Earth, Life & Social Sciences
Kampweg 5
3769 DE Soesterberg
P.O. Box 23
3769 ZG Soesterberg
The Netherlands

www.tno.nl

T +31 88 866 15 00

TNO report

TNO 2014 R11461

QEIP Evaluation - Research Methodology

Date	October 2014
Author(s)	Hester Stubbé and Gemma Corbalan Reviewed by Ernst Stuur and Nicolet Theunissen
Copy no	5
Number of pages	88 (incl. 13 appendices, excl. distributionlist)
Number of appendices	13
Sponsor	Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFSII)
Project name	Conn@ctNow!
Project number	055.01039

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced and/or published by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without the previous written consent of TNO.

In case this report was drafted on instructions, the rights and obligations of contracting parties are subject to either the General Terms and Conditions for commissions to TNO, or the relevant agreement concluded between the contracting parties. Submitting the report for inspection to parties who have a direct interest is permitted.

© 2014 TNO

Contents

1 Introduction 5
1.1 QEIP evaluation 5
1.2 Results 6
1.3 Project deliverables 6
1.4 This report 6

2 Research Methodology 7
2.1 Considerations and suggestions 7
2.2 Research Approach 8
2.3 Participants 9
2.4 Research instruments 9
2.5 Overview of instruments used per school stakeholder 11
2.6 Training of researchers 12
2.7 Data analysis 12

3 Evaluation of research methodology 15
3.1 All instruments could be used 15
3.2 Reliable conclusions 15
3.3 Evaluation per instrument 16
3.4 ELF analysis 18

4 Discussion and conclusions 19
4.1 Research methodology 19
4.2 Teachers 19
4.3 Teacher questionnaire 20
4.4 Involvement of pupils 20
4.5 Observation list 20
4.6 Statistics 20
4.7 ELF framework 21

5 References 23

Appendices
A Pupil interview
B Teacher interview
C PTA/SMC interview
D Head teacher interview
E Pupil focus group meeting
F Teacher focus group meeting
G PTA/SMC focus group meeting
H Statistics
I Observations
J Teacher questionnaire
K District Education Officer interview
L War Child Holland facilitator interview
M Coding in ELF

1 Introduction

In 2010 War Child Holland (WCH) started a program aimed at improving the quality of education in governmental primary schools in Northern Uganda and Karamoja sub-region - Quality Education Improvement Plan (QEIP). QEIP uses a community based approach, involving all school stakeholders, with the aim to increase relevance and sustainability by putting the ownership of the activity with the children, school, community, local leaders and district (all school stakeholders). Through improving the quality of education and engaging parents, the approach aims to address some of the root causes of children dropping out of school. Meaningful participation of children is prompted by providing a platform for their opinions and views to be heard and enabling them to take part in the decision making process. QEIP has been implemented in Gulu, Amuru, Nwoya, Otuke, Alebtong, Pader, Agago, Kitgum and Abim Districts under different projects funded by Oxfam Novib, MSF II and WCH.

According to QEIP, the four key elements for quality education are:
1 Motivated and qualified teachers
2 Conducive learning environment
3 Transparent and accountable administration
4 Involvement of parents and caregivers

The QEIP activities at the school level focus on the four pillars of education: pupils, teachers, school management and community. It aims to support the ability and commitment of each pillar to perform the best of their capacity in addressing motivational and other prevalent issues affecting quality of education in schools.

The intended results of QEIP are:
1 Improved quality of education
2 Increased enrolment and retention of young people
3 Increased parental and community support for education

1.1 QEIP evaluation

The evaluation of the QEIP program has the following aims:
1 Conduct a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the approach to investigate the (perceived) effectiveness of the QEIP on the four key elements in order to create an evidence base for the project that can be used for further fund raising opportunities for WCH in Uganda and globally.
2 Additionally, the evaluation aims at investigating to which extent the QEIP motivates meaningful participation of stakeholders, especially that of children and young people.
3 Provide suggestions for QEIP facilitators in order to (a) improve the module to be used at the different project locations and (b) provide suggestions on how to replicate the approach in other WCH WPAs as well other interested organisations and countries.

1.2 Results

- Perceived effectiveness:
  - All stakeholders are very positive about the QEIP,
  - Relations and cooperation between stakeholders has improved,
  - The safety of the school (building) has improved,
  - Motivation, respect, and academic performance have improved,
  - Drop out has decreased,
  - Statistics do not always support this, but they are based on incomplete data.
- Meaningful participation, of children and young people:
  - Participation has increased,
  - Pupils have been more involved, but children not as much as young people.
- Suggestions for improvement:
  - Train stakeholders to facilitate the QEIP training themselves,
  - Help schools to learn from each other, using lessons learned and best practices,
  - Specifically involve younger pupils,
  - Perform a baseline study at the start of the QEIP,
  - Keep records of enrolment, drop out and Primary Leaving Examination-scores,
  - Collect data for boys and girls separately, instead of general data,
  - Support and stimulate schools to be specific and detailed about activities and results.

For more information about the results see: QEIP Evaluation – Results & Recommendations (TNO 2014 R11460).

