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The Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative aims to improve the living conditions of children and youth in Côte d'Ivoire by promoting quality education in cocoa-growing communities. Via its Grant Matching Mechanism round 2 (GMM2), 13 pilots-to-scale projects are being co-funded with 12 cocoa companies and implemented by 14 implementing organizations in the sectors of Early Childhood Development, Primary Education and Vocational Training.

The role of Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is to provide technical support to the companies and implementing agencies to design and implement sound monitoring systems to closely monitor and learn from these pilots. IPA also conducts its own independent and complementary data collection to evaluate the pilot projects. For each pilot, IPA analyzes these two sources of information—the administrative data collected by the implementing organizations through their own M&E system and IPA’s independently collected data—to assess the pilot on a pre-agreed rubric. The final scale-up report will therefore be based on the evaluation rubric that was agreed upon by all partners.

This report contains IPA’s analysis and recommendations on the potential scale-up of the X pilot. The scale-up under discussion here is focused on other relevant cocoa-growing communities, as is GMM2’s contractual emphasis. However, TRECC may consider whether certain pilots are feasible for future scale-up beyond such communities, for example to the regional or national level.

The report is divided into the following five sections. Each section is broken down into 2-3 components, for a total of eleven criteria:

1. **Relevance**
   1.1. The program is targeting important needs in the community
   1.2. The program is aligned with donors’ priorities

2. **Results (outputs and immediate outcomes)**
   2.1. The program delivers outputs at high quality
   2.2. The program achieves direct outcomes
   2.3. Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive

3. **Costs & Operations management**
   3.1. Costs are well-managed
   3.2. Project management is successful

4. **Capacity to learn, improve and innovate**
   4.1. Project collects credible monitoring data
   4.2. Monitoring is used to learn and improve

5. **Sustainability**
   5.1. Provides sustained benefit to the community
   5.2. There are prospects for scale-up beyond GMM2

Each of these eleven components (e.g., “5.1. Provides sustained benefit to the community”) is evaluated on indicator-level criteria and assigned a color score:
Green indicates that the pilot is, in IPA’s view, consistent with the criteria required for potential scale-up.

Orange indicates that IPA’s data shows the pilot is partially consistent with the criteria for scale-up and that eligibility for scale-up should be conditional on corrective measures to be taken in that area.

Red indicates that the pilot does not appear to be consistent with the requirements for scale-up.

Pilots with green assessments on all 11 criteria receive an unconditional recommendation for eligibility for a scale-up proposal; pilots with only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of green criteria, receive a conditional recommendation for scale-up (i.e. conditional on the various corrective measures being proposed in the orange criteria). Pilots with any red criteria are not recommended for scale-up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Cours Préparatoire Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPFC</td>
<td>Direction de la Pédagogie et de la Formation Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAENF</td>
<td>Direction de l’apprentissage et de l’éducation non Formelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMM2</td>
<td>Grant Matching Mechanism round 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI</td>
<td>International Cocoa Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPP</td>
<td>Inspection de l’Enseignement Préscolaire et Primaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Innovations for Poverty Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENET-FP</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Education Nationale, de l’Enseignement Technique et de la Formation Professionnelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC</td>
<td>Programme d’Enseignement Ciblé (Teaching at the Right Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRECC</td>
<td>TRECC Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IPA observed that very few animators were absent during the program implementation, giving us a proxy measure of absenteeism. However, given there were only fifteen animators and we conducted only one round of classroom observations, this measure is not very reliable.

To have a rough indicator of animators’ absenteeism, IPA asked students to report how many times the animator was absent during the last two weeks. IPA recognizes that this measure can be biased as children might want to protect their animator, but the literature indicates that in cases of high absenteeism this measure still provides important information. Results suggest that 70 percent of the animators missed no days during the last two weeks.

2.2 Achieves direct outcomes

Criteria 2.2.1. Changes in rural animators’ knowledge, behavior and practices

Criteria 2.2.2 Rural animators show effective use of the PEC materials during classroom observations

2.3. Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive

Criteria 2.3.1.a Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs

3. Costs and operations management

Criteria 3.1.2 Do the partners have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale?

3.2 Project management is successful

4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

Criteria 4.1.1 Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with stakeholders

Criteria 4.1.2 IPA’s spot-check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of the data shared by the partner

Criteria 4.2.1 Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management

Criteria 4.2.2 Program improvement in response to monitoring

5. Sustainability

Criteria 5.1.1 Indications that the animators and mentors are likely to continue with the practices or program activities

Criteria 5.2.1. Are there indications that there is potential for further scale-up of the pilot approach in some way, by the government of Côte d’Ivoire, the Cooperation Partner or other development actors?
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Project summary

Through the Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative, the "International Cocoa Initiative" (ICI) and Partner company, with the support of the "Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab" (J-PAL), piloted the "Teaching at the Right Level" approach — translated in French as the Programme d’Enseignement Ciblé (PEC) — in 15 of ICI’s bridging classes in the region of Duékoué, Côte d'Ivoire.

Bridging classes aim to provide a stepping-stone for out-of-school children to enter the formal education system, offering them classes to catch up to their grade level and preparation for classroom expectations.

PEC aims to improve basic reading and mathematics skills by assigning students to small groups that better match their actual skill level. Students are assessed at the outset and grouped according to their level in reading or mathematics. In their new groups, children are taught via engaging and creative activities that are adapted to their learning level. Students are regularly assessed on their performance and can progress between groups as their skills develop.

The goal of the program was to test the PEC approach in already operational bridging classes during an intense period of implementation of 12 weeks. Children did follow the standard curricula of bridging classes for CPU (grade 1 and 2) before and after the program. Each bridging class is taught by a rural animator who is a community member hired by ICI, with some experience in teaching but without a certified degree. Teachers conducted PEC activities in bridging classes in 8 communities for 12 weeks. Bridging classes are hosted in formal schools. The pilot targeted out-of-school children between 9 and 14 years old; ICI enrolled 360 children.

The PEC training and pedagogical supervision was led by a team of the Department of Pedagogy and In-Service Training’s (DPFC) that already has experience implementing the approach in formal schools. A team of The Department of Literacy and Non-Formal Education (DAENF) in charge of the bridging class programs in Cote d'Ivoire also participated to the training and supervision of the mentors. J-PAL provided technical oversight and ICI was in charge of bridging classes operations.

Assessment is at the core of the PEC approach. Teachers’ assessment of students’ skills allows them to assign students to groups correctly. For this pilot, teachers assessed students using a literacy and numeracy assessment tool called the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) test, which measures grade-level reading skills and tests numeracy skills that are taught in grade 1 and 2 in formal schools. Throughout the program (12 weeks), teachers were responsible both for delivering appropriate, engaging teaching activities — following a specific set of activities developed in the PEC curriculum - and regularly re-assessing students’ skills to ensure that, as their skills developed, they were re-assigned to the appropriate groups. This PEC pedagogy is similar to the successful learning camp model developed by Pratham.

In their initial proposal, J-PAL listed five program components that the implementers would need to incorporate in PEC’s program in Cote d’Ivoire:

1. ASER is used in many countries and accepted by researchers as a valid instrument for measuring students’ skills. See Annex 2 for the ASER tool used for this report.
1. **Assessment of children’s level**, using simple 10-15 minute tests administered orally, to constitute level groups according to the results of each child.

2. **Adapted didactic tools**: an adaptation of learning materials and teaching guides to the contextual realities of program implementation.

3. **Training for animators and pedagogical supervisors** (in this case, school directors), so that they take ownership of the program’s principles and activities. The training includes a theoretical phase and a practical phase.

4. **Teaching tailored to the child**, with interactive, progressive and engaging activities.

5. **Regular pedagogical supervision and tutoring** to give friendly, practical advice to animators so that they can overcome any difficulties they may have. This also allows supervisors to ensure that PEC requirements are met.
## Snapshot of specific assessment against each pre-defined evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targets an important need in the community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Aligns with the priorities of the donors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Results: outputs and direct outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Delivers outputs at high quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Improve material delivery and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Achieves direct outcomes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Better adapt the pedagogy to bridge classes, especially on the grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Beneficiaries' feedback about the program is positive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Costs and operations management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Costs are well managed/cost scale-up vision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Project management is successful</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Project collects credible monitoring data</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Collect attendance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Monitoring is used to learn and improve</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Provides sustained benefit to community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Review mentoring incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

General assessment and recommendation

IPA’s Right-Fit Evidence unit conducted an independent process evaluation of the J-PAL/ICI/Partner company program to implement the PEC pedagogy in bridging classes. The pilot aimed to educate out-of-school children in an accelerated timeframe using the PEC approach. The goal of bridging classes is to transition students into the formal system by bringing their competencies up to the required levels. The pilot implemented the PEC approach in 15 bridging classes in the region of X over 12 weeks.

To assess the pilot’s performance, IPA surveyed rural animators (teachers) and tested children before, during and at the end of the program. In addition to this, IPA’s staff conducted one spot-check to check the reliability of the monitoring data collected and the attendance rate.

Overall, PEC in bridging classes as piloted by the ICI and J-PAL has earned a conditional recommendation for scale-up as 9 criteria were rated as green and 2 as orange. The pilot in its current form applied some of the core principles of the PEC pedagogy in bridging classes, with some problems with student grouping. IPA observed that children made significant progress in literacy and numeracy by the end of the program. Despite these encouraging results, IPA is making a number of recommendations on the PEC adaptation in bridging classes that should be taken into account for the project to be well positioned for scale. Our overall conclusions and these recommendations are described below.

1. Relevance:
The program is relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and aligns with funders’ priorities. IPA’s assessments find that students in bridging classes in the targeted cocoa communities lack basic numeracy and literacy skills and are significantly delayed in their schooling attainment for their age. We also observe heterogeneous levels of student ability within the current bridging classes in numeracy, though not in literacy. PEC focuses on basic skills by assigning students to small groups that better match their current level. The PEC approach is thus highly relevant to a real community need; improving the quality of schooling in bridging classes with heterogeneous student abilities. The large number of out-of-school children in the target communities identified by ICI increases the relevance of this approach in bridging classes in particular. Further, donors – the Jacobs Foundation and Partner company– have strategic goals with which PEC implementation is a close fit.

2. Results: Outputs and direct outcomes:
The pilot achieved most outputs at the expected quality. It benefited from the expertise of a team within the DPFC already trained on the PEC pedagogy. These master trainers trained a set of 11 mentors and 15 rural animators. Teacher and student attendance were both satisfactory. Most school material was delivered shortly after the training, but there was some confusion about responsibility for providing more advanced textbooks. Both ICI and rural animators complained about not having access to more advanced exercise books in literacy, impacting their teaching and the progress of children.

