained reading and writing skills reading at levels superior to P2, P3, and P4 compared to non-BTL learners.
- Learners deemed to be at the higher BTL stage outperformed those at the lower stages.
- Boys and girls performed equally well in the test, a feature that is desirable under the child-friendly schools framework.

Uganda BTL results are comparable to those done elsewhere in exhibiting the superiority of BTL, and more specifically to those in Zambia in the performance patterns.

While it may be clear at this point that BTL learners are achieving better than non-BTL learners, it must be borne in mind that an important outcome of the Uganda BTL programme is to have 85% of the learners communicating effectively by reading and writing in their local language by the time they reach P3. This evaluation shows that only 55.4 percent of the BTL learners who were classified by stage had reached the Stage 3 level towards the end of P2. A new challenge to the BTL schools will be to sustain the reading levels, and exceed them such that an additional 44.6 percent can communicate effectively in a year's time. There is yet another challenge.

Operationally, while it is clear what effective communication is in a generic sense for all BTL programs, **it is still not clear** what this entails in the Ugandan context. Neither can we easily infer from the newly developed curriculum for Ugandan local languages what effective communication is. One of the tasks that lay ahead of the BTL team may be to develop a Ugandan BTL version with outcomes that are clearly articulated.

4.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF BTL

BTL is a child-centred approach, and as such it is a labour intensive methodology. There are several issues that should be addressed for its long-term sustainability. The most frequently cited criticism of the BTL approach is its labour intensiveness and, the perception that it is expensive, presumably because of the variety of material that are required for any one BTL classroom. As a result of this perception, there is often a belief that implementation of BTL can only be possible in the case of developing countries, if donors are willing to support it. Naturally, the evaluation looked into the financial implications for Uganda if BTL was to be implemented nationwide, and issues of its sustainability. Specifically this section will be answering an evaluation question on strategies to be put in place if BTL was to be implemented nationwide.

4.1 Implications of cost

The discussion on cost will address development and/or procurement of BTL materials, the cost of training, monitoring and quality control, as well as the cost of mainstreaming BTL into regular Ministry of Education and Sports duties, processes and procedures. Data for this section was estimated with the help of officials from ITEK, Kyambogo, where the organisational aspects of piloting BTL were situated.

Procurement of BTL materials

BTL materials were developed under the direction of Molteno, South Africa, and published by MML. Box 1 below presents a summary of the cost structure of MML Molteno's BTL materials.

Box 1: Cost of BTL Materials
<p>Molteno BTL Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BTL Teachers Manual (1) • Pupils Sentence Makers (50) • Pupils Sentence Holder (50) • Teachers Sentence Maker (1) • Teachers Sentence Holder (5) • Word store (1) • BTL Reader: 4 sets of 12 (48) • Conservation Posters (1 set of 4 posters) • Phonic Posters (1 set of 50 posters) • Occupation Task book (1) <p>Total cost of kit for 50 learners = \$250.00 Total cost per learner per year = \$250/50/ 5 = US\$1.</p>
<p>Cost implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government replacement policy for textbook and related materials is 5 years. • Government budget per primary learner for English text book = US\$2.1 • Government budget per primary learner for requisites = <u>US\$3.3</u> <p>Total government allocation per learner, for texts and materials = <u>US\$5.4</u></p>

The estimated cost of a BTL kit for 50 learners is \$250.00, or \$5 per learner. Taking into consideration the fact that the Ministry of Education and Sports has a 5-year replacement policy for materials, the cost for BTL materials per learner per year is estimated at \$1.00, for the several pieces that make the kit to be used both by the teacher and the learner. Not only is

\$1.00 within the government allocation of \$2.1. Compared to the \$ 0.42 cost of **one** non-BTL textbook in primary schools in P1, (i.e., for Grade 2 readers:), the cost of BTL materials is conservative.

It should be noted, in addition to other factors, that the cost above is meant for materials developed outside the Ugandan market, and sourced out from a single source, MML publishing company. The cost of BTL materials does not have to be as high as \$1.00. It could be cheaper if produced locally in conformity to the MOE policy of opening up the book market for publishers to compete fairly. Already there was evidence as evaluation teams visited the classrooms, that teachers were using the BTL kit mainly as reference material, and developed some of the pieces from cardboard material, sometimes using thread to sew cardboard pieces to produce sentence holders, instead of just glueing together. Instead of buying some of the pieces, the school could seek assistance of parents and other community members in developing materials for BTL learners.

In-service Training and Monitoring Costs

Specific BTL activities included materials development, training, monitoring, supervision of teachers, and actual classroom teaching. In all, a total of approximately 354 people who directly or indirectly contributed to the success of the BTL programme were trained. The designation of people who received BTL training is as follows:

- 60 TOTS – 4 days x 1 (trained once)
- 109 PI BTL Teachers
- 100 PI BTL H/Teachers
- 46 COPE Instructors
- 4 Inspectors of schools
- 2 Tutors
- 16 CCTS
- 1 PTC Principal
- 6 COPE Supervisors
- 7 Orthographers
- 2 FAWE
- 1 ESA, 1 Gender Desk & 1 Teacher Education

The total number of days expended in training was 37. Fourteen days were spent on the initial training of trainers; 14 days for the material production team; 5 days for teachers, and 4 days for MOE personnel. The cost of the initial in-service training was **38 787 500/=** (see summary in Appendix C). Following the first monitoring exercise, another cost of training was incurred in a 5-day refresher course that was attended by about 265 teachers across the 4 districts. The cost of this training was **50 135 000/=**, which brings the total for training to **88 922 500/=**.

A monitoring exercise was planned as a necessary component of the BTL process. Two official monitoring visits, conducted by UNICEF/MOE/ITEK teams, were undertaken to each of the four districts. The cost of these activities was estimated to be **11,702,000/=**.

The total amount that was expended in the BTL pilot is presented in Table 13 in Ugandan shillings and equivalent Us dollars amounts.

Table 13: Cost of BTL per learner

Item	Ugandan Shillings	US Dollars	Cost per Learner US\$
Material	91 000 000	50 000 ¹	5.00
Training	88 922 500	48 859	4.89
Monitoring	11 702,000	6 430	0.64
Total	191 624 500	105 289	10.53

Initially BTL, approximately 9 728 learners (approximately 10 000) were selected as the BTL pilot sample in June 2001. This means that the total cost of BTL per learner has been estimated at 9100 Uganda Shillings for materials, 8900 Uganda Shillings for training, and 1170 Uganda Shillings for monitoring.

At the beginning 2002, the 9 728 learners were then considered by the school to be P2 grade as the school year dictates, even though they were still following the P1 BTL curriculum. In January 2002 when a new cohort of P1s came in, an additional 10 880 pupils were exposed to BTL. Hence this cost of training has been stretched to cover these learners, sometimes over-stretched to a point where resources were divided between the P1s and the P2s. One such example was in situations where teachers had to pull out from P2 BTL classes to teach the incoming P1s, an action which may be responsible for some BTL classes not performing as well as was expected.

4.2 Estimating the costing for National implementation

The new language policy in Uganda stipulates that the medium of instruction for learners at P1 to P4 be their local language, and English from P5 onwards. In this model, English is taught as subject in the curriculum in the first three years of schooling. In order to implement this policy objective, NCDC has identified the need to develop strong L1 courses, the aims of which are to get learners to demonstrate permanent functional literacy, and to communicate effectively in their own languages (National Curriculum Development Centre, 1999). From a number of interviews that were held, there were strong suggestions (stated and implied) that the Ministry of Education intends to implement the language policy as it affects classroom instruction, by introducing six major languages under which the many languages that are spoken in Uganda may be grouped. BTL piloting targeted two of the language groups, namely, Luganda and Luo (Alur and Dhophadhola).

There have been visible signs of improved reading and writing in BTL classes compared to classes that are non-BTL in both languages, throughout the piloting period. A possible list that was suggested was Luganda, Luo, Ateso, Runyoro/Rutooro, Runyankore/Rukiga, and Lugubara. This evaluation has documented evidence that local language teaching is acceptable to parents. If it is acceptable to other stakeholders, the programme should be extended to the 6 major language groupings, two ways of estimating the cost of BTL are presented hereunder:

Method 1: We calculate the cost per learner using the amounts spent in the pilot, and then multiply that by the number of learners who are expected in P1 in 2003. As mentioned in the previous section, the cost of developing materials was US\$5 per learner. If we consider that this is the money that government will have to pay up front as down payment, the amount of \$10.53 should be estimated for 1 594 017 pupils who will be in P1 in 2003 throughout Uganda.

