Instructional coaching and literacy improvement at national scale

Lessons from Kenya’s Tusome Early Grade Reading Activity
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Tusome in Very Brief

Tusome Program Reach
• ~24,000 schools
• ~77,000 teachers
• ~5,600,000 students

Coaching
Gov’t schools:
  Curriculum Support Officers (CSOs)
Low-cost private schools:
  Instructional Coaches (ICs)

2017: ~140,000 obs records
Our Coaching, from 30,000 ft

**Volume** of observations is high

**Dosage** is comparatively low

**Coverage** needs improvement

**CSOs vs ICs**
- Coach-per-School ratio comparable (~17.5 to 1)
- Geography matters
- The principal-agent problem in action
Strategic Design Choices

Work within the system…
- Ministry of Education curriculum, management, schools
- Teacher Service Commission teachers, CSOs

...while trying to improve it.
- Address gaps between policy, practice (e.g., coaching $)
- Bring definition and structure
- Ensure consistency

New, but not too new
- Do not create, rearrange zones
- Align with CSOs’ existing JDs
Carrots and Sticks – Transportation Reimbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th># Schools</th>
<th># Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>4 – 59</td>
<td>15 – 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICs</td>
<td>13 – 20</td>
<td>39 – 123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Formula for per-coach target</th>
<th>Maximum reimbursement for 100% of target observations</th>
<th>‘Price’ per observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CSOs | \(1 \times \text{lesser of } 45 \text{ or } \text{tchr}_\text{ct}\) | \(12000 \text{ kes} = \$120\) | Min: \$2.67 (45 tchrs)  
Max: \$8.00 (15 tchrs) |
| ICs  | \(2 \times \text{lesser of } 45 \text{ or } \text{tchr}_\text{ct}\) | \(8000 \text{ kes} = \$80\) | Min: \$0.89 (45 tchrs * 2)  
Max: \$1.03 (39 tchrs * 2) |

Average reimbursement per CSO per month: \$$26.46\$
Carrots and Sticks – Management Consequences

CSOs reporting their County Dir had announced consequences for low levels of coaching **23.8%**

**Examples from CSOs’ reports**

- “Warning (‘show cause’) letters”
- “Failing to support teachers is like insubordination…”
- “I had to work harder…to evade dire consequences”
- “Officers would be interdicted if no results were seen”
- “The director told us we must improve because the data in the dashboard was not impressive”
- “One time he said that the dashboard report will be used to gauge the performance and determine promotion of CSOs”
- “He promised to visit the concerned CSOs especially those doing bad to ascertain the reason behind poor achievement among pupils”
The need drives the selection of the tool

Dashboard data from CSOs, ICs via Tangerine: Coach
- Public visibility
- Accountability
- Auditability / Validation (e.g. lesson duration, GPS, time of day, day of week)

Qualitative daily briefs from staff via MS-Word ContentControls + VBA → Excel pipeline
- Early-warning system (e.g., book ratios)
- Finger on the pulse of implementation fidelity
- Informing content for next training

ICT is your tool, not vice versa
A peek at forthcoming analyses

As part of RTI’s ongoing cross-national study of coaching effectiveness (Betts, Dombrowski, Hardon, Jukes, Mejía, Piper, Poutezavara, Ralaingita, Sitabkhan, Slade):

• Do composite measures/indices of the quality of lesson delivery improve with repeated observations / coaching?

Elsewhere:

• Linking CSO-generated data with staff-generated (‘coaching of coaches’) data: how much alignment is there on the quality of a given lesson’s delivery?
A peek at prior analyses: maximizing cost-effectiveness
### A peek at prior analyses: lesson pacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Lessons/Week</th>
<th>Lessons Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129-143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average aggregate deviation of observed lessons from the expected pace by grade for a given date**
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