The pilot achieved mixed results on direct outcomes. The primary outcome of the pilot was to have rural animators implement the PEC approach in their classrooms, but there were significant limitations in the implementation of this approach. First of all, it appears that rural animators experienced some difficulties accurately completing the standard literacy and numeracy test (ASER) with children to identify their level. In addition, in our classroom observations IPA observed that the core elements of the PEC pedagogy were not implemented to the standard specified by J-PAL, particularly in the rural animators’ ability to teach to different groups. Despite this, student learning outcomes were impressive, although it is difficult to attribute results to the PEC pedagogy rather than the standard bridging classes program in general. Based on IPA’s baseline and endline ASER test, students made significant progress both in literacy and numeracy.
In just twelve weeks, the number of children not able to recognize a letter shrunk from 94 percent to 54 percent. As for numeracy, the percentage of children able to recognize 3-digit numbers jumped from 11 to 60 percent. General feedback of animators on the pedagogy was positive and mentors were highly engaged and seemed to understand their role.

**Recommendations in case of scale-up:**

- **Extend training duration:** Rural animators didn’t fully understand how PEC was supposed to be implemented and struggled with grouping children, requiring refresher training. In this respect, we advise J-PAL to consider extending their training to cover all required material.

- **Better adapt PEC pedagogy for bridging classes:** Current PEC adapted pedagogy targets formal teachers. Pedagogy should be reviewed to better consider specific constraints related to bridging classes.

- **Set clear expectations about delivery of pedagogical materials:** As material is an important topic for project partners, we recommend project stakeholders to better manage expectations of animators as to which material will be delivered and in which timeframe.

3. **Costs and Operation management:**

The project management team made efficient use of resources and spent less than budgeted to implement all the activities of the pilot. The plans for scale-up was only partially shared with IPA, making it hard to assess the vision of cost-efficiency at scale, and it appeared that J-PAL didn’t participate in the scale-up proposal as the PEC approach is not part of the proposal. ICI seem to be seeking to implement the bridging class approach in community schools, straying somewhat from the pilot tested here. The intervention was implemented according to the road-map despite the tight deadlines of the project, and ICI and JPAL communicated efficiently.

4. **Capacity to learn, improve and innovate:**

ICI did collect routine monitoring data on the implementation of the training and the ASER tests. Data on training implementation and student assessment appeared to be credible even if we observe some inconsistency in student assessment data from rural animators by comparison to IPA assessment results. Data on attendance was unfortunately not actionable, and only the test completion rates were available to indicate students’ attendance. The project stakeholders did use data and field observation to improve program delivery; for example, J-PAL and Pratham organized a refresher training midway to tackle implementation challenges.

**Recommendations in case of scale-up:**

- **Collect attendance data:** We recommend project stakeholders to collect actionable attendance data more regularly as children absenteeism is a core challenge of bridging class programs.

5. **Sustainability:**

In terms of sustained benefit to the present pilot beneficiaries, there are no strong signs that the PEC approach will continue to benefit rural animators, as they reported significant challenges implementing the methodology. Financial incentives have also played a big role in the engagement of mentors and without this ongoing support they may not continue their close supervision of the implementation. Nevertheless, in a broader sense, bridging class programs do have prospects for expansion beyond the GMM2 program. There are strong signs of governmental buy-in around bridging class projects, although there is yet to be practical support for bridging classes in terms of sufficient resources and viable guidelines (the NRC has issued some that have not become standard) that could be used as a standard. Private sector partners also seem to be interested in financing such projects.

**Recommendations in case of scale-up:**

- **Mentors’ engagement:** Financial incentives likely played a significant role in encouraging mentors’ high engagement, and project partners should investigate ways to maintain this engagement in a sustainable, scalable way.
Data and Methodology

IPA collected independent data and analyzed data from implementer and government sources. (See Table 1)

Table 1: Target population, Round of data collection, Sources of data and Sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round of data collection</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Survey planned</th>
<th>Survey covered</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Period of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>March 11-12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animators (teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>March 26-29, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>June 11-15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animators (teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected

IPA performed three rounds of data collection – baseline, spot-check class observation and endline – on the pilot. The baseline survey aimed at gathering beneficiaries’ characteristics at the beginning of the pilot, including levels of need. Classroom observations were the opportunity for IPA to observe teachers’ implementation of PEC and deliver information to course correct the project if needed. The endline checked students’ learning levels and collected overall feedback from participants.

IPA gathered qualitative input through Focus Group discussions (FGD) with beneficiaries’ parents, holding one FGD per school – with a group of between 8-12 of the beneficiaries’ parents.

Students’ skill levels were tested in reading and mathematics in all 15 pilot bridging classes during the baseline and endline data collection. Data on students’ learning levels were collected through ASER literacy and numeracy tests administrated by IPA enumerators (details on this test can be found in annex 2).

IPA interviewed teachers (rural animators) at two different points in time: once during baseline, to ascertain their level of confidence with the program, and once at endline to hear their assessment of the intervention.

Separate to IPA’s data collection, ICI organized the final transfer test which aims at assessing the level of each child before transferring him or her into the formal system in an appropriate grade.

Sample covered

All animators were interviewed during the baseline and endline data collection. During the classroom observations survey, IPA observers did not perform classroom observation in two bridging classes because the assigned animators had been fired and not yet replaced. IPA observed that these two classes were taken over by the headmaster. Two new animators started their work at the end of April. During baseline IPA tested a sample of 65 percent of the 324 children enrolled.
1. Relevance

Relevance is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- ✔ The program is targeting important needs in the community
- ✔ The program is aligned with donors’ priorities

**1.1 The program is targeting important needs in the community**

This project targets important and specific needs in the communities, where we found that children enrolled in bridging class are delayed in their schooling attainment given their age and have overall low learning levels in literacy and numeracy. PEC is well-suited to addressing low learning levels. On a handful of skills (particularly numeracy), students showed a wide range of skill levels, which is also a situation in which PEC is likely to be effective addressing students’ needs.

Criteria 1.1.1. J-PAL’s needs assessment report and IPA’s baseline assessment show evidence of a need being addressed by the pilot

This section presents detailed information on students’ age and learning levels in targeted bridging classes and confirms that students have low levels in French and mathematics in the pilot communities. The low levels of children in those two topics is a sufficient prerequisite to implement the PEC methodology in bridging classes.

**Children in the targeted communities have delay in schooling**

IPA observed that there were children in the targeted communities who were delayed in their schooling. The pilot targeted out-of-school children between 9 and 14 years old. The Ivorian system sets the maximum age of 9 for registration in the first year of primary school (CP1) and 16 as the maximum age to complete the primary cycle. After a year of study in bridging classes- ICI’s program covers grade 1 and 2 in one year- students should integrate into the formal system in grade 3 (or CE1 in the French system). IPA’s baseline data shows that the students enrolled in bridging classes have an average of 3 years of delays in schooling given their age.

On average out of school children enrolled in the program are 10.45 years old (see figure 1 for a precise distribution) while at this age they should be in grade 5. Bridging classes teach grade 1 and 2 curricula.

Looking at the targeting we observe that 4 percent of students were older than the targeted age (9-14 years old) for the program. The oldest student was 30 years. ICI accepted him into the class as he was illiterate and strongly motivated to learn how to read and write. Note that the statistics on age was computed with a sample size of 95 (46 % of total sample) students given that not everyone was able to report his or her age. The average might therefore be skewed upwards as younger children tend not to know their age.
Recommendation for scale-up: At scale, IPA recommends ensuring that students who enroll into the bridging classes are between 9 and 14 years old. Indeed, the pilot is aimed to integrate children in the formal system at the end of the year and children above 16 cannot stay in formal primary school any longer.

Majority of students do not master basic reading and math skills

IPA baseline data shows that the majority of students have low levels in both reading and mathematics skills. Results revealed low heterogeneity within classes for literacy as most children were at the beginner level. However strong heterogeneity was observed on the numeracy side further strengthening the relevance of the program.

The literacy learning assessments tested reading ability in French and placed learners into one of five levels: in descending order, Story, Paragraph, Word, Letter, and Beginner. Overall, as presented in figure 2 students’ literacy level is low. Students’ literacy and numeracy is presented at the community level in figure 2, noting that one community has two classes. Almost all students cannot identify and read letters, 92% of students had beginner levels, 4% of them had letter levels, 1% have word level, 1% had paragraph level and the remain 1% had story levels. The majority of grade 2 students should be at the Word level. In addition, there is significant heterogeneity in each community in numeracy levels in particular, which likely presents a challenge to teachers in each classroom.

---

2 For more detail on how the ASER test was conducted see Annex 2
3 As part of the IMPAQ project, an adaptation workshop was conducted in April 2016 at MENET in Abidjan to ensure that the reading part of the ASER test was culturally appropriate and consistent with Ivory Coast’s learning standards for each grade level in primary school (https://www.impaqint.com/sites/default/files/files/AVSI%20FFE_Baseline%20FiNAL_091916.pdf).
It is important to note that for most students, French is not their native language. Most students are using their local language to communicate in their community and start to learn French while starting school. This may explain students' low performance at the beginning of school year.

Figure 2: Literacy baseline assessment by IPA enumerators

The numeracy assessments are split into two parts: number recognition and mathematical operations. For number recognition, a learner can be placed into one of four levels, depending on the largest type of number they can recognize. Students tested better on numeracy than literacy, which is a standard result in the region. As described in Figure 3, 26 percent of students are in the Beginner level. Overall most students (55 percent) can identify at least one-digit number. Results at the numeracy level do show higher heterogeneity than in literacy.

---

Regarding basic operations, students’ skills are poor. Only 8 percent can do addition and 11% can do subtraction. For other operations, at most 3 percent reached multiplication and division levels.

**Figure 3: Numeracy baseline assessment by IPA enumerators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARSÈNEKRO</th>
<th>DAHOUA</th>
<th>DIEHIBA</th>
<th>GLAOU</th>
<th>GOZON</th>
<th>GUINGLO</th>
<th>SROPAN</th>
<th>YAOKRO 3</th>
<th>YAOLUCIEN</th>
<th>KRO</th>
<th>All communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-digits</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-digits</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-digit</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4: Operation baseline assessment by IPA enumerators**

Criteria 1.1.2. Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot

After the initial training, almost all animators declared thinking the PEC approach would help students filling their learning gap. Animators’ buy-in after the initial training does not inform us on the performance of the project but build important foundations for future project success.
After the animators’ training, IPA gathered animators’ opinions on PEC. IPA’s agents interviewed all 15 rural animators. When considering PEC as a solution to fill students’ gaps in learning, almost all animators (93 percent) reported that students will be able to learn more with the PEC approach.

This is in line with current findings from the literature that – like RESEN and PASEC 2014 – indicates a need for child-centered and -tailored pedagogy.

![Figure 5: Animators’ feedback on PEC as a solution to improve students’ learning level](image)

1.2 The program is aligned with donors’ priorities

The approach proposed is aligned with donors’ strategic ambition and the pilot, as implemented, has strengthened their willingness to continue supporting the project.

[Details removed]

2. Results (outputs and direct outcomes)

Results are divided into three components to capture each type of result TRECC is looking for in a pilot. The pilot is assessed on each of these components:

- Delivers output at high quality
- Achieves direct outcomes
- Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive

2.1 Delivers outputs at high quality

Most outputs were achieved at high quality. Data show that both mentor and rural animators’ trainings had high participation rates. ICI did deliver pedagogical material to animators but confusion remains on the responsibility over advanced literacy exercises books that were not delivered to animators. During endline, 8 out of 15 animators declared that they had not received all necessary material to teach the PEC approach during the
program. Children’s attendance was generally good except for one community, as observed during IPA’s spot-checks.