¹ Approximately 10 000 pupils at \$5 each for the Molteno BTL kit

Therefore, the amount of US\$**16 784 999.00** should be set aside for development of BTL if materials are developed through the Molteno/MML partnership when it goes to scale. (It should be borne in mind, however, that materials are used for 5 years, hence the cost is subsequent years will be that of training and monitoring. The training aspect will also be eventually be mainstreamed into other preservice activities.

Method 2: As presented in Box 1 is a by item estimate, provided by the BTL manager/coordinator assigned by ITEK. This estimate should be rationalized once more.

Box 1	
PROJECTED COSTS OF BTL ACTIVITIES FOR: RUNYORO/RUTOORO, RUNYANKORE/RUKIGA, ATESO & ANG'AKARAMOJONG	
1. One 6 day material writing workshop for each of the 4 languages @ 21,000,000/= x 1 W/shop x 4 languages = 84,000,000/=	
2. One 6 day orientation workshop for each of the 4 languages @ 21,000,000/= x 1 W/shop x 4 languages = 84,000,000/=	
3. Two 14 day W/shop in BTL stages 1,2 & 3 for each of the 4 languages @ 44,210,500/= x 2 W/shops x 4 languages = 353,684,000/=	
4. Three 5 day school based support workshops covering 18 districts @ 12,533,750/= x 3 W/shops x 18 districts = 676,822,500/=	
5. Three 5 day BTL monitoring visits covering 18 districts @ 2,925,500/= x 3 W/shops x 18 districts = 157,977,000/=	
Total = 1,356,483,500/= (US\$ 745 320.00)	

The cost of developing BTL materials and getting it to run will be relatively high, as can be expected for any new initiative. Additional cost will be incurred in developing pre-service materials, training of trainers at the pre-service level, and mainstreaming this approach into MOE procedures. Most of these are concurrent running costs that should be incurred in any educational system.

In the case of Uganda, an estimate for teaching and learning materials is US\$ 5.4, (as provided by ITEK). This means that the government would have been prepared to spend approximately US\$ 8 607 692 on teaching and learning materials alone, for the P1 learners. Using either Method 1 or Method 2 estimated above, BTL will be accommodated comfortably in the present government budget for education.

A concern that was expressed by government officials, also expressed in the Zambia pilots, is that of procuring of BTL materials through a single source, MML Publishers. In Uganda this would not at all be allowed since it would contravene government policy on preventing monopolies in sourcing out materials, hence the necessary negotiations with Molteno and MML are on-going. This means that BTL materials will come at a cheaper price than is estimated above if it goes to scale in Uganda.

4.3 Mainstreaming BTL into Ugandan education System

It has already been shown in the discussion above that the BTL approach will require a considerable amount resources for it to produce the necessary results. Given that the approach is geared towards having learners acquire functional literacy in a manner that will facilitate all their academic pursuits, the resources on BTL should be a worthwhile investment. It is also should be noted however, that some of the cost can be devolved to other levels of the system.

Adaptation of BTL material will make it cheaper to produce, and also customize it to the needs of Ugandan children. The experiences in Zambia culminated in the development of a BTL that is more responsive to the needs in Zambia, the NBTL (email communication with DFID Education Project officer)

The new features in the Zambian adaptation are:

- New and more up-to-date readers, which are colourful, and modern (gender-sensitive etc)
- Use 4 of group-sentence makers instead of using pupils individual sentence makers. These have been found to be neater, sturdier..
- A new Learner's Activity Book. This takes the pressure off the teacher to come up with tasks for the non-teaching corner groups
- Improved and user-friendly Teacher's Guide.
- The methodology has been changed to allow teachers take only two groups to the teaching corner from Stage 2 onwards to allow more time, and to allow for a Day 5, which is set aside for remedial work with slower learners.

Evidence of adaptations was there throughout the BTL classrooms, both in terms of altering the instructional materials to suit the materials circumstances, and in organizing the materials in a more manageable way. Improvised materials included banana fibre wall pockets; improved reading cards made out of manila paper.

On the issue of mainstreaming BTL, a representative of Molteno RSA contributed to this evaluation by sharing their experiences of working with the Ugandan pilot project. Most of the responses covered issues that were borne out by the evaluation findings. Their main observation that the Uganda pilot was set up in a collegial and inclusive way in which responsibilities were shared among different members of the pilot implementation team. This worked well for a pilot sample. However, as a medium to longer term strategy, Molteno is convinced :

that for the effective implementation and co-ordination of a transformative and complex programme like BTL, there needs to be a full-time co-coordinator (at least; ideally a co-coordinator and an administrator) dedicated exclusively to the responsibilities that this programme involves.

Some of the responsibilities of the coordinator would be to responsibilities of such a post might be the following:

- Devising the roll-out strategy
- Consultation with the key stakeholders at donor, Ministry (central and district levels), teacher, learner and community levels
- Establishment of a Steering Group/Reference group
- Liaison with the materials developers
- Devising the training strategy
- Over-seeing the trainer training process

- Arranging the logistics for all events including the timeous access of funds for each activity
- Co-ordination of the materials distribution strategy
- Periodic reviews of progress and strategic planning
- Establishing structures at District and cluster level for the sustainability of the programme beyond the initial roll-out phase
- Quality assurance of the training process and of the implementation in schools
- Arranging for systemic evaluations as deemed necessary by (both externally and internally conducted)

Uganda BTL has got some unique features, due to the fact that its implementation coincides with UPE. The issue of large classes was raised throughout the evaluation, and was also cited as one of the most problematic issue by Molteno. Unlike in many other developing countries, there was an influx of younger children that were coming into schools. A mainstreaming strategy should of necessity limit class size to 100 and under, and enforce the official school-going age requirement.

5.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BTL was declared a success by teachers and parents during the first few months of piloting. Anecdotal evidence of its success from the reports of the district monitoring teams, and from field workers (CCTs) who have been conducting on-going monitoring visits to the schools was confirmed through analysis of scores on a literacy test, children's written work, classroom observations, and teacher interviews in this summative evaluation. This is not to say that BTL has not encountered problems, however.

Is BTL more expensive than the present methods of teaching literacy? Could be – to the extent that the methodology forces the education system (schools, teachers, MOE) to do what we all know should be done for the foundation level. Some interviewees suggested that as part of providing additional information before deciding for or against BTL, a study tour of to a country which has recently gone to scale with BTL (such as Zambia) should be arranged for implementors so that there is full appreciation of the task at hand after having observed first hand the successes and the setbacks.

Is BTL sustainable? This is not a yes/no question. Once the decision has been made to go BTL, sustainability has to be planned for. Introducing BTL methodology in all schools will initially be costly, in that schools have to rely on in-service strategies of training teachers and supervisors. Once the methodology is institutionalized at the pre-service level, expenditure on it will be comparable to the current methodologies that are used in schools. But, not introducing it comes at an even higher cost in that money will continue to be spent on education, when the majority of learners are failing to master even the basic skills of reading and writing. A number of issues, at the school and policy levels, will have to be tackled, which issued may compromise the future success of the program if left unattended.

5.1 Issues at the school level

While the level of teacher preparation has been intensive, it is still not sufficient. For instance, it is was clear to many teachers what is to be done within the BTL stages, especially the difference between Stages 2 and Stage 3 activities. In some classrooms where children were supposed to be in different stages they are given the same tasks, usually tasks that are suitable for learners at a lower stage. Also, as it is to be expected, some teachers have not put enough effort into teaching the BTL way, while others are downright overwhelmed.

Assessment of students beyond Stage 1 has been problematic – all teachers will need further training on assessment development, and strategies of assessing literacy. The weakest link in the methodology BTL so far is its cursory reference to the CA approach of assessment, without clear guidance on what the teachers need to do. As a result, teachers do not know how to pass learners from Stage 2 to Stage 3.

At an organizational level, most schools have introduced BTL in the new P1 cohorts, even though they were not resourced to do so. Also, school-level decisions on how to share the resources between the 2 cohorts vary from school to school. It is expected that this has diluted the impact of BTL. Supervision of BTL schools by district education officials has not been to the required level, due to financial constraints. This has led to a situation where the methodology was practiced only minimally in a few schools. To this end, evaluations teams have requested that financial resources be provided during this last leg of BTL activities so that maximum

attention should be given to schools.

