



The challenges of public agency in public primary schooling

Lessons from a Kenyan experiment

By Samuel Otieno



About Twaweza

Twaweza means “we can make it happen” in Swahili. Twaweza works on enabling children to learn, citizens to exercise agency and governments to be more open and responsive in Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda. We have programs, staff and offices across all three countries, and a world respected practice of learning, monitoring and evaluation. Our flagship programs include *Uwezo*, Africa’s largest annual citizen assessment to assess children’s learning levels across hundreds of thousands of households, and *Sauti za Wananchi*, Africa’s first nationally representative mobile phone survey. We undertake effective public and policy engagement, through powerful media partnerships and global leadership of initiatives such as the Open Government Partnership.

Building the idea of public agency

As a learning organisation, it was necessary to sense-check the idea of public agency. The thinking process for the initiative commenced in February 2016 with scoping missions in two counties, Migori and Baringo, and later to eight others (Kilifi, Busia, Embu, Trans Nzoia, Nyeri, Wajir, Narok, Nairobi). The aim was to explore the concept of public agency, identifying situations where citizens were already acting together with local leaders to resolve shared challenges. Here, the Twaweza team held conversations with local/district NGOs, county and district education officers (and other district-based officials), unpacking their understanding of the idea and any existing manifestations in their districts. The school meetings with head teachers and teachers explored how they interacted with education authorities and with parents, and what they thought about opportunities to deliberate on and shape decisions for their schools.

Following the discussions and exploration, we distilled several critical design parameters for the public agency pilot:

- i. Address an issue which can be traced through the entire system – it needs to be directly relevant to schools, but reflect a felt priority at ward and district levels, and also have resonance nationally.
- ii. The issue should have a citizen voice component. This will likely be focused at the community level, but can also include the district and national (where Twaweza plays a role) levels. How might the various levels reinforce each other?
- iii. It should be an issue for which there is possibility for change – in that it is already a topic of debate, concern and implementation.
- iv. There should be multiple opportunities within the system where the issue can be tackled: the more windows of opportunity up and down the levels, the better.
- v. Clarity about what change looks like – from changing policies, plans and budgets to changing attitudes, norms, and behaviours (whose behaviour?). Actors from community, ward, district and national levels were included in the analysis.
- vi. Think hard about the incentives and barriers to change, for actors from community, ward, district and national levels.
- vii. Iteration and incremental improvement by piloting, testing, going back to the drawing board, revising and refining, then doing it all over again.

The issue and location

After this process, the issue selected was that of **increasing the learning time** or contact hours in public primary schools, this can be referred to as the quantity of learning. The idea was that teachers, parents, learners and local leaders work collaboratively to increase the amount of time used for learning at school. This is in the context of official school teaching time prescribed by the ministry of education. The initiative, known as *Husika*, which

translates into English as *get involved*, was born to bring together local level stakeholders (pupils, parents, teachers and leaders) to collectively find solutions to challenges facing the education sector in their communities using existing spaces and platforms (village barazas, parent meetings, school government).

In the end, two counties (Baringo and Kilifi) were selected for the pilot. These counties were deliberately chosen based on the following:

- Their previous successful participation in the Uwezo assessments.
- The two counties are in the last two quintiles in the Uwezo county ranking of learning outcomes and have a record of deep challenges in the education sector.
- An estimation of the extent to which the time spent on learning would be an issue of reasonable concern among local education leaders at district and county levels.
- The strength of Twaweza partnerships and networks within these counties.

The initiative covered 36 schools, 18 each in Kilifi and Baringo Counties and consisted of: a baseline study conducted in September 2016; followed by the lesson attendance study implemented over a ten-week period between January to March 2017; and finally an endline study which took place in April 2017. In this report, we analyse the data collected (from the endline, lesson attendance study and baseline) and present the key findings.

Why this issue?

In Kenya, Uwezo's evidence has demonstrated that outcomes are low across the board. However, the 2015 results establish that children attending private schools outperform their public school peers by nearly 10 percentage points in both literacy and numeracy. While one may speculate about what influences this difference in learning outcomes, the World Bank's Service Delivery Indicators survey highlights "difference in time on task" as a leading differentiator between learning in public and private schools. There was a difference of 2 percentage points in regard to teachers who were not at school (16% in public schools, 14% in private), but a difference of 16 percentage points in the teachers who were at school but not attending lessons (47% in public schools, 31% in private). Ultimately, children in private school learn for one hour and nine minutes more every day than their peers in public schools, or 5 hours and 45 minutes more every week, or around 70 hours more in a school term of 12 weeks. Considering all factors, a final recommendation was thus given: "The SDI results point to gaps in teacher knowledge, time spent teaching and absence from classroom that require urgent action".

