



Uwezo Regional Monitoring Framework & Plan Final Version 2013



Uwezo Regional Monitoring Framework & Plan

Final Version 2013

Introduction

The outline of this plan consists of the following sections:

Section 1: Uwezo theory of change, monitoring vs. evaluating

Section 2: Narrative of the framework

Section 3: Tentative tasks and timeline

Annex 1: Details of monitoring of the assessment

Annex2: Details of communications monitoring

This framework is based on discussions between LME Unit and Uwezo Regional Office in December 2012, and subsequent discussions with the Hewlett foundation and CIFF (main donors and vested partners) in January 2013. Further revisions to this framework are expected in particular during Q1 2013.

Section 1: Uwezo theory of change, monitoring vs. evaluating

The proposed monitoring framework will endeavor to gather evidence on the following two questions relevant to the strategy of Uwezo:

1. Is there evidence that, at least in the short-term, Uwezo assessment has an effect on parents of assessed children, and on the communities in which the assessment takes place? (These effects are to be measured in terms of what parents know about their child's learning levels, the messages around supporting/encouraging learning, and involvement in school; and in terms of the community dialogue on learning). In other words, does the large effort of Uwezo testing contribute to change at household and community level?
2. Is there evidence that the communication of Uwezo results has had an influence on the national-level discussions on education and learning? Or, at the regional/district levels? E.g., use/citation of findings, discussions about priorities in education and therefore where/how to allocate funding, etc.
 - a. Simultaneously, the strength and focus of the Uwezo communications strategy and roll-out needs to be assessed. This is to inform the findings: that is, if we find limited effect, is that because the communications strategy has not been implemented, or because it is not effective?

This proposed monitoring framework complements the currently ongoing quantitative evaluation of Uwezo (Lieberman, Posner, Tsai). The LPT evaluation aims to assess whether the overall Uwezo approach (the Uwezo theory of change) has had the desired impact – particularly as shown by children's learning levels (and also by more proximal indicators/evidence, such as parental involvement in their children's learning). It is an experimental design measuring long-term outcomes at the level of children and households. In contrast, the monitoring framework aims to track and describe the Uwezo interventions (assessment and communications), as well as examine through quantitative and qualitative methods the engagement with the Uwezo goals at household and community levels, as well as regional and national (policy-setting) levels.

The specific objectives of monitoring activities are to:

- a) Track, describe and assess whether both the assessment and communication activities undertaken by Uwezo are designed and implemented according to plan.
- b) Assess whether there is coverage of and engagement with Uwezo communication activities and products by the target audiences, and
- c) Assess whether there is evidence of short-term effects among targeted citizens (i.e., precursors to citizen action; or even citizen action); and to assess whether there is evidence of short-term effects at district and national-level.

In order to achieve the monitoring objectives, a number of different processes are to be put in place, including a variety of different processes and tools. Table 1 outlines these processes and overview of tools, organized by monitoring component. Note that although a number of reports are listed, some of them are brief summaries, while others, more substantive, will combine several components into one report. The idea is to produce a few succinct reports that will be useful in the next planning / strategizing phase of Uwezo.

Table 1: Broad outline of framework components:

Component	Methods & tools	Envisioned product
1. Monitoring (quality assurance) of the assessment	Quantitative and qualitative tools developed to monitor the quality of each step of the assessment	- Annual report per country + 1 regional report, summarizing the quality of the assessment procedures
2. Monitoring of the distribution of communication outputs (materials as well as media products)	- Sales Force (and preceding its total uptake, specific quantitative tools) - Media monitoring (3 rd party contracted and internal)	- Quarterly brief reports per country summarizing outputs (using Sales Force and media monitoring results); combined with point 3 below
3. Monitoring of quality of communication materials and products	- Media monitoring: 3 rd party (agency), and possibly internal - Pre-testing of products	- Quarterly brief reports per country based on internal monitoring; combined with point 2 above
4. Monitoring the coverage of communication materials and products	- Quantitative survey instrument (likely to be LQAS) - Community-level monitoring (through volunteers) - District-level monitoring (ref. 5b, below)	- Brief report on the results of LQAS survey - Annual report per country combining results from monitoring effects, as per point 5, below
5. Monitoring of effects:		
a. At "top" level (MoE, other national-level key actors)	- Qualitative instrument & process (e.g., semi-structured interviews) - Possibly a systems-analysis (in case that education policy is reviewed/reformed; this would include district-level assessment as well)	- Mid-year brief summary - Annual report per country (combined with annual report listed in number 4, above)
b. At district-level (district education officers/local government)	- Selection of districts; qualitative instrument & process (e.g., semi-structured interviews); combined with coverage monitoring (point 4)	- Mid-year brief summary - Annual report per country (combined with annual report listed in number 4, above)
c. At community-level (among parents, teachers, community elders/leaders)	- Purposive selection of communities; qualitative research at community level (combined with monitoring coverage, point 4)	- Annual report per country (combined with annual report listed in number 4, above)