1.3 Project deliverables

1 Research methodology and evaluation instruments to evaluate the QEIP approach;
2 Transfer of knowledge on how to do research (see QEIP Evaluation – Results & Recommendations;
3 Evaluation report (see TNO 2014 R11460) including:
   - Actual evaluation of the QEIP approach
   - Suggestions for improvement concerning both the actual implementation and the QEIP module;
   - Recommendations and suggestions to facilitators on how to replicate the module at different project locations and other WCH WPAs as well other interested organisations and countries.

1.4 This report

This reports describes the research methodology designed to evaluate the QEIP, including the considerations and choices made, and offers recommendations about the future use of this methodology. A toolbox for future evaluation of the QEIP is included in an annex.

2 Research Methodology

- Evaluation of and educational intervention in developing countries is complex, this asks for a thorough research design;
- All relevant stakeholders should be involved, (young) children as well;
- Qualitative as well as quantitative instruments should be used (interviews & focus group meetings, observations, questionnaire & statistics);
- Use more instruments per stakeholder to increase reliability;
- Researchers need to be trained to use the instruments;
- Use a validated method to analyse the collected data (ELF).

2.1 Considerations and suggestions

The QEIP is a community based approach that aims to involve all school stakeholders (pillars of education) and thus improve the quality of education. This approach, the number of stakeholders involved, the context and the research aims lead to the following considerations:

- Evaluation of projects implemented by iNGOs in developing countries is complex. Because of the donor relationship and the local culture, stakeholders may be too positive (it is not accepted to say that something is not good) or too negative (if we say that our situation is not good, the iNGO will give more help) about the project. This means that in this evaluation reliability of data is very important.
- A community based approach is not effective in itself; it needs to be implemented properly before you can find any positive effects on the quality of education. (1) QEIP needs to be implemented, 2) QEIP works (when implemented).
  The assumption is that the better the implementation, the more effect the approach will have. Therefore, research needs to focus on both the implementation of the QEIP and on the results of a proper implementation to be able to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the QEIP. If not, a lack of results cannot be explained by effectiveness of QEIP alone: it is not possible to determine whether the QEIP does not work, or the implementation should be improved.
- The QEIP involves all school stakeholders who in turn, together, improve the quality of education in their school. Therefore, to determine if the QEIP is effective and to gather suggestions for improvement, all relevant stakeholders need to be involved in the research.
- There is no baseline study. This means that a retrospective method needs to be used, in which stakeholders are asked to think back about the situation at the start of the QEIP.
- This evaluation will be mostly based on qualitative data. To ensure the reliability of qualitative data, triangulation is used: different instruments are used to collect data on the same topics. The results are then compared. If they are similar, the reliability increases.
- This evaluation will be carried out in Uganda. This means that language will be an issue: only some teachers, head teachers and parents will be able to speak English. Children and most adults will not. Local researchers need to be involved to speak with the stakeholders who do not speak English.
- Involving local researchers means that they need to be trained to carry out the proposed research.

- The research will consist of a summative evaluation - to prove, and a formative evaluation - to improve. The summative evaluation is used to determine the effectiveness of the QEIP. The formative evaluation is used to collect information on shortcoming and suggestions for improvement. A formative evaluation gives input for further improvements and standardization (scalability).
- Preferably, local partners are involved in the design of the research instruments. This helps to develop locally and culturally correct instruments.

2.2 Research Approach

The considerations mentioned above can be addressed by using a three-level research approach, divided into six elements. The table below describes how this was done for the more factual information as well as for the personal interpretations (perceived goals and effects) of the stakeholders involved.

Level of research	What	Research questions	
Intentions of the QEIP	Written materials: Documentation on the QEIP approach and workshop materials	A	What is the QEIP approach and what is it meant to achieve?
	Interview with WCH facilitators		
Implemented	Perceived: Interpretation by the stakeholders	B	How do all school stakeholders interpret and perceive the QEIP?
	Operational: Observations and facts (plan-in-action)	C	What are the experiences and the opinions of all school stakeholders in the use, implementation and suggestions for improvement of the QEIP approach and its participatory nature?
Attained	Perceived results: by all school stakeholders	D	What do all school stakeholders think of the implementation of the QEIP? What results do they perceive?
	Attained results: e.g. less drop out, increased enrolment, improved PLE-scores	E	To what extent is QEIP effective in improving the quality of education?

At all three levels, existing documentation can be used (desk research). On top of that additional data, both qualitative as well as quantitative, need to be collected. To support triangulation several methods of research (literature review, facts, questionnaires/interviews and observations) will be used; together they will support more robust conclusions than only one method. The instruments will be developed specifically for this evaluation, but where possible we will make use of existing, validated examples.

When and where possible, information on the situation *before, during and after* the implementation of the QEIP (e.g., dropout rates, enrolment and PLE-scores) will also be collected and used for the interpretation of the results. This is especially useful and needed to answer research question E.

In order to make more robust statements about the (perceived) effectiveness of the QEIP approach, it was considered to involve non-QEIP schools in the evaluation as well. With those data a comparison between QEIP and non-QEIP schools is possible.