Criteria 2.1.1. Key outputs from the proposal logframe were achieved

To measure output achievements IPA collected its own data, which serves as the basis for most of this section.

Share of mentors trained on PEC methodology

All mentors were trained on PEC methodology as planned. From 10th to 20th of December 2018 ICI organized the mentors training in Duékoué on PEC pedagogy. The team of master trainers was comprised of both J-PAL’s staff and Department of Pedagogy and In-Service Training’s (DPFC) staff. It is important to note that the DPFC team led by Mr Dally had already gained significant experience in training while rolling out the PEC program in 50 formal schools. The master trainers team trained 9 school principals and 2 pedagogical advisors to mentor the 15 rural animators. After a theoretical training, the pilot mentors conducted practical activities in the bridging classes for 10 days. ICI organized the training in Duékoué in the Orientation and Information Center. ICI registered attendance every day on an attendance sheet that was transmitted to IPA.

According to ICI’s administrative data, all pedagogical advisors and school principals were trained. During the spot-check visit, IPA’s Monitoring and Evaluation Assistant did interviews with one pedagogical advisor and all school directors who confirmed this statement.

Table 2: Key output #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># pedagogical advisors trained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ICI’s administrative data and IPA’s spot check visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># school principals trained</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ICI’s administrative data and IPA’s spot check visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of animators who completed the training on PEC methodology

The rural animators also received a PEC training in Duékoué. The training took place from the 4th to the 12th of February 2019. The master trainers – from the MEN and J-PAL – lead the training. During the project, a refreshing training took place from the 14th to the 20th of April 2019 to continue the training of the rural animators and onboard new rural animators.

According to ICI’s administrative data, all 15 rural animators attended the full initial training. During the pilot, two rural animators were fired and replaced. These new animators participated to the refresher training but naturally missed the initial one. IPA’s baseline survey – through interviews with the rural animators - confirmed that all rural animators attended at least one training.
It is important to note that all animators were already trained by the DAENF on the standard curricula for bridging classes’ at the beginning of the school year. It is possible that this initial training set strong foundations for the team to receive another training on PEC.

Table 3: Key output #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural animators trained</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ICI administrative data and IPA baseline data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools that received PEC material

Although ICI’s administrative data shows that all bridging classes received PEC material at the beginning of the pilot, rural animators didn’t have access to all required material at every stage during the 13 weeks of implementation.

Table 4: Key output #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools that received PEC material</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IPA’s baseline and endline survey Key informant interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to ICI’s administrative data, all pilot schools have received PEC material between the 10th and the 13th of March. Indeed, ICI collected the signature of rural animators when they received the material. Since the material was not delivered when the pilot began, rural animators started implementing PEC with the material they had or made up their own.

However, rural animators and ICI’s management said that some material – in particular exercise books on advanced chapters in literacy – were not delivered to the schools. According to the rural animators, it had a negative impact on their performance. At baseline, 13 of the 15 rural animators reported having all the necessary materials to deliver the pedagogy. At endline, only 8 of the 15 animators said that, over the course of the pilot, they had always had all necessary materials, because of the missing exercise books on advanced chapters. Indeed, the beginner exercise books were received by ICI but no material was available for more advanced levels. In Math, 8 exercise books were available to ICI covering beginning and advanced math.

IPA observed some confusion around the roles and responsibilities of ICI and J-PAL on the delivery of the more advanced exercise books. J-PAL did mention during key informant interviews that not all the exercise books are necessary to implement PEC as animators should create their own. This had to be clearly communicated to animators before project implementation. In fact, rural animators did wait to receive specific dedicated material to implement the PEC methodology that included exercise books for advanced literacy levels.

Recommendation for scale-up: IPA recommends to project partners to clarify expectations regarding what materials will be delivered. In a context of scarce resources, receiving new material is an important source of motivation for rural animators.
According to rural animators, the lack of materials had a negative impact on their performance. Among the rural animators who reported not always having all the necessary materials, 47 percent reported that they could have performed better with the material.

Figure 7: Nb of rural animators reporting that they were missing materials, by type at endline

Criteria 2.1.2: Participation rate

Animators’ attendance rate to class
IPA observed that very few animators were absent during the program implementation, giving us a proxy measure of absenteeism. However, given there were only fifteen animators and we conducted only one round of classroom observations, this measure is not very reliable.

To have a rough indicator of animators’ absenteeism, IPA asked students to report how many times the animator was absent during the last two weeks. IPA recognizes that this measure can be biased as children might want to protect their animator, but the literature indicates that in cases of high absenteeism this measure still provides important information. Results suggest that 70 percent of the animators missed no days during the last two weeks.
Students’ attendance rate to bridging classes

According to IPA’s data, learner’s attendance appears to be satisfactory.

As ICI could not share data on attendance\(^5\), IPA took the results of the class observation as a proxy of the attendance rate. It is important to note that this measure could also be biased given that most animators knew IPA would come this day (see annex 1 for more details on the class observation protocol). To monitor attendance rate, IPA surveyors did collect information on the number of children supposed to be in class (looking at the teachers’ logs) and the number of students effectively attending the class. Results are presented in figure 9 at the community level. Across the program between March 26 and 29, 94 percent of children attended the bridging class program.

\(^5\) The DAENF was in charge of collecting data on attendance but ICI declared not having access to it
Looking at ICI’s data on the implementation of the ASER test we observe an overall good participation rate of learners in the ASER test of 90 percent (see figure 9) with some variations across communities. During the ASER test some communities managed to exceed 100 percent as they enrolled new students.

Table 5: Percentage of children participating in ASER test of total children enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>ASER 1</th>
<th>ASER2</th>
<th>ASER3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X B</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X A</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X B</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diéhiba A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diéhiba B</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>132%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaou A</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaou B</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozon A</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozon B</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinglo Sropan</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaokro A</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaokro B</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaolucienkro A</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaolucienkro B</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Achieves direct outcomes

The pilot achieved mixed results on direct outcomes. The primary outcome of the pilot was to have rural animators implement the PEC approach in their classrooms, but there were significant limitations in the implementation of this approach. Animators’ did complete the ASER tests with children on three occasions, and recorded childrens’ results in the logs; but these results showed significant differences compared with IPA’s own test results. IPA enumerators observed the implementation of the PEC methodology during classroom observations, and found that animators did use the materials and children were participating, though there were some problems in grouping children into levels for teaching. Finally, strong engagement was observed from school directors and pedagogical advisors to provide regular mentoring. Overall, IPA observed impressive learning progress in basic literacy and numeracy skills in a short timeframe.6

Criteria 2.2.1. Changes in rural animators’ knowledge, behavior and practices

Rural animators completed ASER test with children and can produce the results in the ASER logs

J-PAL provided animators with a logbook (ASER logs)7 in which they were expected to record students’ ASER results. All logbooks were completed and IPA had access to them during spot-checks. During the different rounds of data collection, IPA enumerators always had access to the logs that reported individual ASER test results. During the baseline, enumerators referred to animators records of students’ initial evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Number of schools where Animators’ logs were available per wave where it was checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Bridging classes (out of 15) where animators logs were available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PEC approach as implemented in formal schools in Cote d’Ivoire is more of a complementary approach to the current formal teaching. Indeed, in formal schools PEC is implemented for only a few hours a day.

Criteria 2.2.2 Rural animators show effective use of the PEC materials during classroom observations

Typically, rural animators performed some components of the PEC pedagogy during class observations but had issues with creating different physical groups of students in their class, one of the three core components of the pedagogy.

---

6 We cannot attribute the change over time solely to the program, as the children would have been expected to make some progress at the bridge schools regardless of whether the PEC pedagogy was employed or not. Nevertheless, such significant progress is an encouraging indication for this program.

7 The teachers’ logs’ template is available at Annex 5.
IPA completed one round of classroom observation surveys and observed each rural animator during the implementation of the PEC sessions between the 26 and 29 of March. IPA conducted only 13 classroom visits to rural animators as two animators (from Gozon) were fired by ICI due to absenteeism problems and asset misappropriation. More details on the classroom observation protocol can be found in annex 1 section 1.3.

To measure the effective use of PEC materials by rural animators, J-PAL supported the MENET-FP in the development of a classroom observation tool that mentors should use to perform supporting school visits (See Annex 6). The goal was to compute rural animators’ score between 0-10 on a composite index that captures three dimensions:

1. Students’ grouping by level and progress
2. Use of materials and activities
3. Students involvement and rural animators’ position in the class

IPA’s classroom observation tool contains the same information as the one developed by the MENET-FP but provides a more detailed account of activities in the classroom. IPA enumerators did observe each class for 30 minutes without intervention while filling in the observation tool on a tablet.

Results from IPA’s classroom observations show that on average, rural animators scored 6.7 points out of 10 for compliance with PEC behaviors. This is below the targeted score set by J-PAL – 8 points. A Potential explanation is that this classroom observation happened less than a month after the start of the project, when animators may not have yet been fully comfortable with the PEC pedagogy. See Table 8 below for more results.

A short analysis of rural animators’ scores’ components show that rural animators’ weakest area was student grouping (see table 7). Indeed, almost all IPA observers reported that even if benches were pushed to the sides of the room and the floor was being used as expected for the PEC approach, teachers were teaching the same material to the entire class. The main reason for this reported by animators was that all children were in the same beginner level. However, the PEC pedagogy expects teachers to create groups of children to improve their learning even if students are at the same ASER level.

| Students grouping and progress (score out of 3) | 0.7 |
| Use of materials and activities (score out of 4) | 3.7 |
| Students participation & Rural animators’ position (score out of 4) | 2.3 |
| Rural animators scores (score out of 10) | 6.7 |

Following the class observation results, IPA did share with partners the concern about grouping of students in the class. Indeed, it appeared that no clear guidelines were provided to animators on how to effectively organize different small groups of children in the same classroom after the ASER tests. In qualitative interviews, animators reported that teaching to different levels at the same time was complicated.

Following this feedback and discussion around the grouping issue, J-PAL and Pratham organized a refresher training to better support animators in the implementation of the PEC pedagogy in the field.

---

8 School director reported that two new animators would start the 1 of April. In the meantime, the school director was taking care of the two classes,
Recommendation for scale-up: Given the limited understanding of animators about the physical organization of the classroom, IPA strongly recommends communicating clearer guidelines on how to group students after their ASER test.

Rural animators reported having a coaching session with schools’ principals or inspectors

IPA observed a high level of engagement of both school directors and inspectors on the mentoring component. As part of the monitoring of PEC implementation, school directors and pedagogical advisors were designated as mentors, and as such were expected to provide first assistance to rural animators.

During the endline, IPA interviewed animators to check if mentors were performing their coaching work. When asked if they received assistance on PEC during the last three months, all interviewed rural animators said that they received assistance from their school directors and pedagogical advisors.

Pedagogical advisors reached the expected number of unannounced visits per school per month (see Table 8).