Recommendation 1: *That BTL implementation should be broadened. A model of rolling it out to selected schools in all districts where the Luganda, Alur and Dhophadhola are spoken seems to be the most feasible at this point, as well as carrying the subsequent cohorts in the 100 schools. At the same time, funds can be committed to developing materials for the remaining languages, in preparation for piloting of the other languages in 2004, and nationwide implementation in 2005.*

Recommendation 2: *Develop a Uganda adaptation, that is BTL Uganda (BTLU). The thrust of the adaptation would be to create the necessary environment for maximum learning gains. Some of the issues which need to be considered in the adaptation are the following:*

- *Develop BTLU with the aim of making it decidedly outcomes-based*
- *Develop BTL kits using locally available materials*
- *Enhance the cultural elements, and lifeskills teaching. This would mean bringing in a variety of conversation posters.*
- *Build on the teamwork approach*
- *Increase of contact time on BTL activities. Rather than extending the time for reading and writing, one way of increasing contact time would be to adapt the methodology to teaching most of the subjects at the foundation level*
- *Develop clearly assessment for monitoring learning achievement, and for evaluation purposes.*

In this model, the initial 100 schools can be used as “lead schools”, while the second generation of schools could also be lead schools that are trying out new improvements in the BTL methodology. Introduce the BTL methodology as it is. The related issues would be to decide the year of going to scale. I would suggest 2005, to give time for MOE and other stakeholders to plan for this initiative, and to assemble a team of local aspects who would start immediately to work on the adaptation. In the meantime, make concrete decisions and plans for the P1 cohorts of 2002 and 2003 in the piloting schools. According to the BTL concept paper, the impact of BTL will be properly measured at P3, hence piloting of the first generation lead schools should continue until the 2001 BTL cohort reaches P4 in 2004. (The rest of the activities for P2, P3, and P4 can be planned for under the MALP).

5.2 MOE/Policy Level

The language policy: There are concerns that the six local languages groupings do not cater for a significant number of people, hence some languages will “fall through the cracks”. A well thought out strategy of taking these languages on board is needed. This language issue is not new. In Southern Africa, Zambia and Namibia have piloted BTL under somewhat similar situations. A study tour of Zambia would be informative on the issue choosing the most optimal strategy for developing BTL for several language groups, as well as in learning lessons on the NBTL adaptations.

Recommendation 3: *Undertake a study tour to Zambia where full scale implementation of NBTL commenced in 2002. the tour should address the following*

- *implementation of the language policy;*
- *adaptation of BTL, and*
- *lessons that can be learnt from those who are currently going to scale with the BTL. (It may also be possible to exchange ideas on the issues of procuring material for BTL).*

Procurement of BTL materials: This issue has created the most anxiety for the MOE and all partners (EFAG, ITEK, etc.). The MML procurement arrangement is proving to be regional problem, with countries such as Zambia having experienced some difficulties with it. (my email correspondence with Education Program Officer, DFID, Zambia). UNICEF does not support the single-sourcing procurement arrangement that Molteno/MML has in place since it stands in contravention of MOE open policy on procurement of materials. Also, a single-sourcing arrangement could render BTL “undoable” for Uganda.

Recommendation 4: *UNICEF Regional Education Office should be approached with the possibility of conducting the necessary consultations/negotiations with Molteno/MML on behalf of all countries in the region which might wish to adopt the methodology.*

ITEK and NCDC have been highly successful in leading the BTL initiative, using the TDMS framework. However nationwide implementation of BTL would need reinforcement from the Ministry of Education and Sport. A focal point for BTL even if its for a contractual period, with clear terms of reference on what is to be achieved in the period of the contract.

Recommendation 5: *The Ministry of Education and Sport should consider appointing a focal point for BTL for a contractual period, with clear terms of reference on what is to be achieved in the period of the contract. Responsibilities of such a person would be to plan for expansion of BTL, up to nation-wide implementation, as well as devise monitoring and evaluation strategies.*

5.3 Summary

BTL implementation has been successful in that there is evidence of reading in the classrooms. There is also evidence that children enjoy coming to school. The reading vocabulary is also impressive. Close to 50 percent of the learners have acquired an extensive vocabulary, as can be seen by being able to perform the dictation tasks satisfactorily. About 30 percent of the learners have developed the ability to integrate the skills, compose and write simple stories with a minimum of three or four sentences. However, the learners are still far short of the 85 percent that is stipulated in the objectives of BTL. Areas which need to be improved are reading comprehension and sentence composition. Also, this BTL pilot has not been successful with teaching of lifeskills. Neither has the evaluation been successful in measuring the lifeskills component of the test. A protracted strategy should be devised to ensure that children are able to learn the basic lifeskills, with corresponding work going into assessment strategies for lifeskills.

APPENDIX A – LIST OF CONTACTS

Following is a list of individuals who were interviewed. This is comprised of teachers and headteachers for both BTL and non-BTL schools, members of school management committees, local leaders, and parents and educators in different capacities.

Teachers

1. Mr. Bithum RONALDA – Kelle P.S. (BTL)
2. Mr. Opoki Albino – Avubu P.S. (BTL)
3. Mr. Anyonga Paul – Pangere P.S. (BTL)
4. Mr. Onencan Emmy – Omoyo P.S. (BTL)
5. Mr. Dwokacen Wilson – Adeira P.S. (non BTL)
6. Mr. Adubango-Rubanga – Erussi P.S. (non BTL)
7. Ms. M. Nakalawa Molly
8. Ms. C. Nakalanda Cissy
9. Ms. H. Nakibuuka Halima
10. Mrs. Busingye Ida
11. Mr. Senkubuge Edon
12. Mr. Ndugwa Abbas
13. Mr. Namigadde Benna
14. Ms. P Namugosa
15. Mr. Namulondo Kamuli
16. Ms. S. Lubuga
17. Ms. B.Kakai
18. Ms. I. Kyowelera
19. Isabirye
20. Mr. S Mwase

CCTs

Mr. D. Wedunga David - CCT Erussi
Mr. S. Orombi Sam - CCT Afere
Mr. Rwothongeyo - CCT Pajobi.

Community Members:

1. Mr. H/M Pasai
2. Mr. Aneko Rufino – Chairman, Mgt Comm.
3. Mr. Maken Francis – Vice Chairman, Mgt Comm.
4. Rev. Sr. Anikane Jane – Chairperson Mvuranyi P.S.
5. Mr. Anyolikko Nestore – LC I of Malaga
6. Mr. Opoka Christopher – PTA Comm. Mvuranyi P.S.
7. Mr. Jakonya Steven – Chairman LC I Kulimao Village
8. Mr. Abimwangokane Cyprian – Chairman PTA – Pasai
9. Mr. Albert Kabuuye

Head Teachers:

Mr. Kabala Julius Bugulusi P/S
Mr. Bungu Patrick - Kamuli Girls P/S
Mr. Wakabi Patrick - Kamuli Boys P/S
Ms. Sanyu Irene Bulogo COPE Centre
Mrs.Kaziba Rev. Nayenga P/S

Education Officers and other Educators:

Mr. Akoyo Charles D
Mr. Kanakulya Ibrahim
Prof. Lutalo Bosa, principal, ITEK
Ms. Florence Malinga, Commissioner

REFERENCES

1. Higgins, C., Tumbulukani, Chikalanga, I. (2000) Report on the evaluation of New Breakthrough to Literacy; Unpublished Report.
2. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2001). Report on BTL Stage 1 training workshop. Non-published report. May, 2001.
3. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2001).). Report on BTL Stage 2 and 3 training workshop. Non-published report. August/September, 2001.
4. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2001). Report on monitoring of BTL Stage 1 in Masaka District. Non-published report. August, 2001.
5. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2001). Report on monitoring of BTL Stage 2 in Masaka District. Non-published report. October, 2001.
6. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2001). Report on BTL refresher workshops in the districts of Tororo, Kamuli, Masaka, and Nebbi. Non-published report. November, 2001.
7. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2002). Report on BTL school based support workshop in Nebbi district. Non-published report. May, 2002.
8. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2002). Report on monitoring of BTL Stage 2 in Nebbi District. Non-published report. May, 2002.
9. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2002). Report on monitoring of BTL in Masaka District. Non-published report. May, 2002.
10. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2002). Report on monitoring of BTL in Tororo District. Non-published report. May, 2002.
11. Institute of Teacher Education, Kyambogo. (2002). Report on BTL refresher workshop, Kamuli district. Non-published report. May, 2002.
12. Kingwill, P. (1998). Transforming language education in Southern Africa. Braamfontein, The Molteno Project.
13. Mckay, D., Thompson, B., and Schaub, P. (1970). Breakthrough to Literacy. London. Longman.
14. Ministry of Education, Botswana (2000). Education for All Assessment 2002: Botswana Country Report
15. National Curriculum Development Centre (2001). Teacher's Guide to Uganda primary School Curriculum. Volume 2.