This would support robust conclusions about the QEIP having (perceived) effect, instead of external circumstances that affect all schools. For pragmatic reasons, this has not been carried out: it would be too time-consuming for the researchers, and it would be difficult to involve control schools. Control schools would not benefit enough in relation to the time they need to invest.

2.3 Participants

The following stakeholders will be involved in the evaluation:

- Teachers;
- Head teachers;
- Pupils;
- Parents / caretakers (Parent Teacher Association/School Management Committee);
- District Education Officers (DEO);
- WCH Facilitators of the QEIP.

2.4 Research instruments

In this paragraph all research instruments used are described with respect to their use, advantages and disadvantages. In general, all instruments have their advantages and disadvantages. Using a combination of instruments contributes to reliable research and robust conclusions.

- Document study
  At the start of the evaluation, all relevant documents and materials are studied. This provides information on the QEIP and gives input for the development of the research instruments.
  - A document study guarantees that all relevant information is used for the research. Nothing is missed.
  - At the same time, the relevant material that is there, can be used. Nothing is done twice.

- Semi-structured interview
  In the QEIP evaluation semi-structured interviews were held with all school stakeholders. A semi-structured interview is based on a select number of leading questions. The researcher has a conversation with the interviewee that at least addresses the leading questions, but also allows for other input.
  - An interview is a good instrument to gather information on perceptions and interpretations. In one-on-one conversations people are usually quite open.
  - People usually participate actively in interviews because of the one-on-one conversation. They are motivated to answer.
  - The advantage of semi-structured as opposed to a structured interview, is that it allows interviewees to bring up new subjects.
  - Semi-structured interviews guarantee that the interviewee provides information on the topics of the research, as opposed to unstructured interviews, where the interviewee decides what he wants to share.
  - Disadvantage: because interviews are time-consuming to carry out and to report on, only a few people can be interviewed. It is possible that the findings of the interviews do not represent the general feelings.

- When deciding who is going to be interviewed, it is important to include people from different backgrounds (gender, age, level of education, number of years working in this school).
- A typical interview should not take longer than one hour. It should not be too short, 30 minutes is a minimum.

- Focus group discussion
  In the QEIP evaluation focus group meeting were held for pupils, teachers and parents. A focus group meeting is a meeting of 8-15 relevant stakeholders who are invited to discuss certain topics/leading questions. There is also room for other, personal contributions.
  - A focus group meeting is a good instrument to gather information on perceptions and interpretations. The group discussion facilitates general conclusions and reduces the risk of extreme opinions.
  - People usually contribute to a group discussion when they participate, because it motivates them. The facilitator can stimulate them if necessary.
  - As opposed to interviews, in focus group meetings more people can participate. This increases the reliability of data.
  - On the other hand, peer pressure in focus group discussions can prevent some people from speaking, while others are very dominant. General conclusions are not general at all if this happens. A facilitator should be at least aware of this, and preferably try to prevent this.
  - A focus group meeting can take 1 to 1.5 hours, depending on the age of the participants. When dealing with young children, the meeting should be maximum 1 hour.
  - Always start with an icebreaker. For children this can be singing and dancing, or drawing. Adults need careful introductions with all names and titles mentioned.

- Questionnaire
  In the QEIP evaluation a questionnaire for teachers was used. The questions addressed the same subjects as the interviews and focus group meetings, but could be filled out by all teachers. A questionnaire is number of questions with closed answers (yes/no, ticking a box, or using a scale) that can be answered with a pen on paper, or digitally.
  - A questionnaire is a good instruments to collect information and perceptions.
  - The advantage of a questionnaire is that many people can be reached by one instrument, and the reporting on the data is not too time-consuming.
  - A questionnaire is a written instrument. People need to be able to read, in order to answer the questions. A questionnaire is therefore less suitable for beginning readers, like children.
  - The disadvantage of a questionnaire is that people fill it out by themselves. Sometimes they do not fill it out at all, or skip certain questions. This reduces the reliability of data collected in this way.
  - Because people fill out a questionnaire by themselves, they may misunderstand some of the questions or answering categories. Because of this, their answers can mean something completely different. A questionnaire should, therefore, only be used in combination with either interviews or focus group meetings.

- Observation
  In the QEIP evaluation an observation form was designed. The local researchers were asked to specifically look at the school and its surroundings, relations and communications between school stakeholders, and, if possible, at the interaction in the classroom. When using an observation form researchers are asked to look at/watch for certain behaviour or materials. Observations are usually supported by an observation instrument in which the topics of research are described, as well as how the observations should be scored.
  - Observations are more or less objective data, collected by the researchers. (are there any books in the school, is the school yard clean). These data can support or contradict the more qualitative data of interviews and group discussions.
  - Observations can only be done if the researcher has access to the localities where the observations take place (school yard, classroom).
  - Researchers need to be trained to use the observation instrument. If they do not understand what they are looking for, observations may not reflect the situation.