Section 2: Narrative of framework: Monitoring the presence and effects of Uwezo

1. Describe and quantify the process and quality of the national assessment (Annex 1 provides details of the tools & processes)
2. Track distribution and assess quality of communication materials:
 - a. Distribution tracked through Sales Force; include specifying outcomes, target audiences, geo-coding, time span
 - b. Quality assessed by pre-testing materials; possibly also during community-level assessments
3. Track distribution and quality of communication products (media products):
 - a. Distribution to be monitored through Sales Force, but also through independent media monitoring (for 3 selected months);
 - b. Quality (specifically of the radio components) to be monitored through district coordinators and perhaps volunteers; possibly also during community-level assessments. If possible, all communication products are to be pre-tested.
4. Assess coverage of materials, products, and presence of short-term effects among Uwezo-assessed households: decision was taken that coverage would not be measured at national-level (i.e., within a representative sample of HH assessed and not-assessed by Uwezo). It was felt that first we ought to know whether there is any traction/effect of the Uwezo communication activities and products among households that have been assessed (and that currently, the presence of Uwezo at broader national level is limited to the radio communications). Therefore:
 - a. Coverage will focus on HH which have undergone Uwezo assessment round 4
 - b. It will be a statistically-representative sample of selection of districts, using an innovative technique to keep sample sizes small (LQAS)
 - c. It will focus on (1) presence of Uwezo materials in households and communities; (2) recall of Uwezo communication materials and media products; (3) knowledge/awareness among parents on few selected issues related to Uwezo goals (e.g., do parents know the learning levels of their children; do they feel it is within their interest and power to intervene with the school to improve learning, etc)
 - d. Advantage of LQAS is small sample sizes, but the disadvantage is that precise point-estimates on any indicator cannot be made. Instead, LQAS gives an estimate on whether a certain pre-determined quality threshold has been reached for each sampled area (e.g., whether at least 50% of parents sampled household know their child's learning levels).
 - e. (NOTE: there is no reason other than cost that this exercise could not be carried out also among non-assessed households, for a comparison group. While we would not expect to get much engagement with Uwezo materials in the comparison group, it would be insightful to see whether parents in assessed communities are in fact more knowledgeable about their children's learning levels as compared to parents in non-assessed communities)
5. Community-level monitoring, consisting of:
 - a. Selection of 1-2 communities in each of the 20 regions corresponding to the regional coordinators (selection criteria & methodology to be decided). The aim of this exercise is to understand the resonance of Uwezo products and messages at community level and in discussion with the main stakeholders in education at this level (parents, teachers, community leaders). It is designed to be a primarily qualitative exercise.
 - b. Primary method is community-level discussions involving leaders/elders, parents, teachers and head teachers. The mix of respondents is deliberate to foster a sense of a joint (community) issue. The discussions to focus on:
 - i. Learning levels among children and other Uwezo goals (including action that parents and teachers can take)
 - ii. Uwezo communication through media (recall/engagement with SMS, radio, TV, etc)