While it may be difficult for citizens to contribute to more teacher knowledge, we found both absence from classroom and time spent teaching to be appealing grounds for public agency. Further, recalling Uwezo's evidence that on an average school day, 11% of learners do not come to school, we expanded the concept to also include student attendance as part of the equation for boosting the time spent teaching, now rephrased as **time spent learning**, in which both the teacher and learner are in class, engaging in learning activity.

The intervention design

The short-term hypothesis was that communities (teachers, local leadership, parents, pupils) around the focus schools will demonstrate increased interest and engagement in reducing pupil and teacher absenteeism to increase learning time. The pilot ran for one school term between January and April 2017.

The main intervention components were as follows:

a) Collecting data and evidence:

- Trained class monitors (or class representatives, in Kenya known as MPs) maintained a daily lesson-by-lesson record of teacher and pupil attendance, indicating whether, for each lesson, the teacher was

on-time, late or absent as well as the number of fellow pupils (by gender) who were present and absent.

- A teacher nominee (referred to here as the *Husika teacher*) equipped with an Android device, compiled the records from the class monitors on a weekly basis and shared the trends with fellow teachers including the head teacher (to stir in-school discussion) and sent the data on to an online KoBoCollect platform (for retrieval and analysis by the Twaweza team).

b) Monitoring and spot checks:

- A *Husika monitor*, who is a local citizen at the ward level, equipped with a device, conducted spot checks in schools to monitor the process, collect the evidence and share this with the local leader (primarily the chief). Each monitor oversees three schools in their ward.

c) Convening discussions on the data

- At class level, teachers convened class parents' meetings to discuss learning hours and hold parents to account for learner daily attendance.
- At school level, parents received information about lesson attendance by teachers and from their children and their representatives. They are held accountable for daily attendance of their children, but also expected to hold teachers to account for their presence in class.
- At community level, the Area Chief or assistant chief receives a monthly brief from the Husika Monitor on changes, includes this as agenda for the public monthly barazas and reviews the actions being taken to improve learner and teacher attendance.
- At the County level, the *Husika County Coordinator* (Twaweza Partner) coordinated the initiative, monitoring and reporting but also conducting spot checks and posting their validation. They convened conversations at the county level, through the County Education Board, to understand challenges at county level, discuss and galvanise action.
- The County Education Board includes in their meeting updates on changes from both the County Education and Teachers Service Commission (TSC) Directors.

d) Rewards and recognition

- At sub-county level, the Husika Sub-County (district) Coordinator aggregated the schools' data and generated a district report. S/he presented this to the sub-county education officials.
- A public awards ceremony was convened to recognise the head teachers, teachers, chiefs and schools who have contributed the most in increasing time spent learning. The Husika Coordinator attended the awards ceremony at the school, helped with presenting the awards and reporting to the community on actions taken.



Identified issues

Issue 1: How do people perceive and describe absenteeism?

In order to provide formative information for the project, Twaweza, through a baseline study, checked the level and local manifestations of absenteeism in the selected counties. In addition, the study also examined local knowledge, attitudes and practices around school attendance and absenteeism and their underlying causes in the two counties.

In both counties, pupil absenteeism stood at around 14% on an average school day prior to the *Husika* intervention. Boys were more likely to be absent than girls possibly because boys engage in economic activities to support family livelihoods. The pupils are more likely to be absent on Monday, Tuesday and Friday during afternoon hours in both counties. However, even as the project focused on addressing absenteeism, it was noted that the number of out of school children (children of school going age who are not enrolled) was also high in the two counties.