- Statistics
  In the QEIP evaluation we have tried to collect data on the number of children enrolled in school in a certain year, Primary Leaving Examination (PLE)-scores, drop out, etc. Statistics are facts and figures about the topics of the research. These quantitative data can support or contradict the more qualitative data.
  - To draw robust conclusions it is necessary to collect statistics, preferably over more years (at least a baseline and an effect study), and differentiated for gender.
  - In general it is difficult to collect statistics from schools in developing countries; not many schools keep track of numbers.
  - On top of that, statistics are not always meaningful: enrolment is often based on the number of children present on the first day of school. It is possible that children drop out, but are still included in the numbers on enrolment.
  - Many schools do not collect data for boys and girls separately. General averages do not always represent the situation accurately. E.g. if overall enrolment stays the same over the years, but the number of boys increases and the number of girls decreases, there is a problem, although you might think there is not.

2.5 Overview of instruments used per school stakeholder

In the previous paragraphs the relevant stakeholders and the relevant research instruments for this evaluation have been described. Table 1, below, gives an overview of the instruments used per stakeholder. Between brackets, the proposed number of participants is mentioned. The document study and observations are not included in this overview, because they were carried out by the researchers without interaction with the stakeholders.

Table 1 Overview of instruments per school stakeholder.

Stakeholder	Interview	Focus group meeting	Questionnaire	Statistics
Head Teacher	X (1)			X
Teacher	X (2)	X (8-15)	X (all teachers)	
Pupil	X (2)	X (8-15)		
Parents/caregivers	X (2)	X (8-15)		
DEO	X (1 per district)			
WCH facilitator	X (1 per district)			

2.6 Training of researchers

A team of five researchers was trained to use the instruments. Frida Nyberg, coordinator of this team, was trained by TNO and WCH in both the use of the instruments and a child-friendly approach. Frida, in turn, trained her local team consisting of Simon Peter Ouma, Brenda Openy, Sylvia Atto and Fred Otile. During the evaluation Frida checked regularly with the researchers if they worked according to plan and if their reports about the data collection were correct.

2.7 Data analysis

The number of research instruments and the number of participants involved in this evaluation led to large amounts of mostly qualitative data. To ensure thorough analysis, a framework was used: the Ecology of Learning Framework (ELF) to order the information (Theunissen, Bloeme, Corbalan & van de Plas, in preparation).

This framework states that the learning of individuals is influenced by the context in which they operate and learn. Therefore, when planning interventions for learning, preferably, the whole ecology of learning should be addressed, which includes micro (individual), meso (organizational) and macro (society) levels. This approach has been used before and builds on the Social Ecological Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Suthers et al., 2010; Golden & Earp, 2012; Weiner, Lewis, Clauser, & Stitzenberg, 2012). The QEIP evaluation focuses specifically on target populations and interventions at different levels, from the individual pupil, to state or even international level. In the QEIP evaluation there is a focus on pupils (micro-level), teachers (meso-level), school (meso-level), community (meso-level) and district (macro-level), which makes the ELF a suitable way of analysing the results.
The building blocks for ELF consist of five levels of influence in combination with four elements of intervention. The five levels of influence are: Micro: learner, Meso-small: group, Meso-large: organization, Macro-small: collection of organizations, and Macro-large: country or collection of countries. The Four intervention-elements are: Target groups, Characteristics, Intervention activities, and Outcome).

In the QEIP evaluation this means:

- Five levels: individual (pupil), group (teachers), organization (school), network (district), national/international network.
- Four elements: target population (the QEIP stakeholders), context, outcome (goals as intended, implemented and attained by the QEIP), and interventions.

For analyses purposes ELF is visualised in a table with the five levels as column headers, the four intervention-elements as boxes with level indications, including the relation between building blocks.

	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
Target population					
Context					
Results					
Intervention					

Figure 2 Schematic representation of the Ecology of Learning Framework (ELF).

The following steps were taken for the analysis of the interviews and focus group meetings:

1 **Semi-structured interview protocol:** Based on ELF, the interview contained questions about target groups, the context and conditions, the desired and achieved outcome, possible obstacles in the implementation of interventions, their experiences with the QEIP and an opportunity for the participants to ask extra questions or make any other comments.
2 **Interview:** Each interview lasted about 1 hour. The interviewer did not guide the participants responses to the questions: the participants were not explicitly informed about the framework.
3 **Interview report.** A summary of each interview and focus group meeting.
4 **Textual representation per interview.** The information of each of the interviews and focus group meetings was filled out in separate ELF formats. This means that the text of the interview reports was put in the right cells of the format.
5 **Coded format per interview.** Based on similarities in the textual representations, subjects were defined, described in keywords or short sentences.
6 **Coded format per school.** For each school, all the coded formats of interviews (and focus group meetings) were clustered. This resulted in one coded format per school. Differences between stakeholders are clearly defined in this format.

This set of steps offers an overview of similarities and differences between the various stakeholders per school.

3 Evaluation of research methodology

Positive findings:

- All research instruments could be used.
- Using a number of different instruments increases reliability, even when one instrument is not used in a school.
- The ELF is a time consuming method for analyses, but it supported a good analysis of the qualitative data.