Table 8: Animators’ assistance on PEC from mentors during the last three months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural animators who... (N=15)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had not received assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>IPA endline survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited from assistance from school directors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited from assistance from pedagogical advisors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Animators reported a significant level of investment of school directors during the endline survey. In fact, on average school directors provided 20 visits to animators during the last three months meaning one every week. As mentioned earlier in the report, we observe a strong heterogeneity, reflecting school directors’ engagement on this mentoring component. In one community the school director did only three visits while the most engaged director did 36. IPA wants to acknowledge that comparing to other bridging classes’ programs, the pilot did manage to leverage a significant engagement of school directors, potentially through greater engagement from the start and use of financial incentives. The table 9 presents detailed information on the number of visits made by key people in bridging classes.

Table 9: Numbers of days of assistance provided by mentors during the last three months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N=15)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School directors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>IPA endline survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical advisors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IPA endline survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural animators administer the ASER test to students accurately

IPA’s baseline results have found fair performance in terms of rural animators’ accurate administration of the ASER test. In general, their accuracy was poorer than IPA has observed in other PEC implementations in GMM2. This can be partly explained by the fact that animators don’t have the same degree of qualifications as formal teachers. To check whether animators accurately delivered the ASER test to
students, IPA compared the evaluation conducted by animators to the one performed during the independent evaluation by enumerators.

**Baseline results**

The first phase of rural animators-led ASER tests ended on the 19 of February 2019 and the IPA independent evaluation team assessed students seven days after, from March 11th to 19th 2019.

**Literacy**

IPA performed an inter-rater agreement test based on one IPA sample during the baseline. For the literacy test, 66 percent of students were classified in the exact same level. As kids might perform differently during the different tests, one should expect some differences, but this is nevertheless only a fair level of agreement.

Figure 10 present this test and gives an overview of the global performance. Green boxes indicate full agreement meaning that the same student was allocated to the same group by rural animators and IPA enumerators. A partial agreement in orange, refers to the situation where we observe a slight difference between IPA enumerators and rural animators. This is particularly the case for the Letter and Word sections for rural animators. In general, we see that the majority of ratings were in agreement, with a slight tendency for animators to categorize children at “letter” level where IPA enumerators classified them at the “beginner” level.

*Figure 10: Inter rater agreement matrix literacy test*

**Numeracy**

Results of the numeracy baseline are somewhat different than for literacy. In fact, IPA enumerators appeared to assess students as having better number recognition than the rural animators did.

Figure 11 presents results from the two sources of data, IPA and the animators – based on IPA sample during the baseline. We observe that animators tend to be more likely to classify children as beginners compared to IPA’s enumerators. As presented in figure 11, for only 49 percent of the children both IPA and animators assess the children in the same way.

*Figure 11: Inter rater agreement matrix numeracy test*
We also performed an inter-rater agreement test, called the Cohen’s Kappa test. This test weighs the different scenarios, assigning a linear weight to close misses (e.g. a rank of 2 vs. a rank of 3) than to misses that are further apart (e.g. a rank of 1 vs. a rank of 5) based on the assumption that a difference of adjacent ranks is less critical than a difference that is farther apart. The result of the kappa weighted test gives us a final value of 80 percent of agreement while the expected agreement is 71%, indicating that they are not making their determinations randomly, but the agreement is not as strong as IPA has observed for other PEC pilots.

**Mathematical operations**

Findings on the mathematical operations skills appear to be similar for the two raters (IPA enumerators and animators). Results show that students’ level in all operations increase at the endline. More than half of students can do addition (against 8 percent at the baseline) and subtraction (against 11 percent at the baseline) at the endline. More than the third can do multiplication (against 3 percent at the baseline) and more than the quarter can do division (against 1 percent at the baseline).

Figure 12: Levels in operations endline IPA vs animators

![LEVEL IN OPERATIONS](image)

---

**Students show early changes in basic literacy and numeracy skills**

Using IPA’s independent data, we observe significant early changes in students’ levels in both numeracy and literacy during the 12 weeks period.10 These results are very encouraging, especially because the program was implemented during such a short period of time. Similar programs11 targeting out of school children have observed smaller changes12 in children’s learning progression using a before and after approach.

---

9 The coefficient kappa of 0 occurs when observed agreement can be exactly accounted for by chance and the coefficient kappa of 1 occurs when there is complete agreement between raters. Kappa can yield a negative value when there is less observed agreement than is expected by chance.

10 Due to the before/after nature of the evaluation it is not possible to identify the causal effect of the PEC pedagogy compared with a bridge school without PEC. To do this a counterfactual would be needed.

11 EPT pilot implemented in the region of Agboville

12 No significant changes were observed on this pilot on the literacy side
However, these results raise important questions around the mechanism through which these learning gains were achieved. As discussed above under indicator 2.2.1, the animators rarely grouped children into learning levels for teaching, which is a core component of the PEC approach. If children are better grouped, we might expect even better learning improvements.

As to the question of how children managed to learn so much despite the grouping not happening, there are two likely potential explanations. First of all, it could be that the PEC general pedagogical training and materials were enough to improve teaching practices to realize gains. Second, the surge of mentoring, training and classroom monitoring might have been sufficient to increase teachers' motivation to perform well during the 12 week implementation.

**Literacy**

Results of the ASER literacy test showed significant drop in the number of beginners, meaning children that are not able to recognize letters. This translates into an increase in the higher levels. Looking at the figure 13 we observe that the increase in students’ levels is not concentrated around the early levels, but significant improvement has been experienced for all levels.

*Figure 13: Baseline – Endline students’ literacy level assessment*

### Table: Students’ Literacy Level Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Numeracy**

Students’ results in number recognition follow the same trend as in literacy. Looking at figure 14 we observe a significant improvement in students able to recognize three-digit numbers, jumping from 11 to 63 percent at endline. Results on students’ ability to perform mathematical operations do not see any significant changes, as presented in annex 4.
2.3. Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive

Overall animators and mentors have a good opinion of their trainings which allow them to be confident with the approach and children, but one quarter of animators reported that they would benefit from more training. Moreover, all animators declared that students will learn more with the PEC approach and that they would recommend it to all schools in Côte d’Ivoire.

Criteria 2.3.1.a Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs

- Mentors provide positive feedback about mentors’ training

Mentors interviewed provided positive feedback about their training. All mentors interviewed reported that they have learned from the training and 5/6 reported that they were comfortable with the approach. “We were trained in 3 disciplines. French, Math and Psycho. The training I liked a lot because teachers must always learn. I discovered new things”.

- Rural animators provide positive feedback about animators’ training

Most animators reported that they are satisfied with their training. During individual interviews at baseline, all animators gave a positive overall feedback on the training: “[the training was] good” “the training was of good quality”, “interesting” “it helps me to be confident with the approach and children.” Animators reported that they have been trained in subjects such as French, Mathematics and Psycho Pedagogy. “The training was of quality because we learned about Psycho Pedagogy, we learned the activities we should do...”. “I was trained in French, Math and Psycho Pedagogy for 10 days”. Moreover, most animators declared that they were comfortable with the PEC pedagogy. “Today I feel comfortable with the PEC, the activities, the grouping.”

However, a few animators (3/12) suggested they could have benefited from complementary training. Thus, one animator believes that he would have been more efficient if he had been given additional training. “These trainings were good, but it would have been nice if we received another training that will
allow us to become more operational”. Also, the second animator told that the training was too short for a person without prior qualification as an animator. “I enjoyed the initial training, but I found that the duration of the training was short especially for someone who has never done the CAFOP”. Finally, the third animator reported that he had difficulties grouping the children. “Only the grouping posed me problems”.

Rural animators provide positive feedback on the PEC materials/activities
Rural animators reported to be confident in their ability to deliver this new methodology and on students’ ability to progress. Endline results indicate that all rural animators think that students will be able to learn more using the PEC approach. This is not proof that animators can implement PEC successfully, or that PEC can improve students’ learning. However, if there were warning signs at this stage, it would be necessary to lower expectations for the pilot.

Table 10: Rural animators confidence in implementing the PEC methodology

| % of rural animators who trust in their ability to implement the PEC methodology | Baseline | Endline |
| % rural animators who think that students will be able to learn more with PEC approach | 100% | - |
| 100% | 100% |

What are the strengths of PEC approach?
During IPA endline survey, rural animators were asked to list the three biggest assets they found in PEC approach. The most common answers were “PEC ability to improve children’s level” (67 percent of respondents), “PEC’s ability to make students more confident” (27 percent of respondents) and, “PEC reduce barriers between rural animators and students” (20 percent of respondents). (See Figure 15 for more information).

Figure 15: Reported rural animators’ feedback regarding PEC approach assets

What did rural animators report as the PEC approach’s weaknesses?
Despite their favorable opinion about the program, rural animators reported some shortcomings that should be considered for scale-up. For instance, rural animators complained about “sitting on the ground to perform a part of activities” (67 percent of respondents), rural animators reported that “Some materials were missing” (27 percent of respondents), and few rural animators reported that “PEC program is more focused on Math than French” (13 percent of respondents).
Rural animators recommend that the PEC approach to be taught in bridging classes of Côte d’Ivoire (CI)

The percentage of rural animators who are ready to recommend PEC for a full roll-out in bridging classes in Côte d’Ivoire remained constant from baseline to endline (100 percent). This could be explained by the very high rate of rural animators convinced by the program after the training and children performance improvement at the endline.

Table 11: Percentage of rural animators who recommend PEC in CI across waves of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of rural animators who agree to recommend PEC to be taught in all primary schools in CI</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rural animators have a positive opinion about the mentoring

Most animators have a positive opinion about the mentoring (11 animators). According to them, coaching was efficient and has helped improve the implementation of PEC’s pedagogy. In most instances, animators reported that mentors have helped them to better understand the students’ grouping and to improve classrooms management. “The director solved the problem of grouping by level that he found during his visit”. It is also important to note that one animator reported that the pedagogic supervisor helped him to solve a dispute between animators. “At first, there was a conflict between the other animators and us; We informed the director who informed the CP and the problem was solved.”

Most animators reported that school directors were engaged in their role as mentors and conducted follow-up visits in the PEC classes at least twice a week. One animator declared never receiving supervision visits by the school director. After investigations, IPA discovered that this statement was more related to a personal quarrel than a lack of mentoring.

Mentors have a positive opinion about the mentoring

Mentors had a very positive view of their role, they reported that their role was to advise, assist and guide animators. They also declared ensuring animators implement PEC pedagogy. “My role as mentor is to supervise, visit, advise. The objectives are to ensure that the program is well conducted”. Mentors reported that in the conduct of their mission they have helped animators address specific difficulties. One of them explained: “The grouping of the children according to the level was not done by the facilitator, he was placed badly during the courses. I explained him how this is all done”.
However, mentors expressed several difficulties they faced to conduct their mission:

1. **Lack of documentation for supervision.** One mentor reported not having access to appropriate documentation to monitor animators. "We lack document to have more knowledge to better supervise the animators".

2. **Lack of means for transportation.** One pedagogic supervisor suggested that he needed support to commute to the communities under his supervision. "I also need fuel to move".