- iii. Engagement with Uwezo materials (consider whether this discussion can also be done with children/young people)
 - c. There will also be simple checks on Uwezo materials present in the community. This is independent of the qualitative component, and can be conducted by Uwezo volunteers prior to the community discussions. It would consist of the volunteers checking whether Uwezo materials are available/ visible in key locations, e.g., schools (not households).
- 6. Local governments at district and/or regional level: (assuming there is a substantial effort in place to reach this level with Uwezo messages) this will be monitored through a mixed-method exercise. The exercise will consist of a systematic or purposive selection of districts in which the following are assessed (primarily qualitatively):
 - a. Presence (coverage) of Uwezo materials
 - b. Recall/engagement with Uwezo materials and communication products
 - c. Engagement with the goals (i.e., promotion of learning outcomes)
- 7. “Top level” – MoE, MPs, celebrities, etc. This is likely to be a targeted, qualitative, descriptive assessment. It is less important to count how many Uwezo reports/booklets, etc, were distributed at this level; instead, it is to describe and trace any effects of Uwezo in national-level discussions. If the engagement – and response – at this level has largely been through motivated/interested individuals, then these discrete stories will be documented. If on the other hand there has been a systemic approach by Uwezo to target this level (whether it resulted in actual change within the MoE or not), then a more in-depth case study approach might be warranted. In this case, the case study methodology (as used, for example, by the International Budget Partnership, and Oxfam) will be adapted.

Additional human resources (consultants) are envisioned for the following tasks:

1. Quantitative (LQAS) survey (Jan – May 2013)
2. Community-based monitoring (May – August 2013)
3. Monitoring at district-level, and at national level (one round, mid-year; possibly 2nd round end of year)
4. Note that a consultant was not brought on board to assist with the development of the assessment monitoring. The responsibility for this fell to the Monitoring officer in the Uwezo Regional Office.

Identified gaps in current draft of framework:

1. This current write-up does not reflect how Uwezo communication has, and can in the future, strategically use Twaweza’s established partnerships with media/other communication channels. This is a gap that will be addressed in Q1 2013 (e.g., actively seeking a space for Uwezo within the media framework agreements that Twaweza has with large media houses). It is to be noted that some links have already been established between “alternative” media – such as WTS/Shujaaz – and Uwezo, and that future communication strategies ought to further develop these. Monitoring of outputs resulting from such partnerships will be included into the Uwezo monitoring plan.
2. It is to be revised whether monitoring at district and/or regional levels (with education officers) and monitoring at national level (among governmental and other key actors) merits to be done twice per year. Decision on this to be taken in Q1 2013.
3. It was agreed between Uwezo RO and LME manager during the 19 December meeting that a retroactive tracking/monitoring of Uwezo communication materials and products would be conducted (at least) for the period June – December 2012. This activity will be spearheaded by the RO Communications Intern (Hannah-May Wilson), using and building upon current records kept by Uwezo country offices. It was discussed that while a substantial amount of data on these indicators probably exists, it has not been systematically collected and aggregated at the country and/or regional level. This activity will inform both (a) the feasibility/usefulness of indicators to be created

within the Sales Force system through which this kind of monitoring will be done in the future, and (b) the Uwezo communications strategy for 2013 and beyond. Furthermore, this monitoring will be carried out prospectively in 2013, until the Sales Force system is operationalized, at which point the monitoring will be done in the SF platform.