Across the board, people don't recognise (both teacher and pupil) absenteeism as a major problem in education. When discussing issues affecting education in general, people generally focus on issues related to poverty, environmental challenges, low parental involvement in education, low literacy among the community and poor relationships between teachers and parents. Pupil absenteeism only comes up when prompted. While pupil absenteeism is prevalent, it remains a non-issue to many either because of lack of information on its prevalence and effects but also because it is seen by many as acceptable. Even in places where it is recognised as a problem, a contradiction exists in that where the problem is highest, the recognition is lowest. The study found that in most situations, perceptions did not align with the real problem, but are formed more by the value attached to education.

Similarly, teacher absenteeism is not generally considered a serious issue. As expected, teachers exonerate themselves, while parents would rather be careful about the issue, probably due also to the limited information accessible to them. Even where teacher absenteeism is high, teachers themselves do not consider teacher attendance an issue, and tend to find ways to justify their absences.

The study found that absenteeism among pupils is caused mainly by a collection of home factors – i.e. poverty, ignorance and illiteracy among parents, retrogressive culture and child labour. Low appreciation of the value of education among communities and a lack of role models in these communities is also a deterrent to school attendance and a major contributor to school drop-outs. In addition, much as primary education is supposed to be free, there are many school levies that are regularly charged – these may mean that many children whose parents cannot pay stay at home for prolonged periods. Finally, the relationship between teachers and parents is largely antagonistic, such that even when pupil absenteeism has been detected, it is often difficult to persuade parents to come to school to discuss the situation with teachers.

Issue 2: Do people come together to solve education problems?

Kenya has been implementing a free and compulsory primary education programme (FPE) since 2003. While the free component envisages the abolishment of all school levies to ensure no child is left out, the compulsory element is supposed to ensure no child of school-going age stays at home. While the 'free' component is supposed to be implemented at the school level, the burden of enforcing the 'compulsory' component should fall at the community level. This puts chiefs and assistant chiefs at the centre of implementing FPE. The system therefore envisions a situation in which the school authorities will work with administrators to enforce free and compulsory education, but this tends not to happen.

There are several spaces and events that are well-established within the education sector in Kenya, including education forums/days that bring together stakeholders and the public to discuss issues around education. These are often convened by the Ministry of Education both at the county and district (sub-county) level and sometimes even at school. Discussions in these forums, however, do not generally go beyond announcing the position of the district in the national exam rankings and rewarding the best performers. This is typical of supposedly inclusive spaces at local level: there are concerns about agenda setting, public participation, follow-up, genuine commitment, effectiveness, political will to implement resolutions and balance of power.

At the very local community/village level, authorities and citizens *do* come together to discuss issues related to community development, but whether this includes education depends on the individual interest of the chief and whether there are good working relationships between the head teacher, other teachers and local education officials. However, public agency in education is also complicated by the power structures at the local level that make it difficult for school and community authorities to be mutually accountable to one another.

Issue 3: What are the barriers to working together?

There are many issues around the way in which citizens and their representatives and organisations can come together to co-create solutions to major community problems with government. Although these processes are often in-built into decision-making processes and systems, they often do not work.

- There are no systematic channels for sharing information across the offices of key actors, and much of what sharing there is depends on the personality and proactivity of key individuals. For example, a head teacher could be aware of children who are not attending school regularly but not pass this information on to the chief.
- For parents, they believe that speaking out leads to victimisation of their children and that school heads have formed a cartel so that if a parent upsets one of them, then s/he will be blacklisted in the whole area. They keep quiet to give their children a more secure position in school. As such, though they may know about teachers missing lessons or missing school completely, they feel powerless to act.
- While there are clear guidelines on who and how the School Board of Management (known as BoMs; formerly School Board) should be constituted, there is anecdotal evidence that the head teachers usually exert strong influence on the choice of committee members, who often back the head teachers after they are elected.
- In some places, there is concern about the calibre of membership to the BoMs with some places finding it difficult to raise the numbers required to sit in these committees. This has compromised the quality of engagement in these forums, their ability to provide oversight and to hold head teachers and teachers accountable.
- The management of the school committee meetings with parents is also considered top-down, one-way and not well structured to facilitate constructive dialogue or to provide room for enhancing accountability. Female parents are the most engaged in these meetings, yet many have low literacy levels and socio-cultural norms inhibit their ability to challenge head teachers (who are often male).
- There is poor connection between school authorities and the community. Teachers and head teachers are rarely locals and often reside away from the community, hence don't attend or participate in community public meetings such as chiefs' barazas
- Currently, teachers and head teachers are seen only as powerful within the school setting while the chiefs are powerful at the community. It would appear that there is a culture where nobody wants to get involved – to interfere – with what the other does. This attitude of self-preservation appears to be both by default and design. There are those who want it that way to escape accountability but there are also those who genuinely believe it is not their position to interfere in the responsibilities of others.