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY

VOLUME 2 – EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Kathleen Letshabo, Ph.D

October 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A: MOLTENO EMAIL INTERVIEW	1
APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	2
APPENDIX C: LEARNER PROFILE.....	4
APPENDIX D: BTL TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE	5
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR P2 TEACHERS: NON-BTL SCHOOLS	10
APPENDIX F: BTL HEAD TEACHER EVALUATION	12
APPENDIX G: SENIOR EDUCATION PERSONNEL	15
APPENDIX H: BTL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	17
APPENDIX I: NON-BTL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	21
APPENDIX J: ENGLISH TEST	24
APPENDIX K: LUGANDA TEST	30
APPENDIX L: DHOPADHOLA TEST.....	36
APPENDIX M: ALUR TEST	41
APPENDIX N: SCORING GUIDE	48
APPENDIX O: CODING SCHEME.....	52

APPENDIX A: MOLTENO EMAIL INTERVIEW

Dear John and Paula:

My name is Kathleen Letshabo. I have been commissioned by UNICEF Uganda to evaluate their BTL pilot programme. I have a number of questions about the programme development aspect, and Sibeso has given me your contact so I can request the information from you. Could you kindly respond to the following:

1. Are there any aspects of the Uganda context that are peculiar to them, such that you had to develop their BTL program differently? Any underlying philosophy; assumptions; policies; values, etc?
2. What are your perceptions on the implementation strategy that has been adopted by Uganda? What, if anything, should the Ugandans do to maximize effectiveness of BTL (Please provide examples from other programs you have worked before, if possible).
3. Are there any new lessons that you learnt from the Ugandan pilot?
4. In comparison to other BTL programs in Zambia and Botswana, how successful do you think the Ugandan pilot program is?(Please rank the programmes)

Thank you in advance for your assistance. I will be leaving Uganda on Friday 21st. Please forward your response to my email above if you respond later than that.

Kathleen.

APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Teachers, Head Teachers, Community and Advocacy Groups, and Center Coordinating Tutors

Instructions to the Interviewer: Please use the focus interview schedule to ask questions that are relevant to the group that you are interviewing, and probe as you see fit.

Teachers

1. How is BTL different from the other approaches that have been used for teaching literacy
2. Do you find BTL to be suitable or relevant to your school?
3. Is teaching Grade 1 literacy more enjoyable in the BTL approach?
4. What is your relationship to the learners? Is it better in the BTL classroom, or in the non-BTL classrooms that you have taught?
5. Tell us whether the children learning to read and write faster or slower with BTL approach? Did you expect the results that you are getting? Are boys and girls participating equally?
6. Are BTL learners getting more help on their homework, compared to non-BTL P1learners?
7. What would you do to improve on the BTL approach if it was declared the regular approach to teaching literacy skills?
8. Do you have any additional information that we can use to improve BTL?

Head Teachers

1. Do you find BTL to be suitable/relevant to the Ugandan context?
2. How would you compare the effectiveness of BTL teachers and of non-BTL teachers in their teaching here at your school?
3. Have you observed any change in the professional development of the BTL teachers?
4. In your opinion, are the children learning to read and write faster or slower with the BTL approach that with the old approaches that were used in your school?
5. Are learners getting more help on their homework, compared to non-BTL P1learners?
6. Did you expect the results that you are getting in the BTL classes? Why/why not?
7. What would you make in your school if the BTL approach was declared the regular approach to teaching literacy skills?

8. Do you have any additional information that we can use to improve BTL?

Center Coordinating Tutors

1. How is BTL different from the other approaches that have been used for teaching literacy?
2. Do you find BTL to be suitable/relevant to the Ugandan context?
3. Is teaching Grade 1 literacy more enjoyable in the BTL approach?
4. What is your relationship to the learners? Is it better in the BTL classroom, or in the non-BTL classrooms that you have taught?
5. Are the children learning how to read and write faster with BTL approach? Did you expect the results that you are getting?
6. What would you do to improve on the BTL approach if it was declared the regular approach to teaching literacy skills?
7. Do you have any additional that we can use to improve BTL?

Community and Advocacy Groups

1. Are you aware of the BTL approach? Do you think it is suitable/relevant to the Ugandan context?
2. What of evidence of effectiveness would you need to see in order to support and promote BTL as a new way of teaching literacy skills?
3. What preparations should be made before BTL can be declared the regular approach to teaching literacy skills in Ugandan schools?
4. Would you support efforts to make BTL popular? What activities would you plan for?
5. Do you have any additional information that we can use to improve BTL?

9. Are the learning/teaching instructions clear? If no, please clarify

10 Using the scale below, rate how well the materials at each Stage of BTL help in teaching children how to read and write.

1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
--------	-----------------	---------	-------------	-------------

a) Stage 1 []

b) Stage 2 []

c) Stage 3 []

11. If you gave a rating of “1” or “Poor” for any of the stages, explain why that is so.

12. Does BTL support the teaching of Lifeskills in any way? Yes [] No []

TRAINING AND SUPPORT

13. Using the rating scale below, state how well you agree with the statements below since you started teaching BTL.

1= Strongly disagree	2=Disagree	3= Agree only minimally	4=Agree	5=Strongly agree
----------------------	------------	-------------------------	---------	------------------

a) I enjoy my teaching more with BTL []

b) I am now teach better than before []

d) My BTL class enjoy reading more than my other P2 classes before []

d) My BTL class is reading more than my other P2 classes before []

e) I learnt better skills for teaching of ready at BTL workshop. []

f) I know how to use BTL materials properly []

g) The children in my class are too many for BTL it to work well []

h) I have all the BTL materials and equipment that I need []

i) I understand the BTL course properly []

18. What, in your opinion, are the strengths of BTL?

19. Suggest how BTL exercise or activities can be improved

20. Using the scale below, rate the usefulness of the following materials for your teaching?

1=Not useful	2= Only slightly useful	3= Useful	4=Very Useful	5=Extremely Useful
--------------	-------------------------	-----------	---------------	--------------------

- a. Teacher's manual []
- b. Teacher's Sentence Maker []
- c. Teacher's Sentence Holder []
- d. Conversation Posters (4) []
- e. Learner's Sentence Maker []
- f. Learner's Sentence Holder []
- g. Occupational Task book []
- h. Phonic Posters []
- i. Two exercise books per learner []
- j. Extra teaching aids []
- k. Readers []
- l. Word Store []

21. Are the BTL materials suitable to the Ugandan culture?

1=Not suitable	2= Only slightly useful	3= Suitable	4=Very Suitable	5=Extremely Suitable
----------------	-------------------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------------

Explain your response in Q21 _____

22. Should BTL materials be used for all primary schools in Uganda?

LEARNER PERFORMANCE

23. How do the children in your class behave with this new method? (Tick one)

Worse [1] About the same [2] Better [3]

Explain your rating:_____

24. How do you decide that the learner is ready to move on to the next stage?

24. Indicate the number of learners at the different stages of Breakthrough.

Stage 1[] Stage 2[] Stage 3[]

25. How would you compare BTL with the traditional way of teaching reading and writing?

Worse [1] No difference [2] Better [3]

Explain your rating:_____

TEACHING ENGLISH

26. Would you want to use BTL to teach English reading and writing skills in Grade 2?

Yes [] No []

Explain your answer_____

***THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON IT***

10. What, in your opinion, are the main strengths of BTL?

11. What, in your opinion, are the weaknesses of BTL?

12. Do you think BTL should be introduced all schools in Uganda? Say why, or why not..

13. How would you compare BTL with the traditional approach to teaching reading and writing? (circle one) a) much better b) little better c) no real difference

Comment: _____

14. Would you want to use BTL to teach English reading and writing skills in P2?

Yes [] No []

Explain your answer _____

15. Any other comments, suggestions, criticisms, or general observations that might improve the development of literacy - in either Luganda, Alur, Dhopadhola?

***THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON IT***

APPENDIX F: BTL HEAD TEACHER EVALUATION

DISTRICT: SCHOOL:.....

INTRODUCTION

The information in this questionnaire will be used to improve the BTL programme. Please answer all questions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHER

1. Sex (Tick one) Female [] Male []
2. Highest academic qualifications P7 [] S4 [] S6 []
3. Teacher Training None [] P1-P3 [] P4-P7 []
4. How long have you been 1-5 yrs [] 6-10 yrs [] 11 yrs + []
teaching?
5. Head teacher of this school for? 1-5 yrs [] 6-10 yrs [] 11 yrs + []
6. How did you assist in piloting of BTL? (Tick all appropriate boxes)
- Funding [] Training materials [] Training []

Any other way (specify) _____

7. How well do BTL teachers in your school do their work?

1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
--------	-----------------	---------	-------------	-------------

8. How would you rate the BTL method?

1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
--------	-----------------	---------	-------------	-------------

9. What rating would you give the BTL Programme?

1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
--------	-----------------	---------	-------------	-------------

State the reason/s: _____

10. How often do you monitor the BTL lessons in your school? Tick

Not at all [] Once a month [] Weekly [] Daily []

11. Has BTL made you more involved in your learners' schoolwork?

Yes [] No []

Provide reasons for your answer: _____

12. Have you received any complaints about BTL from the teacher/s?

Yes [] No []

If yes, what was the complaint? _____

13. Have any parents commented on BTL?

Yes [] No []

If yes, what was their comments? _____

14. Do you think BTL has helped children learn how to read well?

Yes [] No []

Explain your comment: _____

15. Do you think BTL has helped teachers with the lifeskills component?

Yes [] No []

16. Are children with learning disabilities getting more attention in the BTL class?
Yes [] No []

Explain why, or why not: _____

17. What, in your opinion, are the main strengths of BTL?

18. What, in your opinion, are the weaknesses of BTL?

19. Should BTL be extended to all primary schools?

20. Please feel free to comment or make suggestions that would help the Ministry of Education and Sports and the evaluators to review and improve the programme.