3. **Clarity concerning responsibilities in the program.** A school director reported the existence of a leadership dispute between a rural animator and himself due to the lack of clarity regarding the responsibilities of actors involved in management of the classes. "It is necessary to situate the responsibilities on the management of the bridging classes".
3. Costs and operations management

Costs and operations management is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- Costs are well managed
- Project management is successful

3.1 Costs are well-managed

The project management team made efficient use of resources and spent less than budgeted to implement all the activities of the pilot. A primary draft of the scale-up proposal was shared by ICI and didn’t include the PEC pedagogy. The scale-up vision appears to extend the ICI pedagogy through community schools.

Criteria 3.1.2 Do the partners have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale?

One day before this draft report was due, ICI shared a first scale-up proposal draft which gives a rough idea of their vision at scale over the next two years. J-PAL has not yet been able to contribute to the proposal. The scale-up plan is therefore not finalized and includes new components in comparison to the pilot. Therefore, we were not able to clearly assess the partners’ vision for cost-efficiency at scale.

The scale-up plan proposed by ICI includes three main activities:

1. continuing the activities in the 15 pilot bridging classes
2. implementing 5 additional community schools
3. running school canteens in both bridging and community schools.

Overall, the program will reach about 1200 students over the two years (the school year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021). The program will target children aged 9 to 14 for the bridging classes and aged 6 to 8 for the community schools. ICI did not yet select the communities for the community schools. There is no mention of the PEC approach in the proposal.

Without the J-PAL costs, the scale-up program budgeted 639 CHF per beneficiary, which is 127 CHF more than the pilot cost per beneficiary. This is necessary because the budget for scale-up includes a year of activity (instead of 3 months); canteens; and construction costs for 40 percent of the schools and rehabilitation of the remaining 60 percent.

It appears that the partners have not developed a vision for scaling up the PEC pedagogy in ICI schools that draws on the lessons learned from this pilot. Rather, the ICI proposal can be seen as an expansion of the ICI model without PEC, in different schooling contexts.

3.2 Project management is successful

Project management was in line with the proposal and no major deviations have been made.
4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

Capacity to learn, improve and innovate is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- Project collects credible monitoring data
- Monitoring is used to learn and improve
4.1 Project collects credible monitoring data

During the pilot, J-PAL and ICI collected data on animators’ and mentors’ attendance at trainings, assessment data of students’ skill levels, and classroom observations data on Animator performance during PEC classes. The key weakness of this pilot was not to share comprehensive data regularly with IPA.

Criteria 4.1.1 Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with stakeholders

During the pilot, J-PAL and ICI collected 3 main types of information:

1. **Training attendance data.** Every day of the training, all training participants (mentors or facilitators) were asked to sign an attendance list containing all relevant information (date, training’s objective, time and place of the training etc.).
2. **Assessment data.** Facilitators conducted ASER tests for all their students three times over the pilot period. Animators documented the results in a log provided by ICI.
3. **Classroom observation:** Mentors collected information regarding the facilitator’s practice in the classroom during PEC activities every month.

J-PAL and ICI did not share data regularly with IPA and stakeholders. This is mainly because no clear M&E plan was validated beforehand. The project management team sent training attendance and assessment data at the end of the pilot.

Mentors’ classroom observations were used to improve the program. Mentors ran class observations but J-PAL and ICI did not collect nor put together these data. Therefore, we did not receive their observation data.

**Recommendation for Scale up:** IPA recommends creating a database with classroom observations (and solutions implemented) to inform future PEC projects which are likely to meet the same challenges.

As described in section 3, although TRECC mandated IPA to help the organization with their M&E plan, J-PAL did not invite IPA to their M&E workshop. The limited preparatory process on setting up a functioning M&E system with clear roles and responsibilities with MENET/ICI/J-Pal led to a poor understanding of IPA’s role. We believe that is the main reason why we did not receive the data regularly.

**Recommendation for Scale up:** In order to ensure good project governance and capacity for improvement, all relevant project stakeholders should be involved in the M&E system setup, and the data should be shared regularly with M&E partners in time.

Criteria 4.1.2 IPA’s spot-check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of the data shared by the partner

IPA conducted spot checks from April 23rd to 26th 2019 in six communities. The objectives were to understand the structure and assess the functioning of monitoring activities through interviews with mentors and facilitators. Although there were some challenges remaining, we did observe that mentors conducted class observations and helped animators. Moreover, the monitoring system seemed efficient when it comes to sharing the information across the different parties (animators, mentors and project management team).

The credibility of data is assessed on three axes:

- **Validity:** valid data accurately captures the core concept one is seeking to measure
- **Reliability:** implies that the same data collection procedure, implemented repeatedly to measure the same reality, will produce consistently similar data.
• **Unbiased**: data does not have systematic errors

*Figure 17: Credible data criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credible data criteria</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Unbiased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training attendance data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Training attendance data*

We are confident in the quality of the attendance data for different training sessions organized by the project management team. The data were collected daily during each training session and IPA had access to the attendance sheets. Baseline data and discussions confirmed the participation of the different actors. Participants signed the attendance sheet, reducing the risk of errors and cheating.

*Assessment data*

We are confident that the testing tool used by animators to assess the level of the students, reported meaningful results. ASER is a common test for checking students' progress through frequent, formative assessments and was carefully adapted to the context and age of the pilot's students. Moreover, all animators were trained to conduct this test. However, the results may not be reliable as testing the same children multiple times might result in different scores. This was observed to a certain extent by the independent testing procedure carried out by IPA. Finally, we don't consider animators results as biased as otherwise the bias of over reporting would go in the same direction for both literacy and numeracy results.

*Classroom observation data*

We are confident in the tool used for the classroom observation data. It is an adaptation of a widely used tool. Mentors were carefully trained for 10 days and then had a refresher training focus on their role as a mentor. Therefore, we believe the way they implemented the test is reliable.

---

✔️ **4.2 Monitoring is used to learn and improve**

Collecting monitoring information during PEC program is crucial for success and learning. During the pilot, regular review and feedback loops ensured that information collected was acted upon.

✔️ **Criteria 4.2.1 Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management**

During pilot implementation ICI and J-Pal did collect actionable data implementing three waves of ASER test and closely following training attendance.
However, project partners did not collect data on attendance of children on a regular basis. ASER testing results does reveal some important dropouts in specific communities. During this pilot ICI maybe had the resources to course correct this issue but at scale, clearer monitoring strategies should be implemented to be able to find mitigations strategies in case of problem.

ICI did report that attendance data was collected by the DAENF but data could not be shared, This poses serious questions about the actionability of data as the structure in charge of offering mitigation strategies should collect data directly.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** Project partners should collect individual attendance data of students as school attendance is a major concern of bridging classes' programs.

✔️ **Criteria 4.2.2 Program improvement in response to monitoring**

PEC teaching requires frequent use of data by instructors and program staff, and the pilot showed implementers making appropriate use of the data they collected. First, Animators used assessment data to group children into learning level groups. Information collected through oral one-on-one assessment also connects the instructor to the problems each child is facing (because they can see when and how children make mistakes during the test). This enables instructors to target the areas where the child needs support and motivates the instructor when the child improves.

After a first month of implementation J-PAL did observe that animators had difficulty in creating groups and teaching at different levels in the same class. This is why a second training was organized with the support of Pratham to identify clear mitigation strategies.
5. Sustainability

Sustainability is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

✔ Provides sustained benefit to the community
✔ There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2

5.1 Provides sustained benefit to the community

Overall the enthusiasm of teachers and mentors is encouraging for the sustainability of the approach. However, it is important to ensure that teachers overcome the difficulties they face to continue to implement the PEC pedagogy in their classes. The project did manage to positively influence children’s learning levels both in literacy and numeracy further strengthening their chance to succeed in formal schools. However, specific attention should be directed towards future children’s integration in the formal system and dropout rates.

Criteria 5.1.1 Indications that the animators and mentors are likely to continue with the practices or program activities

✔ Indications that the rural animators could continue to implement what they learned after the program

There are mixed signals regarding the probability that rural animators continue the program activities in the future. On the one hand, animators have a very positive view of the program and managed to achieve very encouraging results. On the other hand, animators reported difficulties in teaching at different levels in the same class. The animators seem to have a bad perception about the practice which consists of grouping children. During interviews with them, they made several complaints about this activity. According to them, grouping takes time, is tiring and difficult. Animators also reported that the exclusive use of PEC pedagogy was demanding as it requires animators to sit on the floor and play with kids. Under such circumstances, it is questionable whether the animators will continue this activity in the future.

✔ Indications that mentors could continue to implement what they learned after the program

There are some signs that the mentoring could continue around bridging classes. A key success of the program is that it managed to engage both levels of mentors meaning school directors and pedagogical advisors with the supervision of two important Department of the MENET-FP the DPFC and the DAENF. However, there are also signs suggesting that local authorities may not be able to continue the program practices and activities. Directors and pedagogical advisors were receiving a financial incentive, only part of which were intended to cover transportation costs. It is unlikely that the government will be willing to continue paying for mentoring the bridging classes at this level of intensity. Similarly, it is questionable whether the government will fund the bridging classes’ canteens because it struggles to maintain canteens in formal schools.

13 On average, according to MENET-FP officials, canteens are open just 18 days a year in formal schools.
5.2. There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2

Despite strong signs of governmental buy-in around alternative education projects, in practice the bridging classes initiative lacks resources to be implemented at scale. Private sector partners seem to be interested in financing such projects while strengthening the participation of the MENEP-FP.

Criteria 5.2.1. Are there indications that there is potential for further scale-up of the pilot approach in some way, by the government of Côte d’Ivoire, the Cooperation Partner or other development actors?

There are clear indications that the bridging class approach is aligned with the education strategy in Côte d’Ivoire. In the education sector plan 2016-2025, the MENET-FP explains clearly that one of the key objectives is to offer access to schooling to children of primary school age. This includes increasing the scope of bridging classes to give a chance to out of school children to come back in the formal system. In this respect, the education sector plan recommends the creation of bridging classes within formal primary schools for 30,000 children per year. Given that a bridging class has approximately 30 children, the MENET-FP would be ready to support around 1,000 bridging classes in the entire country per year. It is also written that headmasters should be part of this endeavor while supporting bridging classes’ animators and titling.

MENET-FP recently decreased their target from about 250,000 children expected to be enrolled between 2017-2025 to 80,000. 80,000 children would still require at least the implementation of around 2,666 bridging classes in the next six years, confirming the potential for scale-up. Given the limited recent progress achieved by bridging classes, this revision seems to be more in line with reality, but nevertheless signals ongoing political will for bridging classes.

The pilot team did a good work in engaging the governmental counterparts and more specifically the DPFC and DAENF during the training of both mentors and animators. In addition to this, the DPFC and DAENF oversaw the pedagogical component of the program. Joint missions were organized to monitor the implementation of the project together and make the necessary adjustments.

Criteria 5.2.2. Enabling environment

Côte d’Ivoire has already gained significant experience in the implementation of bridging classes programs, which largely emerged after the political crisis of 2002-2011. The idea was to give access to education to children that had their education interrupted due to violence and conflict. In fact, between 2007 and 2015 the Norwegian Rescue Committee (NRC) implemented around 747 bridging classes functional for at least one year. NRC has been at the forefront of the bridging class implementation and advocacy work and and left Côte d’Ivoire in 2015.