Issue 4: Did we execute as planned?

It is also important to reflect on the project design against what was successfully delivered. In sum, most of the project components and activities were delivered as planned.

Team structure: As planned, there were different levels of coordination of the *Husika* project. At the apex (County level) the Twaweza partners were the overall coordinators managing nine people (sub-county coordinators and ward monitors) at lower levels. We had one sub-county coordinator for all the sub-counties selected whose primary role was to coordinate engagements at the sub-county, and to connect the local actors and key education stakeholders with the project team. The monitors worked at the ward level, in charge of carrying out monitoring and spot checks in three schools. The team structure worked as per plan. However, we later realised that the sub-county coordinator layer was not necessarily very useful as it was not easy for them to engage at sub-county level as the structures are less developed than at county and community levels.

Coordination at school: The initiative was led by the head teachers, with assistance from the *Husika* teacher (elected by other teachers). The class MPs completed a diary on a daily basis and then shared it with the *Husika* teacher who would combine all entries and send the data to Twaweza through the KoboCollect platform. The *Husika* teachers were also supposed to update a graph on the school notice board to indicate the trends of both teacher and pupil attendance. The *Husika* teacher reported regularly to the head teacher but also convened special meetings to discuss the issue of attendance or used staff meetings/briefings to report about *Husika*.

The coordination largely worked as per plan. However, we had originally envisioned making use of the post of school president but this was not possible as they were on the campaign trail while *Husika* was being piloted. In addition we could not make use of school cabinet meetings as engagement fora since they are not as well established or entrenched as expected.

At community level: The *Husika* monitor (ward level) was to collect information on absenteeism and the whole *Husika* process and share with the chief, who will in turn ask for a meeting with the head teacher to follow up and will ensure that the issue forms part of the agenda in his/her public meetings with the community.

The connection between the head teacher and the chiefs/ assistant chiefs remain the weakest aspect of the *Husika* project. While there were reports and evidence that the issue of absenteeism got more prominence in community discussions and that it featured prominently in the public meetings as a result of the initiative, not very much can be said about how the chiefs engaged with the data from the schools within their communities.

Data collection: Data was collected initially for three weeks in the last school term of 2016: the *Husika* teachers would compile data that the class monitor collected. This proved problematic as the program was just beginning and there were many errors. The next phase of data collection took place in the first term of 2017 for ten consecutive weeks. There were initially many challenges, especially in the first five weeks when the teachers were getting used to the technology, but this improved over time. By the end we were able to get weekly data that showed some clear attendance trends across the different schools. We were able to witness trends that pointed to an improvement in some schools while for others there were fluctuations owing to various school activities such as sports weeks, or indicative of a lack of school feeding programs. Ten weeks were enough to be able to clearly conclude that the program was having effects.

Data utilisation: It was envisaged that with the weekly data, the teachers and monitors would convene conversations at school and community level to help people discuss and suggest solutions. We saw this work in some schools where the head teachers took up the responsibility of routinely making use of staff meetings to discuss what the data were showing. In some cases, the head teachers even invited parents to come and talk about pupil absenteeism. We also noted that even in cases where there were no distinct meetings on *Husika*, the *Husika* data were used in general staff meetings to highlight the issue and seek explanations from call and class teachers. We also noted a number of actions and internal guidelines developed to respond to the data. For example, in one school teachers and parents made a pact not to let children stay home because of parents'

inability to pay school levies. Instead parents themselves would choose a date by which they were able to pay and their children would continue to attend school in the interim. In other schools, we saw teachers come up with firm guidelines to ensure they arranged for other teachers to utilise their lesson plans in their absence to ensure children do not miss a lesson when the subject teacher is away.

Convening conversations: The whole essence of collecting data was to create evidence that would help key actors discuss and seek solutions on the issue of absenteeism. This happened in some places and not in others. In places where it worked, the head teachers and the *Husika* teachers were positive about the idea and were self-driven and owned the initiative.