4. The LQAS survey is currently envisioned as a post-assessment tool, whose main purpose is to establish recall of Uwezo among parents in assessed households (including recall of materials and messages, and engagement with the Uwezo goals – in essence, looking for short-term effects of the post-assessment communication). We could consider a comparison group – i.e., assessing some of the same indicators among parents whose children have not been assessed, as this might give a more insightful context (comparison) to the assessed group – particularly keeping in mind that some of the baseline (as reported in LPT) indicators were quite high (e.g., over 80% of parents reported having recently gone to the school for a meeting).
 - 4.1. Note that the design of this must be discussed with LPT team, to ensure it does not hinder their evaluation activity. If possible, complementarities between the approaches ought to be sought.
5. The community-based monitoring will include an assessment of the “citizen information-action” chain developed by LPT: examining its relevance in the East African settings, and using it to assess (a) where in the communication chain is Uwezo most effective; (b) where in the communication chain do most bottlenecks/break-downs occur, and (c) in the analysis, matching (a) and (b) in order to get deeper insight into the Uwezo strategy and its effectiveness.
 - 5.1. Note that the design of this must be discussed with LPT team, to build on complementarities between this monitoring and the evaluation activity.
6. The engagement of assessment volunteers and district coordinators in monitoring is not yet adequately reflected in this framework. Currently, it is envisioned the volunteers & coordinators could play an important role in the following:
 - 6.1. Media monitoring (e.g., listening to radio broadcasts sponsored by Uwezo and capturing indicators of quality)
 - 6.2. The LQAS post-assessment survey (in data collection/fieldwork)
 - 6.3. The community-level assessments (in quantitative spot-checks, but also in the qualitative assessment)
 - 6.4. The monitoring framework is based on current communication plans/activities which are largely limited to assessed households and communities (with the exception of radio broadcasts, which have a wider reach). There is a need to develop “experiments” which would answer the question how can information related to learning levels more effectively be spread to a wider population. This may be outside of the scope of monitoring, but this point was raised with Uwezo regional staff in discussions. Additional note (as of Feb 2013): Twaweza partnership with Georgetown University will attempt to answer these questions through experimental design research in Kenya (and possibly also Uganda). It will not be specifically based on Uwezo materials and interventions, but the findings are expected to be very relevant to Uwezo.

Section 3: Tentative tasks and timeline:

Task/process	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
1. Agreement upon the outline of the overall monitoring framework	X												
2. Development & agreement of specific sub-components of the framework		X											
3. Media monitoring and quarterly reports: internally, as well as selected 3 months through an external media monitoring agency (internal media monitoring to rely on assessment volunteers & coordinators, strategy to be developed)				X			X			X			X
4. Development/revision of tools for monitoring the assessment (may be internal or via consultant; if consultant needs to be recruited in Jan 2013)		X	X										
5. Compilation of monitoring data from the Kenya assessment, preparation of a monitoring report				X	X	X	X	X					
6. Compilation of monitoring data from the TZ and UG assessments, preparation of a monitoring report					X	X	X	X	X				
7. Post-assessment monitoring of short-term effects: identification and recruitment of a consultant for LQAS survey, pre-testing and carrying out the LQAS survey method (in TZ and UG)		X	X	X	X	X							
8. Report based on LQAS survey							X						
9. Retroactive monitoring (tracking) of Uwezo communication materials (Jun-Dec 2012); and prospective Jan 2013-onwards, until adoption of Sales Force (see next point)		X	X	X									
10. Adoption of the Sales Force system and its link to monitoring communication outputs				X	X								
11. Compilation of quarterly reports from Sales Force data/records							X			X			X
12. Development and pre-testing of a mixed-method approach to monitor at district level: coverage of Uwezo materials; engagement with Uwezo goals (may be via consultant)					X	X	X						
13. Mid-year monitoring & report to describe engagement with Uwezo materials & goals at district-level								X					
14. Development and pre-testing of qualitative monitoring tools for tracking engagement with Uwezo goals among national-level key actors (may be via consultant; same as 11 above)					X	X	X						

Task/process	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
15. Mid-year monitoring report of engagement with Uwezo goals among national-level key actors								X					
16. Monitoring presence of Uwezo and engagement with Uwezo goals at community-level (primarily qualitative); requires identification and recruitment of a high-level consultant to develop tools & pre-test them, oversee data collection, do analysis & produce report. Covers KE, TZ and UG.						X	X	X	X	X			
17. End-year compilation of Sales Force data/report												X	X
18. 2 nd round of mixed-method approach to monitor at district level: coverage of Uwezo materials; engagement with Uwezo goals (via consultant)											X	X	
19. End-year report from district level: coverage of Uwezo materials; engagement with Uwezo goals (may be via consultant)													X
20. 2 nd round of qualitative monitoring tools for tracking engagement with Uwezo goals among national-level key actors (may be via consultant)											X	X	
21. End-year monitoring report of engagement with Uwezo goals among national-level key actors													X