Despite the fact that bridging classes are explicitly considered as an alternative form of education with specific targets in the education sectoral plan, in practice, there is no clear budgets and guidelines given by the MENET-FP to the decentralized educational structures on how to allocate resources and staff to
this approach. As described in the NRC report\(^\text{14}\), bridging classes are still mostly seen as an “NGO affair”. As a result, there is still little ownership of decentralized ministry structures on bridging classes pupil’s performance, attendance and access to canteens. In this context, if not properly planned beforehand, bridging classes are often seen as a burden by headmasters and pedagogical advisors. More work should therefore be carried out on the advocacy side to better integrate bridging classes into the formal budgeting and planning processes of the MENET-FP.

Criteria 5.2.3. Financing

Bridging classes have been at the center of the industry approach to tackle child labor. The rationale being that if children are in school and learning they are not working in the fields. For this reason, such programs still leverage significant interest among company partners that are ready to support bridging class to offer a prevention and remediation strategy to child labor in areas where it was identified as a problem.

Criteria 5.2.4 Organizational capacity to implement at scale

ICI is a Swiss-headquartered foundation financed by the cocoa and chocolate industry and other institutional donors that has been operating in Cote d’Ivoire and Ghana since 2007. ICI’s office in Abidjan also benefits from regional offices that are located in the main cities of the Ivorian cocoa belt such as Divo, Soubre and Adzope. ICI primary focus is the elimination of child labor. The organization developed a Child Labour Monitoring and Remediation System (CLMRS) that surveys communities regularly to identify cases of children at work and offer remediation. According to the website the CLMRS has been rolled out over 90 000 cocoa farming households. ICI is used to rolling-out large-scale projects building on an extensive team in Abidjan with technical support from the headquarters in Geneva. Since the first project GMM1 with TRECC and Partner company, ICI has been working on over 100 bridging classes and given the level of proficiency of the staff there is good reason to think that the organization could run a bridging class project at scale. Despite these good results IPA does think that ICI would still need support from J-PAL to refine their understanding of the PEC pedagogy, develop a strong monitoring system, and continue to coordinate with relevant MENET-FP directorates, such as the DPFC and DAENF.

6. Annexes

Annex 1: Independent Data collection Methodology

Introduction

IPA led the independent Data Collection (IDC) in order to inform the Evaluation Matrix in the context of the TRECC-GMM2 project. This is complementary to the administrative data collected by the M&E teams of each partners in the pilot. The objective of Independent Data Collection is to better understand the

\(^{14}\) Accelerated Education Evaluation, Cote D'Ivoire | September 2015
context in which the pilots are being implemented, as well as to learn and to provide feedback and recommendations to TRECC, implementers and companies.

This document presents the protocol (or the Survey’s Methodology) guiding IPA’s Independent Data Collection in the framework of PEC implementation in Côte d’Ivoire. The Survey Methodology covers four main sections: (i) the presentation of different waves of data collection; (ii) the sampling and the sample calculation; and (iii) the data collection tools and response rate.

1.1. Waves of data collection

Three to four data collection rounds/waves were planned. Ideally, IPA planned to run one before the beginning of the intervention (baseline), one or two during the implementation (follow-up) and one at the end of the pilot (end-line). Depending of the purpose of each round of data collection, IPA aimed to administer student a test, to interview rural animators, and do classroom observation.

In the framework of PEC implementation, rural animators should assess the students three times during the life of the pilot. It was initially targeted that the first assessment of students by rural animators would happen before the implementation of PEC pedagogy in classrooms. It was also anticipated that the second rural animator’s assessment would be held in midway and, the last assessment will be done at the end of the pilot’s implementation.

IPA’s IDC was scheduled for two weeks after rural animators had led their students’ evaluation, where circumstances allowed. This choice was made to mitigate the increase of students’ knowledge between rural animator’s evaluation and IPA evaluation given that the two assessment use the same test – which is ASER\textsuperscript{15} test.

- Baseline data collection

  The purpose of the baseline is to provide detailed information on students’ learning levels and characteristics at the beginning of the program. For this reason, IPA waited for rural animators to finish implementing their own ASER tests and be aware of each students’ group. This phase of testing ended the 15 of October 2018 and IPA started collecting data 7 days after from March 11\textsuperscript{th} to 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2019.

  Rural animators were interviewed during the baseline to gather their feedback and their confidence in the PEC approach after having attended PEC’s training.

  Schools’ level questionnaire was also implemented to collect information around PEC implementation in schools such names of rural animators responsible of PEC, PEC hours in school and rural animators’ logs (register after having led-ASER test) – these data was useful, for instance, when planning unannounced schools visit.

- Classroom observations

  One wave of classroom observation visit was organized during the pilot’s implementation. This have taken place from March 11\textsuperscript{th} to 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2019.

  Classroom observation consisted in unannounced visit of schools during the reported PEC hours to observe the rural animator’s implementation of PEC with their students. The goal was to gain information about the quality of the program implementation.

- Endline data collection

\textsuperscript{15} More information on this test are available here \textsuperscript{““}
The endline data was collected from June 11th to 15th, 2019.

The targeted respondents for this last survey were students and rural animators. Students level was been assess through ASER test and rural animators were asked about the feedback concerning the implementation of the PEC.

1.2. Sampling and sample calculation

The pilot targeted 15 unified primary schools selected in the region of DUÉKOUÉ. As described in the proposal, the schools were chosen according to four criteria – low level of literacy and numeracy, high average rate of students and rural animator attendance, willingness of schools’ staff to implement the new PEC methodology and inclusion of schools in private cocoa company region of activity.

- Students’ sample

The sample computation for students follows two lines of reasoning. Firstly, we want to interview enough students to have a reliable test evaluating whether rural animators are assessing the students properly (we calculate it with a power calculation for Cohen’s Kappa and found 103 students to be surveyed). Secondly, we need a large enough sample of students to have an accurate estimate of baseline characteristics, including students’ baseline test scores simply using the population (n=450) at a 95% confidence level with a margin of error of +/- 5% gives a sample size of 210 at baseline. This is larger than the 103 calculated above. So, we used 210 as our intended sample size. As a result, in each class, 14 students were randomly selected by IPA’s agents to be surveyed.

The same assumption will be maintained for the endline data collection. So, the endline survey targeted also 14 students by schools – which gives 210 students to be assessed.

- Rural animators’ sample

Given the small number of rural animators who participate in the pilot, we planned to survey all of them. In total, 15 rural animators were targeted during the baseline and the endline data collection. However, in two schools, rural animators have been changed.

- Classroom observations sample

Classroom observations were made without intervention in the class and enumerators visit in schools were unannounced. In practice, one rural animator was randomly selected per school. Which gave 15 classrooms to be observed during each wave of classroom observations.

1.3. Data collection

Data collection tools were designed by IPA and conducted with students and rural animators.

- Data collected and tools

  Students’ interview

Students were assessed to gather their learning level in literacy and mathematics. Data on students’ learning was collected using a literacy and numeracy assessment tool called the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER). Each test took about 10-15 minutes for both sections and was administered to students one-on-one by a trained field enumerator.
During the baseline, a short questionnaire was delivered to each student at the end of ASER test. It lasted around 10 minutes and it includes questions on the way students managed their time outside of school. The aim of this short questionnaire was to assess the learning environment of children.

*Rural animators’ interview*

The goal of rural animators’ interviews changes a bit from baseline to endline.

During the baseline, the rural animators’ questionnaire covered attendance to rural animators’ training, satisfaction toward the PEC training and rural animators’ self confidence in implementing PEC with their students.

During the endline, rural animators were asked for self-assessment of their implementation of PEC, their feedback on PEC and assistance they received from mentors.

Rural animators interviews usually lasted 30-45 minutes.

*Classroom observations*

Observations of PEC’s classroom usually lasted 20 minutes. The classroom observation was made without intervention or disruption of rural animator class. During this observation, IPA agents collected data on whether students attend school, how classrooms are organized, and how rural animators implemented PEC methodology.

IPA classroom observations tools include the rural animators-mentors observations tool developed with J-PAL’s support.

Note that IPA observers’ goal to perform unannounced observations was not perfectly achieved during the different waves of classroom observations. In fact, there are reasons to suspect that schools’ directors were informed about IPA observers’ visit. For instance, it is normal for animators and directors to refuse any interviews without authorization from their inspector. To facilitate IPA observers’ integration in schools, it was agreed that IPA should inform inspectors about any surveys at least two weeks before fieldwork. IPA provided inspectors with survey periods one to two weeks in advance without sharing the exact dates enumerators would visit each school. But, given directors’ close relationships with inspectors, it is quite likely that the directors, and then animators, were informed by the inspectors about the likely period during which these visits would happen, and then make sure to implement PEC during those periods only. In retrospect, it may have been possible to achieve smooth and genuinely unexpected observations by obtaining pre-emptive blanket permission from all stakeholders, including inspectors, for IPA’s observations. This would also make it simple for observers to visit a school repeatedly, at different times, to see how an animator handles each of their different classes. IPA recommends these tactics for any further roll-out of PEC.

•  Sample covered and response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round of data collection</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Survey planned</th>
<th>Survey covered</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural animators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midline</td>
<td>Classroom observation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural animators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: ASER test and Implementation

- Presentation of the test

The ASER tool tests basic reading and numeracy skills that are taught in grade 1 and 2. The choice was made to use the ASER to assess the students given its advantages compared to other tests. The ASER is reliable to measure grade level reading skills, more appropriate for French speaking country (like Côte d’Ivoire), and less complex to develop and administrate.

**Literacy test**

The literacy learning assessments tested the ability to read in French and placed learners into one of five levels:

1. Beginner. At this level, a learner cannot identify sounds or letters correctly.
2. Letter level. A learner can identify sounds or letters but cannot read words.
3. Word level. A learner can read words but cannot read sentences coherently.
4. Simple paragraph level. A learner can read sentences that use simple language but cannot read a short story.
5. Story level. A learner can read a short story containing simple language.

**Numeracy/Mathematics test**

The numeracy assessments are split into two parts. The first part tests number recognition and the second part tests math’s operations.

For number recognition, a learner can be placed into one of four levels:

1. Beginner. At this level, a learner is unable to name even one-digit numbers.
2. One-digit level. A learner can name one-digit numbers but not two-digit numbers.
3. 2-digits level. A learner can name two-digit numbers but not three-digit numbers.
4. 3-digits level. A learner can name three-digit numbers. Learners should be at this level by the end of grade 2.

For math’s operations, learners are tested on two sets of operations. First, they are given some two-digit by two-digit addition and subtraction sums. Second, learners are tested on two-digit by one-digit multiplication and division sums. Depending on their results they can be placed into one of five levels:

1. Beginner. These learners are unable to recognize a one-digit number (So, they can not do either addition, subtraction, multiplication or division given that they have not prerequisite for that) or they have none either addition, subtraction, multiplication or division levels (see definition below).
2. Addition. These learners can do addition. Learners are expected to reach this level by the end of grade 2.
3. Subtraction. These learners can do subtraction. Learners are expected to reach this level by the end of grade 2.
4. Multiplication. These learners can do multiplication.
5. Division. These learners can do multiplication and division.