However, we noted very little utilisation of data at community level. This was attributed to the lack of engagement from most chiefs with the data and the infrequency of parent-teacher meetings, which only occurred once, or at most twice, a term.

Recognition and rewards: The *Husika* teachers were issued with smart phones which they could keep at the end of the project, the class monitors were given a wrist watch which helped them in monitoring time but that was also theirs to keep. Otherwise, the recognition and awards component that was not implemented at all. The main reason for this was the short timeframe of the initiative. We also struggled with the type of reward that would be most appropriate, generally acceptable but also sustainable in terms of the available resources and in view of the desire to go to scale.

Issue 5: Did we succeed?

The pilot ran for 10 weeks (one term). The original design envisaged at least two school terms to give the initiative a chance to be established, and to allow for adjusting the design as needed after the first term. Indeed, the internal evaluation noted that at least one full school year would really be needed to understand fully whether the initiative has potential or not.

From the experiences during implementation and the final evaluation, it is apparent (as expected) the level of traction for *Husika* differed from community to community and school to school. *Husika* has had more gains at the school level, and less in the outside school spaces. Even within schools, the effects were not uniform. We were therefore able to place the various schools in three different categories: schools where the *Husika* experiment was successful, those where it had some effects but it was not easy to trace the utilisation of data, and schools where *Husika* failed to take-off.

- **CATEGORY 1 – Where *Husika* was successful (about 40% of the schools):** This category of schools and communities is characterised by vibrant engagement with the initiative by head teachers, teachers and pupils and to a large extent parents and the local administration as well. In these schools, *Husika* fostered relatively strong local connections, characterised by frequent meetings between the *Husika* teachers, other teachers and class MPs, and much more frequent interactions between the chiefs and the head teachers. In a few places, locally-bred solutions to helping curb absenteeism emerged. In one school, teachers and parents agreed to end the practice of suspending pupils until parents are able to pay school levies. We also noted some schools in which head teachers extended the initiative to other streams and classes not initially selected for the pilot. But even in schools where the initiative was successful, the connections between school and the community remained weak or non-existent. Only in a few cases did we see chiefs proactively reaching out to the head teachers to address any cases of frequent absenteeism.
- **CATEGORY 2 – Where *Husika* picked up partially (about 30% of the schools):** In these schools, our assessment is that the *Husika* idea was embraced, but there were operational gaps or inactive project

leaders. In these schools, *Husika* may have had some effect although it is not easy to trace any utilisation of the data generated from the schools. There were signs that *Husika* might have fostered some local connections, but there were only infrequent meetings between the *Husika* teachers, the teachers and class MPs. In addition, the issue of absenteeism was featured in school meetings but it was hard to decipher whether the project triggered any actions or engagements beyond previously established practices. Some of these schools were also disadvantaged by teacher transfers compelling the project team to retrain new people within the limited timeframe for the project. In some cases, the teacher selected to champion the initiative was perceived to be too close to the head teacher, so some teachers feared the data would be used beyond the aims of the project, to “fix them”.

- **CATEGORY 3 – Where *Husika* failed to kick off (about 30% of the schools):** Lastly, there are schools where *Husika* was launched but remained largely invisible. In these schools, we suspect that teachers might have been opposed to the fundamental principle of pupils monitoring them. In these schools, the selected *Husika* teacher was either not proactive or was not supported by the head teacher. In some communities, the chief was completely removed from education issues in the area and so teachers and the monitors never believed that engaging them would yield much. In addition, Tiaty (sub-county in Baringo) experienced severe ethnic classes in the project period which hindered education provision more generally as well as *Husika* activities; about half the schools in this category are from Tiaty.



Key conclusions, discussions and recommendations

The project revealed the following issues which merit attention when developing future interventions:

- Most actors at the community level (teachers, parents and local leaders) felt that absenteeism of pupils was a problem. They pointed to lack of food (hunger) and water as the top two major factors responsible for pupils' absence from school.
- On the other hand, community actors do not think teacher absenteeism is a problem. However, this assertion differs from other empirical sources which actually show that teacher absenteeism is rampant in these regions. It appears that both parents and teachers are afraid to acknowledge this as a problem: teachers for fear of repercussions and parents for fear of their children being victimised in school.