**UWEZO EAST AFRICA
ASSESSMENT MONITORING
(February 2013; prepared by Uwezo Regional Office)**

The Process	The main purpose of monitoring	Core Indicators	The proposed methods	Tools	Whose expertise	Timeline
PROCESS DEVELOPMENT						
Sampling of enumeration areas	1.To ensure appropriate sampling as per the Uwezo design (PPS, weights, panel)	-Sampling note submitted	-Looking through the sampled EAs of previous years to ensure that current sampling is rotational and captures the Uwezo standards		-The bureaus of statistics, working with Uwazi, Uwezo data center manager, and Uwezo data consultant	August/September
Test Development	1.To ensure that tests meet the Uwezo standards and adhere to test development frameworks	1. Number of tests developed 2. Number of pre-tests undertaken	-Test tracking tool filled after each pre-test -Full district pilot	-Test Tracking tool -Survey tool	-Country offices -The Uwezo regional office	September-October
Partner Recruitment	1.To ensure that partners who meet the stipulated criteria are recruited at district level	-Number of partners recruited -Number of partners retained from previous years	-Analysis of records -Visits to prospective partners	-Partners assessment tool	- Country Secretariat	July/August
Volunteer Recruitment and household listing	1.To ensure the right caliber of volunteers are recruited to collect data in the villages	-Number of volunteers recruited -Number of household lists submitted	- Field monitoring of a sample of Enumeration areas -Monitoring district coordinator feedback during regional trainings	1.Pre-assessment tool	-Country secretariat, regional coordinators,	Dec to Jan
TRAINING						
Trainers Workshop	-To introduce trainers to the training manual and the tools. -To review the training manual for adaptability.	Number of trainers in the pool of trainers confident with tools and manual	Uwezo Key facilitators guide the process	Trainers workshop Evaluation form	Trainers and the secretariat	November
National Training	-To serve as the first comprehensive Training of trainers in order to prepare district coordinators for village level processes -To inculcate in trainers the core	- The number of district coordinators who understand varied pre-assessment roles	-Quizzes during the training	1.Responses on quizzes tabulated 2.Training evaluation form	-Country office, regional office	November to January

The Process	The main purpose of monitoring	Core Indicators	The proposed methods	Tools	Whose expertise	Timeline
	values that Uwezo is hinged upon					
Regional Trainings	1.To serve as the second ToT with focus on the testing process 2.To share pre-assessment process information	-Number of district coordinators who understand how to conduct actual assessment -Number of districts with volunteer names and complete household lists.	-Quizzes to rate training ability of district coordinators.	-Training Evaluation Form	Regional coordinators, secretariat	January - February
Volunteer Trainings	-To ensure that trainings are professional, run according to the timetable, and volunteers are clear on tasks	- Number of volunteers attending training	-Role plays, practical sessions in household and school	-Training evaluation form	Regional Coordinators, Master Trainers, Secretariat	January to March
DATA COLLECTION AND DATA PROCESSES						
Data collection	To ascertain the adherence to the various processes when conducting the assessment	- Number of survey booklets from districts - Reading booklets & other Uwezo materials left at HH	-Data collection in all enumeration areas across East Africa	1.Assessment monitoring tool	Senior volunteers, district coordinators, master trainers, regional trainers, East Africa Participants, Regional office	Jan-March
Process Recheck	To ascertain compliance to the Uwezo process	-Percentage of process compliance	-Field visit to 8 households in each enumeration area in four selected districts	-Process Recheck Tool	-Country secretariat, facilitators, master trainers and regional office	February to April
Re-survey	To test inter-rater reliability	-Percentage of reliability	Full district data collection in one district	Survey Booklet		
Data entry and analysis	To ensure data is entered accurately and by competent personnel	-Data entered and re-entered -Tables generated	-Date re-entry for every fourth household	-Data entry report for every 500? Booklets entered	-Data center manager	March to June

Annex 2: UWEZO EAST AFRICA: COMMUNICATIONS MONITORING (updated Feb 2013)