Issues that need to be addressed:

- There was missing data especially in the teacher interviews and teacher focus group meeting.
- In most schools only one teacher and one parent were interviewed (instead of two).
- Schools did not always organize participation of stakeholders well: not enough participants for interviews (1 instead of 2) or not enough or too many participants for focus group meetings (5 or 25 instead of 8-15), or no participation from one stakeholder.
- The pupils participating in the interviews were 12-20 years old.
- Researchers were not allowed to observe inside the classrooms during the lessons.
- The answering categories in the questionnaire were changed into a priority list instead of a 5-point scale.
- Statistics were incomplete: only 7 schools provided data. There were differences in the years for which data were collected and only 3 schools had gender specific information.

3.1 All instruments could be used

Overall, the instruments could be used in the schools, although local conditions sometimes interfered with measurements. Some people were not available for the evaluation, which meant that in three schools there was no head teacher interview, in two schools teachers could not be interviewed and in two schools parents could not be interviewed. Observations could be performed according to plan in 13 schools. For one school information about the school and school yard could not be obtained because of weather conditions. Seven schools provided statistics for two or more years that could be used for the evaluation. Two more school provided data on 2014 only, which meant they could not be used for the evaluation.

3.2 Reliable conclusions

The selected instruments were intended to create triangulation and at the same time a certain level of redundancy. Because of this redundancy, there was still enough data to reach reliable conclusions, even when there was some missing data because of local conditions that interfered with measurements. In the situations where all instruments could be used, the results were comparable. This supports the reliability of the data and the conclusions drawn.

3.3 Evaluation per instrument

3.3.1 Head Teacher Interview

Overall head teachers were available and well informed. Only in a few schools the head teacher was not available or broke off the interview half-way. The general impression is that head teachers thought it appropriate to be interviewed and were very willing to participate. They gave much information about their school, and did not hesitate to be critical as well.

3.3.2 Teacher Interview

In most schools only one teacher was interviewed instead of two. The plan was to include two teachers per school, one male and one female. That reduces the element of chance findings, and adds the gender perspective. In some of the schools, the interviewed teachers were not employed at the school at the time the QEIP was implemented. For them it was very difficult to say something about the changes brought about by the QEIP. Two of them could not even mention the activities that had been implemented. Those interviews did not provide information about the QEIP implementation.
The teacher interview protocol included many questions, which were not always answered during the interview. As a result there was missing data.

3.3.3 Pupil Interview

In all schools except one, two pupils were interviewed; a boy and a girl. The pupils were very open and mentioned the positive as well as the more negative elements of their school. In general they could describe the change brought about by the QEIP very well. The pupils were between 12 and 20 years of age.

3.3.4 Parent Interview

In twelve schools one parent was interviewed. In the other two schools no parents were interviewed. The plan was to interview two parents per school, one male and one female. That reduces the element of chance findings and adds the gender perspective. Overall parents reported that they have become more involved because of the QEIP and appreciate that they are interviewed as well. Some parents refused to come because their travel was not paid for or because they were not fed.

3.3.5 DEO Interview

The DEO interviews were different from the other interviews, because DEOs did not provide information about specific schools but about districts. Their experience with the QEIP lies at a different level (meso large), although some of them attended the training sessions at several schools. Overall the DEOs appreciated the fact that WCH involved them in the QEIP program, and also in this evaluation. They did not always provide new or extra information, but confirmed the impressions of the schools as based on data from other stakeholders. It is important to include DEOs because of their position. They are important stakeholders at the meso large level, and can thus contribute to the sustainability of the QEIP.

3.3.6 WCH facilitator Interview

Four WCH facilitators participated in the interviews. They had supported several schools each and gave information on QEIP approach and its implementation.
In the interviews they were asked about their interpretation of the QEIP, not about the specific activities in specific schools.

3.3.7 Teacher Focus Group Meeting

Teacher Focus Group Meetings did not always provide information on the subjects discussed. The plan was to have 8-15 teachers per meeting; sometimes only five teachers participated, sometimes there were 25 teachers. Several times, teachers were involved who did not know much about the QEIP implementation, because they were not employed at the school at the time. In some focus group meetings for teachers, we were not able to create an atmosphere in which information was shared freely. Because of this there was some missing data.

3.3.8 Pupils Focus Group Meeting

The Pupils Focus Group meetings provided information on the subjects that were discussed. Although one school had arranged too many children (29 instead of 8-15), it was always fun and children were very open. The younger children started with singing and dancing, the older children had a drawing activity before they started the discussion. The pupils felt proud to be involved in the evaluation and were positive, but also realistic about the QEIP and its results: they also shared information on things that still need to be improved.

3.3.9 Parents Focus Group Meeting

In 13 of the 14 schools there was a Parents Focus Group Meeting. Participation of this focus group meeting was lower than that of the teachers and the pupils (4-6 parents participated per meeting). Still, the discussions offered information relating to the discussion topics.

3.3.10 Observations

The observations provided information on the subjects of the observation form: safety of the school and its surroundings, presence of learning materials, impression of how stakeholders interact with each other and the interaction during lessons in the classroom. The researchers walked around the school and the schoolyard and looked at materials and behaviour. The observation list proved to be clear and the answers were easy to interpret.

It was, however, not possible to observe inside the classrooms when lessons were taking place. This means that there is information about the condition of classrooms: Are there walls and windows? Does it have books and a blackboard? At the same time there is no information on teacher-pupil interaction, teaching methods and pupil participation and motivation.