As discussed earlier, there were some indications of an improvement in attendance in some schools and wards cumulatively over the 10 weeks of monitoring. The project followed up and received explanations in cases where there was either extremely high or low attendance. It is however difficult to conclusively state that *Husika* improved attendance. Among the key school and community actors, however, there was a general feeling that both pupil and teacher attendance had improved in the period between January and March 2017. As for teacher attendance, they are of the opinion that *Husika* likely played a role in the improvement of teacher attendance, although at the same time the Teachers Service Commission was also stepping up its monitoring program – and therefore it is not possible to untangle the effect of one from the other.

The duration of the project was too short to allow tracking of any intermediate effects. It did, however, help in revealing how and where the concept of public agency can be successful in shaping practice that leads to the improvement of education in general but also for the particular issues of teacher and pupil absenteeism:

- Many formal structures and spaces already exist that ideally should generate and nurture public agency. But these spaces are largely controlled with directives from above and so do not fulfil this function. Strengthening these spaces through infusion of evidence and proper moderation can catalyse meaningful discussions and, perhaps in the long run, greater public agency.
- To inspire and motivate citizens and authorities to get involved, the issue selected needs to be a felt need for the community and local elites and leaders. Alternatively, a strong link needs to be established between the issue and community priorities.
- Seeking the perspectives of all key actors that will be involved at an early stage is critical in gaining entry and mobilising participation. The scoping and consultative interactions with key education managers and players was a major contributing factor to the successes in this case.
- Strengthening the links between the school and the community creates more awareness and focus on an issue that is often under-addressed. This has the potential to change norms and practices.
- Amplifying the principle of mutual accountability can be more effective in spurring engagement in education rather than the current default of apportioning blame which tends to make key stakeholders defensive and critical of each other.
- For public agency in education to thrive, there must be a linkage between the mainstream education managers (teachers, education officials) and public administration (chiefs, their assistants) so that they work in the spirit of complementarity rather than in silos.
- There could be power in scale. We realised engaging with community leaders is difficult when you are working in patches of their geographical coverage. Working with all schools in a ward concurrently, for example, would attract greater attention from the chief. Similarly, if you want to enlist the County Director of Education and the County Commissioner, you would need to have good geographical coverage and spread across the County. Through this, you would also be able to address emerging concerns about bias and be able to engage more fully at community level.

Since the pilot was carried out in a short time (10 weeks), it is difficult to assess with any certainty whether it contributed to any intermediate outcomes or indeed whether the pilot led to an increase in pupil and teacher attendance. However, there is evidence pointing to the fact that the *Husika* initiative achieved the following:

- First, it catalysed teacher attendance and hence pupil attendance: “Because there will be teachers in all lessons, I have to attend as my absence will be easily noticed or I will lose a lot by just missing one day”.
- Second, it led to classroom peer effects where pupils did not want to be marked absent. An attitude of “I don’t want to let my team down” was observed.
- Lastly, it enlightened parents on the importance of ensuring regular school attendance and helped bring the issue to the fore of school meetings and public discussions.

While most actors were of the view that the initiative was useful, they expressed the feeling that the time allowed for the pilot was inadequate. The initiative was implemented within a span of one term (four months) and at a time of prolonged drought, making community (parental) engagement difficult. As a result, nearly all schools/communities and indeed the *Husika* team felt that the initiative should continue, subject to certain changes in light of the challenges experienced. The table below provides a summary of these proposed changes.

Table 1: Recommendations and Proposed Changes

	Issue	Change/Recommendation	Note
1.	Export of data causes unnecessary anxiety among teachers	Build capacity for <i>Husika</i> teacher and <i>Husika</i> Monitor to collate and analyse data for local consumption – they can plot graphs for the staffroom and Assistant Chief’s office respectively. The phone remains as an incentive and as a communication device – may be applied at monitoring study	The evidence culture at community level is critical to <i>Husika</i> , and we need to do away with the initial format of “clearing and forwarding” of data.
2.	We lacked any strategy for energising pupil agency	Teacher shares analysis with School President. President tables results on school attendance progress with cabinet for regular discussions. We need a reporting format for in-school sharing	We need also orientation of all pupils to understand what this is all about, and the aim that we need to reach together, especially clarifying their roles. But the school must have created an enabling environment for school government to thrive, otherwise this will not work
3.	The monitor should be more closely linked to the school	Adopt a new qualification framework for <i>Husika</i> partners. Change the <i>Husika</i> (ward) monitor to <i>Husika</i> Volunteer, for each village. Complete the TORs for volunteer, conduct new recruitment (at least in some places) and implement this shift	Redefine standards, communicate to current monitors and recruit where we will have gaps.