The main purpose of monitoring	Example of indicators	Proposed methods	Whose expertise
1. To assess <u>distribution</u> of communication materials and products			
1.1. Materials (printed materials, and any other) to be traced	- no. booklets distributed, by geography - no. materials targeting specific groups	- Pre-testing of materials with identified target audience(s), utilizing the pretests to improve products - Gathering the information from distribution chains. Requiring distributors to specify geographies – i.e., where specifically did the materials get delivered, what amount, and when. - Keeping track of the above in the communications monitoring log.	- Uwezo/Twaweza
1.2. Distribution of communication media messages through national, regional, sub-regional channels	- no. radio shows aired - no. messages/ products per target group	- Pre-testing of materials with identified target audience(s), utilizing the pretests to improve products - Gathering information from media partners. Requiring media partners to specify geographies of reach, target audiences, description of topic; keeping track of these in the comm monitoring log	- Uwezo/Twaweza
2. To assess <u>coverage</u>¹ of communication materials and products			
2.1. In Uwezo assessed communities	- % of adults (in specified groups) who own, have seen/heard Uwezo materials - no. of selected communities in which materials are prominent/present	- Quantitative LQAS survey. Could require contracting a survey firm (e.g., Ipsos). - Community-level and school-level monitoring in a selection of districts. A simple check on materials could be carried out through the Uwezo volunteers, using mobile phones for reporting	- Survey agency, consultant - Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant
2.2. At regional and/or district level (who? MoE officers?)	- no. or % of district officers who have received Uwezo materials	- Statistical or purposeful selection of districts, qualitative assessment by researcher (contracted or agency)	- Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant
2.3. At “top” levels of MoE, MPs, etc	- no. and type of “top level” people who have received Uwezo materials	- Selection of target audiences, qualitative assessment	- Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant
3. To track Uwezo in the media (media monitoring)	- no. and type of media pieces (print and broadcast) in which Uwezo is cited/quoted - analysis of quality of reporting on Uwezo	- Electronic media monitoring & analysis through 3 rd party (agency) - Qualitative monitoring of media quality undertaken by Uwezo volunteers & coordinators (relevant for radio shows in particular)	- Agency - Uwezo volunteers / coordinators

¹ Note that distribution and coverage are different. Distribution means following the product through its distribution chain. Coverage means assessing the reach of the products/materials from the point of view of the target audience. A product (e.g., booklet) could have been distributed appropriately, and yet at the same time its coverage can be very low.

The main purpose of monitoring	Example of indicators	Proposed methods	Whose expertise
4. To assess use/engagement with Uwezo materials and products			
4.1. Among parents in Uwezo-assessed communities	- % of adults (in specified groups) who have engaged with Uwezo materials	- LQAS is best-suited for coverage (estimating above/below a certain threshold). Could be used for recall, but not best suited to assess use/engagement with a product/material. - Additionally this will be assessed with a mixed-method approach through a community-level survey, in a sample of communities (see point 4 below)	- Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant - Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant / agency
4.2. At regional and/or district level (who? MoE officers?)	- no. or % of district officers who have engaged with Uwezo materials	As 2.2. above	
4.3. At “top” levels of MoE, MPs, etc	- no. & type of “top level” people who have engaged Uwezo materials, and a description of the engagement	- As 2.3. above - In the case that there has been systemic engagement in the MoE with Uwezo methods/materials/results, then an in-depth case study approach may be warranted.	- Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant
5. To understand/assess the engagement with Uwezo’s outcomes and goals			
5.1. Do parents, teachers & community leaders know their children’s learning levels; is there a sense of crisis/urgency; is there a sense that something can be done, and that parents & teachers can contribute; also: listening in particular to parents’ voices (in context also of the LPT chain)	- among selected communities, a description (qual) of how key stakeholders are engaging with the outcomes	- Recommend a selection of districts (e.g., since there are now 20 regional coordinators, one district could be chosen per region. In selected districts, select 1-2 communities (by either random or purposive sampling). Suggest conducting a qualitative community-wide assessment. Details in text below.	- Uwezo/Twaweza + consultant / agency
5.2. Do education officers at regional and/or district level know levels of learning in their district (as compared to other districts); sense of urgency; sense that something can be done at this level	- number of selected officers that engage with Uwezo goals; description of the engagement	- Selection of target audiences (could be systematic selection), qualitative assessment	As above
5.3. Do “top-level” people know about the assessment & results, is there a sense of urgency and can something be done and that they can contribute	- description of respondents who are knowledgeable on Uwezo results, description of the engagement with the issues	- Selection of target audiences, qualitative assessment	As above