Comments: _____

***THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON IT***

APPENDIX G: SENIOR EDUCATION PERSONNEL

(INSPECTORS, EOs, DEO AND CURRICULUM SPECIALIST)

This Evaluation Questionnaire is intended to obtain opinions from CCTs, District Education Office, Inspectorate and Curriculum Development Specialists on the effects that the introduction of BTL may have had in the school curriculum.

1. Your position: _____ DISTRICT:

2. How much do you know about BTL? (Tick one)

Nothing [1] Only a little [2] Sufficient knowledge [3] A great deal [4]

3. What responsibility, if any, do you have in BTL?

4. Has the introduction of BTL had any effect on the school curriculum? Be as specific as possible.

5. If the answer in Q4 is yes, should BTL be continued and expanded in other districts?

6. How suitable are the BTL materials?

1=Not at all suitable	2= Only slightly useful	3= Suitable	4=Very Suitable	5=Extremely Suitable
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------------

7. How suitable are the BTL methods?

1=Not at all suitable	2= Only slightly useful	3= Suitable	4=Very Suitable	5=Extremely Suitable
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------------

8. How would you compare the Traditional Approach of teaching language with the BTL approach in teaching reading and writing?

No difference [1] A little better [2] Much better [3]

9. Has BTL had any effect on staffing? Yes [] No []

If Yes, explain how _____

10. What, in your opinion, are the main strengths of BTL?

11. What, in your opinion, are the main weaknesses of BTL?

12. What improvement do you wish to see in the implementation of BTL?

13. Do you support countrywide implementation of BTL in the near future (in 1 year or so)?

Yes [] No []

THANK YOU

APPENDIX H: BTL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Instructions: *This is not to be handed out to the teacher. A member of the evaluation team should observe the classroom*

Name of school: _____

How many learners in each BTL Stage? Stage 1[] Stage2[]Stage3[]

A. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Tick as appropriate to indicate whether the classroom has the specified organizational components.

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|---------|----|---------|
| 1. Social /Ability groups | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 2. Teaching Corner | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 3. Subject corner with learning aids | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 4. Are the group names displayed? | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 5. Has the teacher completed a lesson plan? | Yes | [] | No | [] |

B. MATERIALS

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|---------|----|---------|
| 6. Are the following materials present and being used? | | | | |
| a. Teacher's manual | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| b. Teacher's Sentence Maker | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| c. Teacher's Sentence Holder | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| d. Conversation Posters (4) | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| e. Learner's Sentence Maker | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| f. Learner's Sentence Holder | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| g. Occupational Task book | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| h. Phonic Posters | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| i. Two exercise books per learner | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| j. Extra teaching aids | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| k. Readers | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| l. Word Store | Yes | [] | No | [] |

C. METHODOLOGY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--------|----|--------|
| 7. | Have group leaders been identified? | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 8. | Does each child get a turn to be group leader? | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 9. | Are assessment charts displayed? | Yes | [] | No | [] |
| 10. | Does the teacher use the chalkboard? | Yes | [] | No | [] |

11. Rate appropriately as follows: *1 = Poor* *2 = Satisfactory* *3 = Good*

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|-------|
| a. | Teacher's language command adequate for BTL teaching | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| b. | How does the teacher manage the groups? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| c. | How effective is the teacher the facilitator of the discussion? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| d. | Is teacher using the Teacher's Manual effectively? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| e. | Does the teacher use the Phonic Posters correctly? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| f. | How constructive is feedback by the teacher? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| g. | Is the 'Shared Book Method' used effectively? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| h. | Does the teacher follow the steps in the Teaching Corner as prescribed? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| i. | How learner-centred is the lesson? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| j. | Does the teacher give clear instructions? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| k. | Is the teacher pleasant? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| l. | Is the teacher responsive? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| m. | Does the teacher use questioning skills well? | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| n. | How is the quality of rapport | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| o. | Degree of positive feedback | [1] | [2] | [3] |
| p. | Level of teacher's confidence with the approach? | [1] | [2] | [3] |

Make general remarks about the methodology as used by the teacher.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS : Comment on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the **teacher**, the **lesson**, or **any other relevant** issue.

20. How would you rate the lesson?	1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
------------------------------------	--------	-----------------	------------	-------------	-------------

Explain this rating _____

Name of Observer:: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX I: NON-BTL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Instructions: *This is not to be handed out to the teacher. A member of the evaluation team should observe the classroom*

1. Name of school: _____ DISTRICT: _____

4. No. boys in class [] No. of girls []

A. PREPARATION

7. Has the teacher planned a scheme of works, or using notes to guide his/her teaching?

Yes [] No []

B. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT:

5. Describe how the classroom is organised.

C. TEACHING MATERIALS

6. What materials are used? Describe fully.

D. ENRICHMENT MATERIALS:

8. Does this classroom have additional enrichment materials are used? Describe fully.

E. METHODOLOGY

9. Describe the main features of the methodology followed by the teacher.

10. Does this methodology seem suitable for the class? Describe

F. LEARNERS

11. Describe fully how the learners respond to the teaching.

12. Describe the work done by the learners.

- a. Is the children's work displayed on the walls? Yes[] No[]
- b. Are learners' books neat? Yes[] No[]
- c. Are boys and girls participating equally? Yes[] No[]

If no, which are participating more? Boys [] Girls []

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS : Comment on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the teacher, the lesson, or any other relevant issue.

21. How would you rate the lesson?	1=Poor	2= Satisfactory	3= Good	4=Very Good	5=Excellent
------------------------------------	--------	-----------------	---------	-------------	-------------

Explain your rating: _____

Name of Observer: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX J: ENGLISH TEST

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY(BTL)

EVALUATION TEST INSTRUMENTS

ENGLISH

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SPORTS
BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY(BTL) EVALUATION TEST INSTRUMENTS
ENGLISH

Name of District..... Code.....

Name of School/COPE Centre Code..... School Type BTL Non-BTL

Name of Testee Code..... Age:..... Sex of testee M F

TASK	INSTRUCTIONS
<p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lifeskills - Reading <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Musa is going to the market. 2. Musa is carrying a bag. 3. Musa is buying potatoes. 	<p>General instructions</p> <p>The test is made up of 4 tasks. Three tasks (A, B and C) will be administered to the learners as a whole group, while the fourth task will be administered to the individual learner.</p> <p>Instructions to the learner are given in italics. Please read the text to the learner exactly as it appears on this administration script.</p> <p>Read out the three sentences to the learners slowly twice. Then ask them to write each sentence as you read it out slowly as stipulated below.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Listen to the sentences as I read them.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Musa is going to the market.</i> <i>2. Musa is carrying a bag.</i> <i>3. Musa is buying potatoes.</i>
<p>Qtn.1. Musa is going to the market.</p>	<p>Now say the following:</p>

	<p><i>I'm going to read the sentences again one at a time. Here is the first sentence:</i></p> <p><i>Musa is going to the market</i></p> <p><i>Now, write the sentence down on your paper.</i></p>
Qtn.2. Musa is carrying a bag.	<p>Listen to the second sentence:</p> <p>Musa is carrying a bag</p> <p><i>Write the sentence down on your paper.</i></p>
Qtn.3. Musa is buying potatoes.	<p><i>Now, listen to the third sentence:</i></p> <p><i>Musa is buying potatoes.</i></p> <p><i>Now, write this last sentence down on your paper.</i></p>
<p>B. COMPOSING SENTENCES</p> <p>Skills Tested: - reading - writing</p> <p>Words: Mother Pot Cook Food</p>	<p>Instructions:</p> <p>To the administrator:</p> <p>In this task, children will use words to write sentences. Show the testees the 4 words that are given on a manilla paper.</p>
Qtn 4 Composing a correct sentence	<p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Read the words to yourself silently</i></p> <p><i>Now, write a sentence using all the words on the chart.</i></p>