- IPA/IDC ASER tests sample

IPA’s ASER tests was developed with the support of J-PAL and MEN experts—who received the expertise to developed ASER test which were used by rural animators from Pratham team. The fact to have IDC
tests were validated by MEN’s experts ensures to IPA to have reliable tests in the sense that students should perform in the same way regardless of the assessor (IPA enumerators or Rural animators).

- IPA implementation of ASER test

IPA implementation of ASER test follows the same protocol as describe in the Literacy and Numeracy PEC Manuals provided to rural animators by the Company — See Annex 3 and Annex 4 for details for the ways to administrate ASER test.

The test was programmed in the electronic tablets in such way assessors were only able to gather learners’ answers at each step of the test step but cannot provide the final score or level. The learners score was automatically calculated by the device and was unknown to the assessors. This choice was made to minimize assessors bias in learners final score.

The test was delivered during one-on-one friendship’s discussions with students in respect of “IPA Child Safeguarding Policy”. Besides of schools’ staff consent to implement the survey, students’ assent was required to administrate the test. In addition, enumerators were trained to reassure children and help them to perform at their best during the test.

Annex 3: Protocol to administrate ASER literacy test
Comment tester la lecture :

**Commencer par le niveau « Paragraphe »**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L’enfant n’est pas au niveau « Paragraphe » s’il / elle :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte comme un enchaînement de mots, plutôt que comme une phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte de façon rassadée, en s’arrêtant souvent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte de façon fluide mais en faisant plus de 3 erreurs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L’enfant est au niveau « Paragraphe », s’il / elle :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte comme une phrase, plutôt que comme un enchaînement de mots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte de façon fluide et aisée, même s’il / elle lit lentement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lit le texte avec 3 erreurs ou moins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Si l’enfant n’est pas au niveau « Paragraphe », lui demander de lire des mots.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Si l’enfant peut lire un paragraphe, lui demander de lire l’histoire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Tester le niveau « Mot »**
Demander à l’enfant de lire 10 mots parmi la liste de mots. Laisser l’enfant choisir les mots. S’il / elle ne choisit pas, lui montrer des mots à lire. L’enfant est au niveau « Mot » s’il / elle :

- Lit au moins 6 mots sur 10 avec aisance.

**L’enfant est au niveau « Histoire » s’il / elle :**

- Lit le texte comme une phrase, et non comme un enchaînement de mots.
- Lit le texte de façon fluide et aisée. L’enfant peut lire lentement.
- Lit le texte avec 3 ou moins de 3 erreurs.
Comment tester les mathématiques :

**Instructions pour la partie 1 : « Reconnaissance des nombres »**

Commencez avec les nombres à 3 chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 nombres à 3 chiffres, il est au niveau 3, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

Si l’enfant n’est pas capable de reconnaître les nombres à 3 chiffres, demandez-lui de reconnaître les nombres à 2 chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 nombres à 2 chiffres, il est au niveau 2, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

Si l’enfant n’est pas capable de reconnaître les nombres à 2 chiffres, demandez-lui de reconnaître les chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 chiffres, il est au niveau 1, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

S’il n’est pas capable de reconnaître les chiffres, il sera au niveau débutant.

**Instructions pour la partie 2 : « Opérations »**

Il faut demander à l’enfant d’essayer toutes les opérations en commençant par l’addition, puis la soustraction, puis la multiplication et enfin la division. Dans chaque section, le facilitateur notera si l’enfant « peut faire » ou « ne peut pas faire » ce type d’opérations.

Commencez par le niveau « addition ». Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire addition ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire addition ».

Une fois les exercices d’addition terminés, demandez-lui de faire les soustractions. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire soustraction ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire soustraction ».

Une fois les exercices de soustraction terminés, demandez-lui de faire les multiplications. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire multiplication ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire multiplication ».

Enfin, demandez à l’enfant de faire les divisions. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire division ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire division ».

Si l’enfant ne peut pas faire ni addition, ni soustraction, ni multiplication ni division, il est débutant en opérations.
Annex 4 Classroom observation tool developed by J-PAl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature du mentor (conseiller pédagogique / directeur)</th>
<th>Signature de l’enseignant</th>
<th>Total de points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regroupement et progrès des élèves</th>
<th>Lien, mais des améliorations sont possibles</th>
<th>Très basse mise en place du PEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Regroupe les élèves en fonction de leur niveau.</em> (0 à 3 points)</td>
<td><em>Assurez-vous d’enrôver les élèves dans un groupe plus avancé à mesure qu’ils progressent.</em> (2 points)</td>
<td><em>Pédiatriques :</em> Très basse mise en œuvre du PEC (2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Développe et utilise les métiers PEC.</em> Assurez-vous que les activités se déroulent en absence du groupe vacant, sans perturber les progrès et réussite au niveau individuel.* Assurez-vous que dans chaque activité, les enfants se soucient, partagent, soutiennent, aident et coopèrent.* (0 à 3 points)</td>
<td><em>Assurez-vous d’utiliser les métiers PEC.</em> <em>Faites des objectifs réalisables pour aider les enfants à progresser en autonomie.</em> <em>Assurez-vous que la distribution de la carte de classe facilite la déroulement des activités.</em> (0 à 3 points)</td>
<td><em>Pédiatriques :</em> Très basse mise en œuvre du PEC (4 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Encouragez les élèves à participer.</em> Utilisez une gamme d’activités différentes. Donnez des conseils clairs pour chaque activité.* Assurez-vous que les élèves se soucient.* (0 à 3 points)</td>
<td><em>Assurez-vous que les activités encouragent les élèves à participer.</em> <em>Donnez des conseils clairs pour chaque activité.</em> Assurez-vous qu’ils n’aident.* (0 à 3 points)</td>
<td><em>Pédiatriques :</em> Très basse mise en œuvre du PEC (0 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total de points de la dernière leçon observée</th>
<th>/ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total de points de la leçon d’augmentation | /10 |

Notes pour l’enseignant
Annex 5: Animators’ ASER logs

Annex 6: Complementary tables around animators accuracy measure

**Literacy Baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers results</th>
<th>IPA results</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Endline Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers results</th>
<th>IPA results</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0.3324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.2286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.1145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Numeracy baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers results</th>
<th>IPA results</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-digit</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-digits</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.6367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-digits</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.0046</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Numeracy endline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers results</th>
<th>IPA results</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.9374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-digit</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.0955</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-digits</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-digits</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0.2048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graphs

- **Baseline vs. Endline**
  - Beginner: 95% vs. 86%
  - Can do addition: 8% vs. 60%
  - Can do subtraction: 11% vs. 58%
  - Can do multiplication: 3% vs. 38%
  - Can do division: 1% vs. 28%
Annex 6: Evaluation Matrix

The Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative aims at improving the living conditions of children and youth in Côte d’Ivoire by promoting quality education in cocoa-growing communities. Via its Grant Matching Mechanism round 2 (GMM2), 9 pilots-to-scale projects are being co-funded with 10 cocoa companies and implemented by 14 implementing organizations in the sectors of Early Childhood Development, Primary Education and Vocational Training.

The role of Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is to provide technical support to the companies and implementing agencies to design and implement sound monitoring systems to closely monitor and learn from these pilots. In parallel, IPA conducts its own independent and complementary data collection. IPA will use these two sources of information – the administrative data collected by the implementing organizations through their own M&E system and the independent data collection – to feed into an evaluation matrix to assess each pilot.

Each evaluation matrix describes how IPA will use the data to make recommendations on the potential scale-up of the pilots to other relevant cocoa-growing communities. In addition, TRECC may consider whether certain pilots are feasible for future scale-up beyond such communities, for example to the regional or national level, though this is not a central focus of this evaluation matrix given the existing contractual arrangements on GMM2.

The evaluation matrix comprises five sections which will be the basis on which to recommend eligibility of a pilot team to submit a proposal for potential scale-up. The five criteria are Relevance; Results (outputs and immediate outcomes); Costs & Operations management; Capacity to learn, improve and innovate; and Sustainability. For each criterion, we describe the key evaluation questions, which will be common across all pilots.

This document presents the evaluation matrix tailored to the J-PAL and Partner company pilot, with the five criteria and the qualitative and quantitative indicators to that will be used to assess each criteria. IPA will work with Partner company and J-PAL to finalize the indicators, targets and data sources for the pilot, drawing on their logical framework.

We will use a “traffic light” color system to provide an overall assessment against each of the five criteria: green will mean that the pilot is compliant with the criteria requirement for potential scale-up, red will mean that it is not, and orange will mean that it does partially comply and that eligibility for scale-up should be conditional on corrective measures to be taken. At the final evaluation stage:

- pilots with green assessments on all 11 criteria will receive an unconditional recommendation for eligibility for a scale-up proposal;
- pilots who have only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of green criteria, will receive a conditional recommendation for scale-up – i.e. conditional on corrective measures in response to findings from monitoring and evaluation.
- pilots who have only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of orange criteria, will not be recommended for scale-up.
- pilots with any red criteria will not be recommended for scale-up.
During implementation, IPA will provide work-in-progress traffic-light assessments to the pilots as part of our quarterly updates (ideally during advisory calls), for criteria for which there is enough data already available for an interim assessment. This will allow opportunities for course correction and improvement. Before sharing our work-in-progress assessments, if any are orange or red light assessments, we will discuss them with the implementing partners first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Targets an important need in the community</td>
<td>1.1.1. Is there any evidence of this being an important need in the community?</td>
<td>1.1.1 J-PAL’s needs assessment report and IPA baseline shows evidence of the need being addressed</td>
<td>1.1.1 Key government stakeholders’ description of community shows evidence of the need being addressed</td>
<td>Administrative data</td>
<td>Green: Pilot addresses specific important needs that were among targeted population. The intervention as implemented focuses on the objectives initially agreed, or agreed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Is the intervention model appropriate to respond to the identified need?</td>
<td>- Children (from 6 to 11 years old) have delay in schooling and do not master the basic reading and math skills (ASER test) which are a prerequisite to successfully integrate formal schools. The above indicator is sufficient to justify the need for TaRL in bridging classes. Classroom heterogeneity confirms the relevance of grouping children by level – yet TaRL can also be implemented in homogeneous classrooms where children are failing to master basic skills.</td>
<td>- TaRL can also be implemented in homogeneous classrooms where children are failing to master basic skills.</td>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td>Orange: Pilot did not fully address important identified needs and/or partially reached the targeted population. The implementation strayed somewhat from the initial agreed objectives. Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3. If relevant, do the project’s targeting criteria allow to reach the group that needs the intervention the most in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red: Pilot does not address important needs in the community and/or does not serve the targeted population. The implementation shows that program objectives are no longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Quantitative indicators</td>
<td>Qualitative indicators</td>
<td>Data source and collection method</td>
<td>Assessment definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Aligns with the priorities of the donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td>Green:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1. Does the pilot still align with the objectives of TRECC and Partner company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews with program management team</td>
<td>Pilot addresses specific important needs that were among targeted population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including TRECC and Partner company</td>
<td>The intervention as implemented focuses on the objectives initially agreed, or agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk Research</td>
<td>changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of initial proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. The pilot, as implemented, remains aligned to the objectives originally agreed and any agreed changes have been documented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td>Orange:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interview with program management team confirms that the program goals remain aligned with the priorities originally described in the proposal, which is to improve achievement on the basics in French and mathematics for students from CE1 to CM1 by adapting the teaching to the actual level of each child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews with program management team</td>
<td>Pilot did not fully address important identified needs and/or partially reached the targeted population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including TRECC and Partner company</td>
<td>The implementation strayed somewhat from the initial agreed objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk Research</td>
<td>Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of initial proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot does not address important needs in the community and/or does</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 1. Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not serve the targeted population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The implementation shows that program objectives are no longer relevant to those originally agreed. No feasible remediation identified for these issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Results (outputs and direct outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Delivers outputs at high quality</td>
<td>2.1.1. Has the pilot produced measurable outputs with the required quality? 2.1.2. Did the expected number of beneficiaries engage in sustained way?</td>
<td>2.1.1. Key outputs from the proposal logframe were achieved – 15 animators who completed the training on TaRL methodology – 8 school principals trained on TaRL methodology – # of mentors trained on TaRL methodology – 8 schools received TARL material (a school is considered to have received TARL material if it received 2 complete sets of materials for calculation and reading for 2 classes)</td>
<td>2.1.2. Participation rate</td>
<td>2.1.1. Positive feedback about the quality of key outputs – Feedback from animators, principals and mentors about training received</td>
<td>Administrative data   ○ Review of the quarterly &amp; annual reports and routine monitoring reports ○ Analysis of project monitoring data Independent Evaluation ○ Results from spot-checks ○ Qualitative interviews with animators, principals and mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green: ○ Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality ○ A high and sustained participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries, who provided positive feedback Orange: ○ Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.2. Achieves direct outcomes | 2.2.1. Have changes been observed/self-reported in the knowledge, attitudes, behavior or practices directly targeted by the interventions? | 2.2.1.a. Results of pre and post-tests show immediate improvement in knowledge | 2.2.1.b. Changes in animators’ knowledge, behavior and practices have been observed over time\(^ {16} \) | Administrative data
Independent evaluation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o A high and sustained participation rate was recorded among</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^ {16} \) Any changes observed over time cannot be attributed to the program without a counterfactual; but the absence of such changes might indicate that the program is not operating as planned.
| % of animators who have completed the ASER test\(^\text{17}\) with children and can produce the results during visits |
| % of animators present conducting PEC activities\(^\text{18}\) during classroom observation |
| % of observed animators who show effective use of the TARL materials during classroom observations (scoring at least 8/10 on the classroom observation tool) |
| % of animators who reported having had a coaching session with schools’ principals or pedagogical inspectors in the last four weeks |
| Animators administer the ASER test to students accurately\(^\text{19}\) |
| Early changes in basic numeracy and literacy skills |

| beneficiaries, who provided positive feedback |

**Orange:**
- Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not achieved, or not with the expected quality
- Below expectation participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided mixed feedback
- Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues

**Red:**
- Outputs and key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved and/or low quality
- Low participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries, who provided positive feedback

---

\(^{17}\) A teacher is considered to have completed the student assessment if he/she has completed the ASER results form, and written the names of the students who were absent for future testing

\(^{18}\) Animators will be defined as “conducting PEC activities” if they are present and appear to be teaching students in groups based on their level during the classroom observation surprise visit, to be conducting during the time specified by animators in advance as their allocated TARL hour (and cross-checked with J-PAL records of TARL hour times).

\(^{19}\) To be measured as the average inter-rater reliability calculated as Cohen’s kappa, between IPA’s assessed ratings for each child and the animators’ ratings for each child, where a kappa score of 0.41-0.6 indicates “moderate” agreement. A score below 0.41 would indicate only “fair” agreement, meaning that the animators’ test scores did not agree with IPA’s scores as closely as should be expected (previous tests have found reliability measures of at least 0.6 on the Cohen’s Kappa rating).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.</th>
<th>Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.</td>
<td><strong>How satisfied are the beneficiaries with the intervention?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.</td>
<td><strong>How meaningful is the intervention to beneficiaries’ lives?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.a</td>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.b</td>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the main immediate outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.c</td>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries describe positive experiences with the program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.</td>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries report that the pilot was meaningful for them</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries who provided negative feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>No feasible remediation identified for these issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green:</td>
<td>Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange:</td>
<td>Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not achieved, or not with the expected quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red:</td>
<td>Outputs and key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % of interviewed animators who provided a positive feedback on the TARL materials/activities
- % of animators who would be likely to recommend TARL for all classes
- % of inspectors and school principals who provided positive feedback on the TARL methodology
- % of animators who can name a useful piece of advice they received from the coaching by mentors and school principals
- % of animators who provided positive feedback on the improvement on their students’ learning in the classroom as result of TARL methods
- Interview with the animators, inspectors and school directors or principals, they can describe how the program had a positive effect on student learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>achieved and/or low quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Low participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided negative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o No feasible remediation identified for these issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative Indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative Indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1. Costs are well managed | 3.1. Did the project make efficient utilization of resources? | 3.1.1. Budget expenditures show good value for money The expenditure indicates cost-efficient use of money There are indications that cost-efficiency was continuously sought during the pilot – avoidance of unnecessary high costs, efficiencies found, etc. **3.1.2. Partner’s vision for scaling** Partner company and J-PAL team can explain how they will achieve a more cost-efficient model at greater GMM2 scale. | Administrative data  
- Pilot Financial proposal  
- Pilot Quarterly and annual financial reports  
- GMM2 Scale-up Proposal  
**Independent Evaluation**  
- Interview with J-PAL | Green:  
- Good cost and project management, in line with the proposal  
**Orange:**  
- Some signs that costs could have been better managed, better resources allocated; some delays were observed; costs significantly exceeded initial budget; some activities initially planned were not implemented because of lack of time or resources  
- Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues if pilot was scaled-up  
**Red:**  
- Signs that costs were not well managed and some resources were wasted; costs significantly exceeded budget without justification; important delays occurred without justification; key activities were not implemented by lack of resources or time.  
- No feasible remediation identified for these issues |
| 3.2. Project management is successful | 3.2. Has the project been implemented as planned, with any changes being justified or outside the partners’ control? | 3.2.1. Intervention is implemented according to roadmap, and any changes are fully justified The pilot was implemented according to the roadmap, and significant deviations | Administrative data  
- Review of the proposal including planned end dates of keys activities and planned budget  
- Review of the quarterly & annual | Green:  
- Good cost and project management, in line with the proposal  
**Orange:**  
- Some signs that costs could have been better managed, better resources allocated; some delays were observed; |
the pilot management according to agreed aspects?

were fully justified and approved.

3.2.2. Cooperation Partners’ involvement
Partner company participated as agreed in the management and implementation of the pilot, or changes in this role have been documented.

- Review of the pilot relevant meetings reports (operational, advisory, steering and review meetings) reports
- Interviews with J-PAL
- Interviews with Partner company

Independent evaluation
- Reports including realized end dates of key activities and realized spending
- Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues if pilot was scaled-up

Red:
- Signs that costs were not well managed and some resources were wasted; costs significantly exceeded budget without justification; important delays occurred without justification; key activities were not implemented by lack of resources or time.
- No feasible remediation identified for these issues
## 4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1. Project collects credible monitoring data | 4.1.1. Is actionable monitoring data collected?  
4.1.2. Are the routine monitoring data credible and reliable? | 4.1.1. Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with the stakeholders  
Monitoring data are collected and analyzed by program management and shared with IPA monthly as defined in the monitoring plan.  
4.1.2. IPA spot check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of the data shared by partner  
IPA spot check confirms the data quality; percentage discrepancies found in the data shared by Partner company/J-PAL compared with IPA independent data is not more than 10% for variables with fixed, stable values (such as the number of training sessions held) and are not statistically significant for variables that may vary in surveying (such as estimates of the numbers of attendees). | 4.1.1.b. Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management  
- Routine monitoring data that was collected that provides actionable insight on program management.  
- J-PAL identified and documented project risks IPA observed in spot checks and acted on them in a timely manner. | Administrative data  
- Review of the monitoring plan and routine quarterly reports  
- Analysis of the project routine monitoring data  
- RAID Template Independent evaluation  
- Results of spot-check visits  
- Review of the pilot relevant meetings reports (operational, advisory, steering and review meetings) reports | Green:  
- Credible and reliable data was regularly collected by the partner and shared according to the agreed calendar  
- Data were analyzed and used to learn and take corrective measures to improve the implementation  
Orange:  
- Signs that data was not always credible or reliable and/or was not collected and shared according to agreed calendar  
- Data was collected but was only sometimes used for learning and improvement or not documented  
- Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues  
Red:  
- There was little data collected and shared and/or data was not reliable nor credible |
| **4.2.** Monitoring is used to learn and improve | **4.2.1.** Is the J-PAL demonstrating willingness to learn, innovate and incorporate monitoring feedback? | **4.2.2.** Did the J-PAL test some key assumptions in their theory of change? | **4.2.1. Program improvement in response to monitoring**
Significance of appropriate changes in program management or delivery that can be linked to monitoring findings

**4.2.2. Use of data to refine the ToC**
J-PAL shows that they have refined their understanding of the Theory of Change through use of their own data, and documented these refinements. | **Administrative data**
- Review of the monitoring plan and routine reports
- Analyses of the project routine monitoring data and reports
- GMM2 scale-up proposal
- Independent evaluation
  - Interviews with J-PAL

**Green:**
- Credible and reliable data was regularly collected by the partner and shared according to the agreed calendar
- Data were analyzed and used to learn and take corrective measures to improve the implementation

**Orange:**
- Signs that data was not always credible or reliable and/or was not collected and shared according to agreed calendar
- Data was collected but was only sometimes used for learning and improvement or not documented
- Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues

**Red:**
- There was little data collected and shared and/or data was not reliable nor credible
If data was collected, it was rarely used to take corrective measures or documented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1. Provides sustained benefit to community | 5.1.1. Are there any signs that the intervention from the pilot will continue to benefit the beneficiaries/community members over time? | | 5.1.1. Indications that the community members are likely to continue with the practices or program activities | Independent evaluation  
- Field observations  
- Qualitative interviews with the beneficiaries, community members and key informants  
- Interview with the J-PAL | **Green:**  
- Strong signs of sustained benefits in the community  
- Promising prospects for scale-up beyond the company funding  
**Orange:**  
- Some signs of sustained benefits in the community and ways of improvement are identified  
- Few potential prospects can be explored for scale-up beyond the company funding  
**Red:**  
- No sign of benefits or only short-term benefits  
- No prospect for scale-up beyond the company funding was identified |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2. There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>