4.	The sub-county coordinators add no value	Do away with the Sub-County Coordinators (SCC) structure. Instead, revise the roles of the county partner, to ensure that all sub-county officials are involved and periodically briefed	Limiting the <i>Husika</i> Volunteer to one village helps minimise chances of being overwhelmed by the complexities of working in diverse community setups.
5.	The participation of Twaweza staff in all major activities has been useful for learning, but moving forward, we must now adopt the Uwezo cascade model for cost-reduction and scalability	During the second term, test the cascade recruitment and training models and just monitor this through calls to various persons and record-keeping to answer the question: can it work without us?	Have a model where each of us has few schools to follow up with, but use cascade model and see how it works
6.	<i>Husika</i> has potential to extend to other schools, and we could use current schools as resource centres to serve the expansion agenda	Provide more diaries to the schools with a call to action: “you could share with other schools, or help them start <i>Husika</i> ”. We can see if anything happened through this invitational approach by end of term.	We should not scale up yet, this year, partly due to funding limitations, but also to allow these model adjustments to be tested
7.	In many places, we did not get the right teacher to serve as the <i>Husika</i> teacher	Rule out deputy head teachers, because they represent the Teacher Services Commission and can cause confusion on whether <i>Husika</i> also represents TSC. Urge the head teacher to allow teachers to nominate the teacher, given the criteria. Preferably, this teacher will be among the Standard 4-7 class teachers for overall harmony	In one school, the deputy was a <i>Husika</i> teacher and was very good. We also run the risk of teachers nominating a popular character who may also not be effective. We can be open with the head teacher, now that we have experience, and just give this as guideline, but also leave it a bit open.
8.	The connection between schools and communities is weak	Integrate Assistant Chief as core player. Involve them in assessment, hold an initial core team meeting with Volunteer, Assistant Chief, Head Teacher and <i>Husika</i> teacher to agree on modalities of sharing the school and community data. <i>Husika</i> Volunteer serves as constant link to Assistant Chief, including plotting of graph hanging in the local office (note, we propose Assistant Chief, and not Village elder (due to capacity gap) and Chief (who are often too far).	We made a mistake by meeting the head teacher/teachers, and chief/assistant separately, so the connection never worked. This will be useful add-on: “we are in this together”. At induction however, respect protocol – inform the Chief and make them feel in-charge. Maintain <i>Husika</i> Volunteer as the cord that binds.
11.	The materials are costly, and may hinder the initiative going to scale	Remove carbon copy on <i>Husika</i> time diary, print at offset, and print all-term version that can be used in any term in case of excess (no year/month)	Provide space to write the year/term

12.	Rather than pay participants, sustain motivation through an incentive structure	Print certificates for Assistant Chiefs and schools/teachers who do well at year end. Effective schools and teachers can be documented and given space in the Kenya Primary School Head Teachers' Association newsletter. We can also sponsor effective <i>Husika</i> teachers to come to KEPSHA conferences to share their stories. Engage sub-county commissioners to put pressure from above and give legitimacy for Chief/assistant to act. Share Uwezo stories with participating schools, and geometrical sets/watches with MPs who are doing well, but look into how each school can reward the 'best attending teacher' and 'best attending class' at the end of the year'.	<p><i>Husika</i> volunteer – cheaper smart-phone; certificate at year end; Mpesa credit worth 1000 per month</p> <p><i>Husika</i> teacher – Infinix phone; airtime worth 500 per month; may be selected to present at KEPSHA conference</p> <p>Assistant Chiefs: Airtime of 500</p> <p>MPs: Watches (KES 200); check quality – buy centrally</p> <p>Classes/teachers: Certificates issued by chief</p>
13.	Clarity on <i>Husika</i> outcomes	Articulate clearly a concrete target outcome, in a way that this can be measured. The outcome is citizens and local leaders acting together to resolve an issue of concern. Increase in contact and the expansion of the social space to act together is the outcome that <i>Husika</i> pursues. What we theorise, is that an issue is important in generating the energy to act together.	