<p>C. STORY WRITING</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Writing - Creativity <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mother is from garden with a bunch of bananas. b) Mother puts the bunch of bananas c) She goes into the house to pick a knife and sauce pan. d) A goat nearby eats the bananas. e) She comes out and is furious as she 	<p>Group Administration</p> <p>Show the testees the pictures that are arranged in a sequence on a manilla paper. Tell the testees that the pictures make a story, and briefly discuss Picture A of the sequence with them. As you discuss the picture, you will be listening out for the following sentence:</p> <p>Mother is the from garden with a bunch of bananas</p> <p>or a similar sentence. Ask all children to write the sentence down as the sentence that will begin their story.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>These pictures make a story. What can you see in this picture?</i></p> <p>Their responses: Woman, mother, bananas, etc.</p> <p><i>Good. Now who can make a sentence about this picture for us?</i></p> <p>Mother is from the garden with a bunch of bananas</p> <p><i>That is a good sentence. Everyone, please write the sentence in your paper.</i></p> <p><i>Now, you have the first sentence of your story. Look at the rest of the pictures, and continue with your story. Write one sentence for each picture, until you reach the last picture, which you will use to write the last sentence of your story.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.7. Sentence about picture d)</p>	
<p>Qtn.8. Sentence about picture e)</p>	
<p>LIFESKILLS</p> <p>Qtn.9. Communication</p>	<p>Instructions</p> <p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of communication, confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>

Qtn.10. Creative thinking	Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of creative thinking confidence and creativity if exhibited.
<p>D. READING COMPREHENSION</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Speaking - Life Skills <p>Reading Text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maria took out a basket of maize for drying. b) A hen came and ate the maize. c) Maria chased the hen away. d) Some of the maize poured on the ground. e) Maria put the maize back in the basket. 	<p>Instructions to the Test Administrator:</p> <p>This is an individual task. Administer it separately to each learner. Also score it immediately on speaking and lifeskills as the learner is responding.</p> <p>Give a text of five sentences to each testee and ask him/her to read it. Then ask the testee to answer the questions orally.</p>
Qtn.11. What did the hen do?	<p>To each learner, say the following:</p> <p><i>What did the hen do?</i></p> <p><i>OK. Now answer this question</i></p>
Qtn.12. Why did Maria chase the hen away?	<i>Why did Maria chase the hen away?</i>
Qtn.13. Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?	<p><i>Here is the last question about the passage</i></p> <p><i>Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?</i></p> <p><i>Thank you. You can go now.</i></p>
LIFESKILLS	
Qtn.14 Communication	You should observe and award marks for communication as shown in the scoring instructions.

Qtn.15	Confidence	You should observe and award marks for confidence as shown in the scoring instructions.
--------	-------------------	---

APPENDIX K: LUGANDA TEST

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY

BTL LUGANDA TEST

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SPORTS
BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY(BTL) EVALUATION TEST INSTRUMENTS
LUGANDA

Name of District..... Code.....

Name of School/COPE Centre Code..... School Type BTL Non-BTL

Name of Testee Code..... Age:..... Sex of testee M F

TASK	INSTRUCTIONS
<p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Iifeskills - Reading <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Musa agenda mu katale. 2. Musa akutte ensawo. 3. Musa agula lumonde. 	<p>General instructions</p> <p>The test is made up of 4 tasks. Three tasks (A, B and C) will be administered to the learners as a whole group, while the fourth task will be administered to the individual learner.</p> <p>Instructions to the learner are given in italics. Please read the text to the learner exactly as it appears on this administration script.</p> <p>Read out the three sentences to the learners slowly twice. Then ask them to write each sentence as you read it out slowly as stipulated below.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Muwuliririze sentensi nga bwe nzisoma</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Musa agenda mu katale.</i> 2. <i>Musa akutte ensawo.</i> 3. <i>Musa agula lumonde.</i>
<p>Qtn.1. Musa is going to the market.</p>	<p>Now say the following:</p> <p><i>Nng'enda kuddamu nsome sentensi zino kinneemu, sentensi esooka:</i></p> <p><i>Musa agenda mu katale.</i></p>

	Kati wandiika sentensi eyo ku lupapula
Qtn.2. Musa is carrying a bag.	<p><i>Wuliriza sentensi ey'okubiri</i></p> <p><i>Musa akutte ensawo.</i></p> <p><i>Wandiika sentensi ku lupapula</i></p>
Qtn.3. Musa is buying potatoes.	<p><i>Kati wuliriza sentensi ey'okusatu</i></p> <p><i>Musa agula lumonde.</i></p> <p><i>Kati wandiika sentensi eno esembayo ku lupapula</i></p>
<p>B. COMPOSING SENTENCES</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reading - writing <p>Words:</p> <p>maama entamu fumba mmere</p>	<p>Instructions:</p> <p>To the administrator:</p> <p>In this task, children will use words to write sentences. Show the testees the 4 words that are given on a manilla paper.</p>
Qtn 4 Composing a correct sentence	<p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Soma ebigambo bino ku lulwo mu kasirise</i></p> <p><i>Kati wandiika sentensi ng'okozesa ebigambo ebiri ku kipande.</i></p>
C. STORY WRITING	Group Administration

<p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Writing - Creativity <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maama ava mu nnimiro nga yeetisse ettooke. b) Maama assa ettooke wabweru. c) Maama ayingira mu nnyumba d) Embuzi erya ettooke. e) Maama yafulumu n’obusungu n’agoba embuzi. 	<p>Show the testees the pictures that are arranged in a sequence on a manilla paper. Tell the testees that the pictures make a story, and briefly discuss Picture A of the sequence with them. As you discuss the picture, you will be listening out for the following sentence:</p> <p>Mother is the from garden with a bunch of bananas</p> <p>or a similar sentence. Ask all children to write the sentence down as the sentence that will begin their story.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Ebifaananyi bino bifa ku lugero. Olaba ki mu kifaananyi?</i></p> <p>Abayizi bajja kuddam unti: omukazi, maama, menu...</p> <p><i>Kirungi! Kati ani asobola okukola sentensi ekwata ku lugero?</i></p> <p>Maama ava mu nnimiro nga yeetisse ettooke.</p> <p><i>Sentensi gy’okoze ntuufu. Buli omu akole sentensi emu agiwandiike ku lupapula.</i></p> <p><i>Tunuulira ebifaananyi ebisigadde buli kimu okiwandiikeko sentensi emu, sentensi zonna awamu zikole olugero.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.7. Sentence about picture d)</p>	
<p>Qtn.8. Sentence about picture e)</p>	
<p>LIFESKILLS</p> <p>Qtn.9. Communication</p>	<p>Instructions</p> <p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of communication, confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>
<p>Qtn.10. Creative thinking</p>	<p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of creative thinking confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>

<p>D. READING COMPREHENSION</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Speaking - Life Skills <p>Reading Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maria yafulumya kasooli mu kisero 2. Enkoko yagenda n'erya kasooli. 3. Maria n'agoba enkoko. 2. Kasooli n'ayiika wansi. 3. Maria n'ayoola kasooli n'amuzza mu kisero. 	<p>Instructions to the Test Administrator:</p> <p>This is an individual task. Administer it separately to each learner. Also score it immediately on speaking and lifeskills as the learner is responding.</p> <p>Give a text of five sentences to each testee and ask him/her to read it. Then ask the testee to answer the questions orally.</p>
<p>Qtn.11. What did the hen do?</p>	<p>To each learner, say the following:</p> <p><i>Enkoko yakola ki?</i></p> <p><i>Kirungi, kati ddamu ekibuuzo kino.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.12. Why did Maria chase the hen away?</p>	<p><i>Lwaki Maria yagoba enkoko?</i></p>
<p>Qtn.13. Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?</p>	<p><i>Kino kye kibuuzo ekisembayo ku lugero.</i></p> <p><i>Lwaki Maria yali ayanika kasooli?</i></p> <p><i>Weebale nnyo. Kati genda.</i></p>
<p>LIFESKILLS</p> <p>Qtn.14 Communication</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for communication as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>

<p>Qtn.15 Confidence</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for confidence as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

APPENDIX L: DHOPADHOLA TEST

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY

BTL DHOPADHOLA TEST

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SPORTS

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY(BTL) EVALUATION TEST INSTRUMENTS

DHOPADHOLA

Name of District..... Code.....