3.3.11 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was not filled out by as many teachers as planned (all teachers of all participating schools). In most schools five to ten teachers participated. In two schools 12-15 teachers participated. The type of questions asked was changed rather late in the process: originally the answering categories consisted of a 5-point scale, asking teachers to show how important they thought interventions, activities and results were. This was changed into a priority list: teachers were asked to show which intervention, activity or result they thought was most important. Because of this analysis of the data could not be done in a quantitative way.

3.3.12 Statistics

Seven schools provided statistics on enrolment and PLE-scores. Only one school provided data on drop out. Three schools provided gender specific data (for boys and girls separately), the other schools only had general information.
This had implications for the analyses. Because the data were incomplete (only half of the schools, and different statistics per school), and in most cases not gender specific, possibilities for analysis were limited. Conclusions are, therefore, tentative and not robust.

3.4 ELF analysis

The ELF analysis took much time because there was much information to integrate in the analysis. There were many interview and focus group meeting reports, some of considerable length, and as a result this took time to process. Still, this was the only way to gain insight in the large amount of data. Similarities and differences were very clear, and empty cells (e.g. no interventions aimed at the community) were very informative as well. Dealing with large amounts of qualitative data brings the risk of superficial analysis, based on interpretation and chance. Using a framework supports objective analysis.

4 Discussion and conclusions

- A combination of different research instruments should be used in future QEIP evaluations.
- Most research instruments need to be (slightly) adapted.
- The research methodology asks too much (time) from teachers.
- The teacher interview has too many questions (now 13, should be 8).
- The teacher focus group meeting has too many questions (now 10, should be 4).
- The teacher questionnaire should have 5-point scale answering categories.
- Younger children should be involved in the evaluation as well.
- Observations inside the classroom during lessons was not allowed. Still, it is important information to collect.
- Do a baseline study on the indicators that QEIP is expected to influence.
- Do an effect study on the indicators that QEIP is expected to influence.
- Support schools throughout the project to keep track of these indicators.
- Use the ELF format, and train researchers to use it.

4.1 Research methodology

The research methodology consisted of a number of different research instruments. There were two reasons for this: (1) Reliability, and (2) Redundancy. (1) More and different instruments create triangulation and increase the level of reliability of the research. (2) If, for some reason, one instrument cannot be used in a school, there is still enough information to draw conclusions.
All instruments were used, although not all were used in every school. From a usability perspective there is no reason to exclude any of the instruments.
For research reasons a combination of different instruments should be used in future research.

4.2 Teachers

There were three research instruments that targeted teachers: an interview, a focus group meeting, and a questionnaire. In the interviews, as well as the focus group meetings, a number of questions was not answered. There can be several reasons for this: teachers are very busy, and will not take the time to answer all the questions; the questions are too difficult, or too specific, and teachers find it difficult to answer them; there are too many questions, and teacher are not willing to make the time to answer them all. Probably, the overall reason is a combination of these three.
We, therefore, recommend to redesign the teacher interview and the teacher focus group meetings and reduce the number of questions. A limited number of questions should address the most important subjects. An updated version of the teacher interview and teacher focus group meeting are included in Annex B and F.

4.3 Teacher questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire could not be analysed in a quantitative way, because the answering categories had been changed into a priority listing. Reliability increases with the use of both qualitative and quantitative instruments. As this was one of the two quantitative instruments, we suggest to change the answering categories back to a 5-point scale. An updated version of the questionnaire is included in Annex J.

4.4 Involvement of pupils

Pupils were involved through interviews and a focus group meeting. There was no missing data and children enjoyed participating. The children involved in the evaluation were between 12 and 20 years of age. This means that younger children did not participate in the research. It is not clear if younger children were involved in the decision making at school. They were involved in the training and clubs, though. We recommend that in the future also younger children are involved in the research.

4.5 Observation list

In general, the observation list proved easy to use and the data it provided could easily be analysed and compared with the more qualitative data. However, the researchers were not allowed to observe in the classroom when lessons were taking place. This means that part of the observations were not carried out.
As observations inside the classroom during lessons are probably not allowed anywhere, it is an option to delete these items from the observation list. On the other hand, just in case these observations can be done, we advise to keep them. They will be moved to the end of the observation list, to facilitate the use of the list. An updated version of the observation list is included in Annex I.

4.6 Statistics

The statistics provided were not complete. This was to be expected because schools do not always keep records. In the end, statistics provide the input for the summative evaluation: does the QEIP work. Without them, conclusions can only be based on perceived results.
We suggest that at least a baseline study is performed at the start of the QEIP. The baseline study collects data on the indicators that the QEIP intends to have an effect on. The intended results of the QEIP are:

1 Improved quality of education
2 Increased enrolment and retention of young people
3 Increased parental and community support for education

The quality of education can be measured by the PLE-scores, but also by dropout rates and enrolment rates. If pupils and/or their parents feel they do not learn anything at school they will not enrol, or drop out. Increased enrolment and retention can also be measured by enrolment rates and dropout rates. Increased parental and community support can be measured by the number of parents who pay the school fees, the number of children with uniforms and writing materials.

Parent involvement can, of course, also be measured by many other indicators, like contributing to the school garden, visiting the school and support for e.g. building teacher housing and improving the classrooms.
These data are only useful if they can be combined with gender, age and grade. E.g. it is not enough to know that 30 pupils dropped out in 2014. You would like to know if they are boys or girls and what age they were.

Ideally, these statistics are collected throughout – and after – the project. If this is not possible, then at least an effect study should be done. At the end of the QEIP the same indicators are measured again, in order to compare the results with the baseline study.
It will probably take some time for the QEIP to be implemented. Then, still, it will take longer before the results can be observed. It would be good to keep on measuring these indicators, even after the QEIP has finished. Thus, you can capture the results that take a little longer to show. On the other hand, it also provides information on the sustainability of the QEIP: do schools keep up the good work after the project has stopped?

4.7 ELF framework

When evaluating interventions for learning, preferably, the whole ecology of learning should be addressed, including micro (individual), meso (organizational) and macro (society) levels.
Although to fill out the ELF formats in the context of the QEIP evaluation was time consuming (large amounts of data), we recommend to use them in future research into the QEIP. It is the best way to order large amounts of qualitative data and draw more reliable conclusions. As the QEIP always aims for the same results and interventions, the subjects to be placed in ELF will probably be almost the same for all schools. This facilitates coding in ELF a next time. An example of the coding used in this evaluation is included in Annex M.

5 References

Theunissen, N.C.M., Bloeme, D.B.A., Corbalan, G. & van de Plas, A.
(in preparation). Ecology of learning Framework (ELF): guidance for multi-level interventions for learning using Social Ecological Theory.

A Pupil interview

A.1 Setting

In each school, one boy and one girl are selected/asked to participate in an interview (based on motivation, enthusiasm, participation during the FGD session/ or with the help of WCH facilitators). Participation is always voluntary.

The goal of the 'case study interview' is to gain more in-depth information about a pupils' personal experience in his/her school and in relation to QEIP activities in the school (learning, the school environment, etc.). The case study interview aims to 'track personal stories' about the most significant changes (and why) that pupils have experienced in their school.

A set of questions is prepared, but the interview follows a semi-structured format, meaning that the flow of the interview can change, questions can be asked in a different order, depending on the participant and how the discussion with the pupil develops.

Pupils/guardians (if pupil is under age of 12) have already given consent for the pupils for the drawing session.

A.2 Introduction - Instructions for interviewer

Introduce yourself (who you are, where you are from, why you are here) and once again the goal of the interview. Explain that the information is used for research. Explain that the pupil can stop the interview at any time if he/she feels likes it.

Example:

Hello, my name is XXX. I am a student and I am from…. I am working for War Child Holland. War Child Holland is an organization that is working/has worked in your school.

Earlier today you took part in the drawing activity with the other pupils. Thank you for participating. I hope you liked the activity?

In this interview I would like to know more about what you think about your school, about activities that have taken place in your school and if you personally think that something has changed in your school or the school environment.

The information will be used for research only. I would also like to record the discussion, is this OK?

If you want to stop the interview at any point, or don't want to answer a question, you can do so. You have to let me know. Your participation in this interview is voluntary. It will take about one hour of your time. Would you like to participate?

A.3 Questions

Date:
Name of interviewer:
Name of the school:
Gender of respondent:

Introduction

1 What is your name?
2 How old are you?
3 In which grade are you now?
4 Do you enjoy going to school? What do you like/don't like about going to school?

QEIP/School related questions and activities

1 Do you know that your school has followed/follows a plan to improve education in your school?

2 What activities did/is WCH do(ing) in your school?

3 Have you been involved in any activities to improve education in your school? *(the interviewer categorizes the type of activities –introduction activities, etc.)*

IF NOT: Why not? Did you get the opportunity to do it?

IF YES: (the pupil took part in some activities), ask:

- Can you tell me which activities have you been involved in?
- What was your role in these activities?
- Did you like doing these activities? Why/why not?
- Did you feel listened to? And by whom?

Personal experience of the pupil in the school – perceived effectiveness

4 Do you think that these activities, or other activities you are aware of, have made your school a better school?

5 What changes have you seen in your school? *(think for example of: attitude teachers, separated toilets, parents, etc.), use the questions below if needed if children do not come up with these topics themselves:*

<u>The teachers</u>
Examples:
- *Do you notice a difference in the behavior of teachers towards the children? (e.g., less corporal punishment, listen more to what pupils say)*
- *Have you noticed if teachers involve children more during lessons?*
- *Do you feel more involved in group discussions in the classroom?*

<u>The other pupils</u>
Examples:
- *What happens if students are absent or drop out from the school?*
- *How does the school try to help them?*
- *Do you think pupils are friendly to each other?*

<u>Parents/Care givers/Community</u>
Examples:
- *Do your parents/caregivers support your education more than before?*
- *Do you get more help with homework from your parents/caregivers?*
- *Do your parents/caregivers bring you to school?*
- *Do your parents/caregivers participate in events in your school?*

<u>The school environment</u>
Examples:
- *What do you think about the school building?*
- *What do you think about the school compound and the road you take to go to school?*
- *Do you feel safe in your school?*
- *Are there separate toilets for girls and boys?*

<u>Your own performance and motivation to go to school</u>
Examples:
- *Did something change?*

Suggestions for improvement

6 If you could decide, what else would you like to improve in your school? How would you do that – what activities are needed?