Name of School/COPE Centre Code..... School Type BTL Non-BTL

Name of Testee Code..... Age:..... Sex of testee M F

TASK	INSTRUCTIONS
<p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lifeskills - Reading <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Musa kidho i katale. 2. Musa otingo mugowa. 3. Musa nyiewo rabwo. 	<p>General instructions</p> <p>The test is made up of 4 tasks. Three tasks (A, B and C) will be administered to the learners as a whole group, while the fourth task will be administered to the individual learner.</p> <p>Instructions to the learner are given in italics. Please read the text to the learner exactly as it appears on this administration script.</p> <p>Read out the three sentences to the learners slowly twice. Then ask them to write each sentence as you read it out slowly as stipulated below.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Winji wini boli wachi ma akidho kisoma ri wini.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Musa kidho i katale.</i> 2. <i>Musa otingo mugowa.</i> 3. <i>Musa nyiewo rabwo.</i>
<p>Qtn.1. <i>Musa kidho i katale.</i></p>	<p>Now say the following:</p> <p><i>Kendo akidho kisoma ri wini boli wachi achiel achiel. Boli wachi mar apena ame:</i></p> <p><i>Musa kidho i katale.</i></p> <p><i>Onyo handika boli wachi no i papila perini</i></p>
<p>Qtn.2. <i>Musa otingo mugowa.</i></p>	<p><i>Winji boli wachi ma aryo:</i></p>

	<p><i>Musa otingo mugowa.</i></p> <p><i>Handika boli wachi no i papila perini.</i></p>
Qtn.3. <i>Musa nyiewo rabwo.</i>	<p><i>Onyo kendo winji boli wachi mar adeki:</i></p> <p><i>Musa nyiewo rabwo.</i></p> <p><i>Onyo, handika boli wachi machowe me i papila perini.</i></p>
<p>B. COMPOSING SENTENCES</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reading - writing <p>Words:</p> <p>mama sapiki tedo chiemo</p>	<p>Instructions:</p> <p>To the administrator:</p> <p>In this task, children will use words to write sentences. Show the testees the 4 words that are given on a manilla paper.</p>
Qtn 4 Composing a correct sentence	<p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Ere soma wachi me nyalingilingi kendini</i></p> <p><i>Onyo, pama ori wachi ma nitye me jie mandiko boli wachi ma otire.</i></p>
<p>C. STORY WRITING</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Writing - Creativity 	<p>Group Administration</p> <p>Show the testees the pictures that are arranged in a sequence on a manilla paper. Tell the testees that the pictures make a story, and briefly discuss Picture A of the sequence with them. As you discuss the picture, you will be listening out for the following sentence:</p> <p>Mother is the from garden with a bunch of bananas</p>

<p>Text:</p> <p>a) Mama owoki indelo gi ngota matoke. b) Mama oketho matoke woko. c) Odonjo i ot omo apala gi sapiki. d) Dyeli ma nichegini obino to chako e) Mama owoki gi nge to ryemo dyeli.</p>	<p>or a similar sentence. Ask all children to write the sentence down as the sentence that will begin their story.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Chali me jie tito kwong kigana moro. Kere ineno ye ango i chali me?</i></p> <p>Radwoki pa nyithindho: mama, matoke, dkako, dwongi, etc.</p> <p><i>Meno beri “ Nga munyo nyalo chweyo ri wani boli wachi ma mako kwong chali me?</i></p> <p><i>Mama owoki indelo gi ngota matoke.</i></p> <p><i>Meno boli wachi ma beri swa. Ere onyo kisi dhano wo handika boli wachi no i papila pere.</i></p> <p><i>Onyo i nitye gi boli wachi mar apena ma kigana perini. Onyo kangasa ma beri chali ma odongi jie, ka onyo i medere kodi kigana perini. Handika boli wachi achieli kwaongi kisi chali, chuka inotundi i chali machowe, ma ila oro ma kuhandika boli wachi ma kigana perini.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.7. Sentence about picture d)</p>	
<p>Qtn.8. Sentence about picture e)</p>	
<p>LIFESKILLS</p> <p>Qtn.9. Communication</p>	<p>Instructions</p> <p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of communication, confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>
<p>Qtn.10. Creative thinking</p>	<p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of creative thinking confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>
<p>D. READING COMPREHENSION</p> <p>Skills Tested: - Reading</p>	<p>Instructions to the Test Administrator:</p> <p>This is an individual task. Administer it separately to each learner. Also score it immediately on speaking and lifeskills as the learner is responding.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Speaking - Life Skills <p>Reading Text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maria owodho adita дума amoya. b) Gweno okidho to chako chamo дума. c) To Maria ryemo gweno. d) Gweno o oyo дума. e) Maria ojowo дума i adita. 	<p>Give a text of five sentences to each testee and ask him/her to read it. Then ask the testee to answer the questions orally.</p>
<p>Qtn.11. What did the hen do?</p>	<p>To each learner, say the following:</p> <p><i>Gweno otimo ango?</i></p> <p><i>Meno ngoni ! Onyo adwoki ye penji me.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.12. Why did Maria chase the hen away?</p>	<p><i>Irango Maria oryemo gweno?</i></p>
<p>Qtn.13. Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?</p>	<p><i>Ee awinji penji perini machowe ma kigana.</i></p> <p><i>Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?</i></p> <p><i>Walwa wini. Onyo pama winyalo kadhori wini.</i></p>
<p>LIFESKILLS</p> <p>Qtn.14 Communication</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for communication as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>
<p>Qtn.15 Confidence</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for confidence as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>

APPENDIX M: ALUR TEST

BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY

BTL ALUR TEST

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SPORTS
BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY(BTL) EVALUATION TEST INSTRUMENTS

ALUR

Name of District..... Code.....

Name of School/COPE Centre Code..... School Type BTL Non-BTL

Name of Testee Code..... Age:..... Sex of testee M F

TASK	INSTRUCTIONS
<p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lifeskills - Reading <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Musa obecidho i soko. 2. Musa obyelo osau. 3. Musa obewilo kata. 	<p>General instructions</p> <p>The test is made up of 4 tasks. Three tasks (A, B and C) will be administered to the learners as a whole group, while the fourth task will be administered to the individual learner.</p> <p>Instructions to the learner are given in italics. Please read the text to the learner exactly as it appears on this administration script.</p> <p>Read out the three sentences to the learners slowly twice. Then ask them to write each sentence as you read it out slowly as stipulated below.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Winj lembe ma abeci kwawo egi.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Musa obecidho i soko.</i> 2. <i>Musa obyelo osau.</i> 3. <i>Musa obewilo kata.</i>
<p>Qtn.1. <i>Musa obecidho i soko..</i></p>	<p>Now say the following:</p> <p>Abeci kwano lembenegi kendo acel acel. Mir acel kwanere kumae</p> <p>Musa obecidho i soko.</p> <p><i>Dong kyew lembe ii karatasi peri.</i></p>

<p>Qtn.2. <i>Musa obyelo osau..</i></p>	<p><i>Winj lembe ne mir ario.</i></p> <p><i>Musa obyelo osau.</i></p> <p><i>Kyew lembe ne ii karatasi peri.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.3. <i>Musa obewilo kata.</i></p>	<p><i>Dong ke iwinj lembe ne mir adek.</i></p> <p><i>Musa obewilo kata.</i></p> <p><i>Dong kyew lembe mir ajiki eni i karatasi peri.</i></p>
<p>B. COMPOSING SENTENCES</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reading - writing <p>Words:</p> <p>maa agulu tedo cam</p>	<p>Instructions:</p> <p>To the administrator:</p> <p>In this task, children will use words to write sentences. Show the testees the 4 words that are given on a manilla paper.</p>
<p>Qtn 4 Composing a correct sentence</p>	<p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Kwan wec enigi giri nyaling ling.</i></p> <p><i>Dong kawomi kyew lembe moko ku wec ma ikwano iwi karatasi no ceke.</i></p>
<p>C. STORY WRITING</p> <p>Skills Tested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading - Writing - Creativity 	<p>Group Administration</p> <p>Show the testees the pictures that are arranged in a sequence on a manilla paper. Tell the testees that the pictures make a story, and briefly discuss Picture A of the sequence with them. As you discuss the picture, you will be listening out for the following sentence:</p> <p>Mother is the from garden with a bunch of bananas</p>

<p>Text:</p> <p>a) Mego oai podho ku wic labolo. b) Mego oketho wic labolo woko. c) Emondo iot ka tingo pala man sufuria. d) Dyel oako camo labolo ne. e) Mego owok woko ku ngey cwiny</p>	<p>or a similar sentence. Ask all children to write the sentence down as the sentence that will begin their story.</p> <p>To the children, say the following:</p> <p><i>Cal eni gibe tado oda moko. Ango ma itye kaneno ical ee?</i></p> <p>Gam pa awia: Dhako, maa, labolo etc.</p> <p><i>Ber, kawoni nga macopo weco lembe ikum cal e?</i></p> <p><i>Mego oai podho ku wic labolo.</i></p> <p><i>Eno gam maber. Ngat acel acel ogor lembene i karatasi pare.</i></p> <p><i>Kawoni dong ingeyo lembe mir acel ikum oda eni. Dong nen cal ne munge man imediri kud oda ne. Kyew lembe acel maber ikum cal acel acel cil ikum calne mir ajiki.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.7. Sentence about picture d)</p>	
<p>Qtn.8. Sentence about picture e)</p>	
<p>LIFESKILLS</p>	<p>Instructions</p>
<p>Qtn.9. Communication</p>	<p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of communication, confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>
<p>Qtn.10. Creative thinking</p>	<p>Rate the task, and award marks for life skills of creative thinking confidence and creativity if exhibited.</p>
<p>D. READING COMPREHENSION</p> <p>Skills Tested: - Reading</p>	<p>Instructions to the Test Administrator:</p> <p>This is an individual task. Administer it separately to each learner. Also score it immediately on speaking and lifeskills as the learner is responding.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Speaking - Life Skills <p>Reading Text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maria owatho anywagi ni thwo. b) Gweno ocidho ka camo anywagi ne. c) Maria oryemo gweno cen. d) Anywagi uoy ingom. e) Maria ujobo anywagi odwoko cen. 	<p>Give a text of five sentences to each testee and ask him/her to read it. Then ask the testee to answer the questions orally.</p>
<p>Qtn.11. What did the hen do?</p>	<p>To each learner, say the following:</p> <p><i>Gweno otimo ango?</i></p> <p><i>Ber, kawoni dong gam penji ee.</i></p>
<p>Qtn.12. Why did Maria chase the hen away?</p>	<p><i>Maria oryemo gweno cen pirango?</i></p>
<p>Qtn.13. Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?</p>	<p><i>Eni dong otie penji mir ajiki ikum lembe eno.</i></p> <p><i>I paro Maria obedo ka moyo anywagi pirango?</i></p> <p><i>Afoyo ba. Dong icopo cidho.</i></p>
<p>LIFESKILLS</p>	
<p>Qtn.14 Communication</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for communication as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>
<p>Qtn.15 Confidence</p>	<p>You should observe and award marks for confidence as shown in the scoring instructions.</p>

APPENDIX N: SCORING GUIDE

TEST OF READING, WRITING, AND LIFESKILLS

Name: _____ School: _____ Stage: _____

Task 1: Dictation

Question 1: <i>Musa is going to the market</i>		Question 2: <i>Musa is carrying a bag</i>	
Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable, or not related to the sentence	0	Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable, or not related to the sentence	0
Only one word from the sentence has been written legibly and spelt correctly	1	Only one word from the sentence has been written legibly and spelt correctly	1
Two words from the sentence have been written legibly and spelt correctly	2	Two words from the sentence have been written legibly and spelt correctly	2
Sentence is written correctly, is legible, and has no spelling mistake	3	Sentence is written correctly, is legible, and has no spelling mistake	3
Question 3: <i>Musa is buying potatoes.</i>			
Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable, or not related to the sentence	0		
Only one word from the sentence has been written legibly and spelt correctly	1		
Two words from the sentence have been written legibly and spelt correctly	2		
Sentence is written correctly, is legible, and has no spelling mistake	3		

Task 2: Composing a Sentence

The sentence below is the desired sentence, or any sentence that conveys the same meaning. A nonsensical sentence which conveys no meaning will be scored partially correct as shown in the rubric.

Question 4:- Sentence is: <i>Mother is cooking some food in the pot</i>	
Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable, or are not related to the sentence.	0
Copies the given words, but words are not arranged in a sentence	1
Copies the given words, the words are arranged in a sentence, but the sentences does not make sense	2
Sentence is readable and correct, but does not use all 4 words that were provided	3
Sentence is readable and correct, uses all the words, but has minor spelling errors	4
Sentence is written correctly, is legible, all words are used, and has no spelling errors	5

Task 3: Picture Story Writing

Question 5: (b)		Question 6: (c)	
Writes nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable	0	Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable	0
Writes legible words that are not arranged in a sentence, and are not related to picture	1	Write legible words that are not arranged in a sentence, and are not related to picture	1
Writes legible words arranged in a sentence, but sentence not related to picture	2	Write legible words arranged in a sentence, but sentence not related to picture	2
Writes a legible sentence describing the picture, but the sentence has minor errors	3	Write legible words arranged in a sentence, but sentence not related to picture	3
Sentence is written correctly, is legible, describes the picture, and has no spelling mistake	4	Sentence is written correctly, is legible, describes the picture, and has no spelling mistake	4
Question 7: (d)		Question 8: (e)	
Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable	0	Wrote nothing at all, or writing is not legible/readable	0
Write legible words that are not arranged in a sentence, and are not related to picture	1	Write legible words that are not arranged in a sentence, and are not related to picture	1
Write legible words arranged in a sentence, but sentence not related to picture	2	Write legible words arranged in a sentence, but sentence not related to picture	2
Writes a legible sentence describing the picture, but the sentence has minor errors	3	Writes a legible sentence describing the picture, but the sentence has minor errors	3
Sentence is written correctly, is legible, describes the picture, and has no spelling mistake	4	Sentence is written correctly, is legible, describes the picture, and has no spelling mistake	4
Question 9: Is the learner communicating well?		Question 10: Has learner shown creative thinking in this task?	
Wrote nothing at all, or the writing was generally not legible/readable	0	Did not write any story at all, or the writing was generally not legible/readable	0
Wrote sentences that were generally communicating some ideas, but communication not about the story	1	Created a realistic story, but has no additional details,	1
Wrote sentences that were generally communicating ideas from the story, but did not describe some of the pictures.	2	Created a realistic story, and has some additional details	2
Most sentences communicate details of the story well, but one or two words are missing, or there are minor spelling errors	3	Created a realistic story, and has included a lot of additional creative details.	3
All sentences communicate the details of the story correctly, clearly, and well	4		

Task 4: Reading Comprehension

Question 11: What did the hen do?		Question 12: Why did Maria chase the hen away?	
No answer, or mumbling incoherently	0	No answer, or mumbling incoherently	0
Correct answer, using only one word	1	Correct answer, using only one word	1
Correct answer, using only a phrase or a clause	2	Correct answer, using only a phrase or a clause	2
Correct answer, using a full sentence	3	Correct answer, using a full sentence	3
Question 13: Why do you think Maria was drying the maize?			
No answer, or mumbling incoherently	0		
Correct answer, using only one word	1		
Correct answer, using only a phrase or a clause	2		
Correct answer, using a full sentence	3		
Question 14: Is the learner communicating well?		Que. 15: Does the learner show confidence when answering this task?	
Said nothing at all, or was generally incoherent	0	Said nothing at all, or writing was generally not incoherent	0
Gave responses but they were generally not related to task	1	Gave responses but they were generally given hesitantly	1
Gave responses but they were generally only partially related to task	2	Gave clear responses generally, but was unsure on one or two occasions	2
All except responses were correct, except only one which was not communicated clearly	3	Gave clear, bold responses to all questions	3
All responses were correct, and communicated clearly	4		

APPENDIX O: CODING SCHEME
FOR LEARNER PROFILE/BTL TEST SCORES

Column #	Variable Description	Code	
A	District	1	= Nebbi
		2	= Tororo
		3	= Masaka
		4	= Kamuli
B	School/Centre	001	= Paila (or its replacement)
		002	= Kelle
		003	= Apar aria
		004	= Owiny
		005	= Achilet
		006	= Mudodo
		007	= Nawire
		008	= Sesera
		009	= Nakatete
		010	= Gulama
		011	= Kalagala
		012	= Luyembe
		013	= Bugulusi
		014	= Kamuli Boys
		015	= Kamuli Girls
		016	= Bulogo
		017	= Nayenga
C	BTL	0	= No
		1	= Yes
D	COPE	0	= No
		1	= Yes
E	Name of Learner	String Variable	
F	Learner ID	001	= 999*
G	BTL Stage	1	= Stage 1
		2	= Stage 3
		3	= Stage 3
H	Age	5	= 999*
I	Sex	1	= Male
		2	= Female

J	Prior school attendance	0	=	Yes
		1	=	No
K	With whom learner lives	1	=	Mother
		2	=	Father
		3	=	Grandparent(s)
		4	=	Other guardian
L	Has older sibling	1	=	Yes
		2	=	No
M	Living parent	0	=	None alive
		1	=	Birth father alive
		2	=	Birth mother alive
		3	=	Both birth parents alive
N - P	Task 1 (Q1 – Q3)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Full Credit
Q	Task 2 (Q4)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Partial Credit
		4	=	Partial Credit
5	=	Full Credit		
R - V	Task 3 (Q5 – Q9)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Partial Credit
4	=	Full Credit		
W	Task 3 (Q10)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Full Credit
X - Z	Task 4(Q11 – Q13)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Full Credit

AA	Task 4 (Q14)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Partial Credit
		4	=	Full Credit

AB	Task 4(Q15)	0	=	Incorrect/No response
		1	=	Partial Credit
		2	=	Partial Credit
		3	=	Full Credit

* 999 means last number in sequence

NB: I will create new variables for score clusters and/or subscores once data is entered on SPSS.