7 Who should be involved to make this improvement?

A.4 Ending the interview

Thank you for your time answering my questions.

Do you have anything else that you would like to share with me about your experience in your school (with WCH)? Or do you have any questions for me?

B Teacher Interview

B.1 Setting

The semi-structured interview aims at gathering information useful for answering the research questions:

How do teachers interpret and perceive the QEIP approach in relation to the four key elements?

C: What are the experiences and the opinions of teachers with respect to the use and implementation of the QEIP approach?
(Based on these experiences, how can the implementation of QEIP be improved?)

E: What is the perceived effectiveness of QEIP according to teachers?

B.2 Instruction for interviewer

Below is a list of questions to be asked. Interviews are semi-structured, this means that the order can change based on how the interview develops. Sometimes more than one question will be answered after one question is asked. After some questions there is some additional explanation/guidelines in *cursive*, these serve as a guideline for the interviewer. If possible, interviews will be carried out after observation at school has taken place.

B.3 Questions

School: QEIP Implementation phase 1. QEIP-Implementation 2. QEIP-Completed		Date: Researcher(s):	
Teacher Gender: Current position: Coming from which village/town:		**Years of teaching experience:** In general: In this school:	

General

1. What is a good school according to you? Please give some examples.

Perceptions and interpretations of QEIP

2. Could you tell me what you think the Quality Education Improvement Plan (QEIP) is?

3. Why do you think your school participated in QEIP? (i.e., which problems/situations did your school want to solve or improve?)

Actual implementation

4. Which activities has your school carried out as part of the school improvement plan (QEIP)? (Think of activities that you know of or have been involved in).

   For each activity mentioned, ask:

   - Where you involved?
   - What worked well and what did not? Explain why.
   - Do you think something changed in your school due to the activities? Examples.
   - Would you do it differently next time? How?

Examples of types of activities that are related to:

Introduction activities
Examples:
- *Introduction meetings*
- *What is quality education? (workshop)*
- *School QEIP plans (SWOTs)*
- *Action planning meeting*
- *Review meetings*
- *Implementation and Monitoring (on a 6 monthly basis)*

Teachers' motivation and/or competences
Examples of activities to improve:
- *Motivation to teach*
- *Absenteeism*
- *Understanding of children needs*
- *Knowledge and application of participatory and creative teaching methods,*
- *Methods of positive discipline and motivating children*

Learning environment
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Safety*
- *More child-friendly teaching approaches*
- *Chances to complete primary education*
- *Avoid drop out*

The pupils
Examples

- *Children's clubs*
- *Resources and equipment*
- *Children's trainings (IDEALs, health trainings)*

Accountable and transparent school administration
Examples of activities:

- *The school administration is open and transparent*
- *The money goes where it should go*
- *Records are kept*
- *Annual financial reports are shared with stakeholders*

Community involvement
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Parents willingness to participate and support education of their children (in and outside of school) and attending school days*
- *Support school initiatives*
- *Frequently following up on performance of their children*

Other strategies (included or not in the school QEIP plan)

Results (perceived)

5 Has the QEIP helped to achieve changes? If so, what?

Sustainability

6 Have you made any plans to ensure that the activities and improvements stay, even after the QEIP program has ended? If so, what?

Suggestions for improvement

7 Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the QEIP approach? (training, support by WCH, etc.)

8 Do you have any suggestions for new schools that start using the QEIP? (What should they do? What was most effective?)

B.5 Ending the interview

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Are there any other comments, ideas or suggestions that you would like to share with us?

C PTA/SMC interview

C.1 Setting

The semi-structured interview aims at gathering information useful for answering the research questions:

How do parents interpret and perceive the QEIP approach in relation to the four key elements?

C: What are the experiences and the opinions of parents with respect to the use and implementation of the QEIP approach?
(Based on these experiences, how can the implementation of QEIP be improved?)

E: What is the perceived effectiveness of QEIP according to parents?

C.2 Instruction for interviewer

Below is a list of questions to be asked. Interviews are semi-structured, this means that the order can change based on how the interview develops. Sometimes more than one question will be answered after one question is asked. After some questions there is some additional explanation/guidelines in *cursive*, these serve as a guideline for the interviewer. If possible, interviews will be carried out after observation at school has taken place.

C.3 Questions

Name of school:		**Researcher:**	
Gender: **Coming from which village/town:**		**Date:**	

General

1 What is a good school according to you? Please give some examples.

Perceptions and interpretations of QEIP

2 Could you tell me what you think the Quality Education Improvement Plan (QEIP) is?

3 Why do you think your school participated in QEIP? (i.e., which problems/situations did your school want to solve or improve?)

Actual implementation

4 Which activities has your school carried out as part of the school improvement plan (QEIP)? (Think of activities that you know of or have been involved in).

For each activity mentioned, ask:

- Where you involved?
- What worked well and what did not? Explain why.
- Do you think something changed in your school due to the activities? Examples.
- Would you do it differently next time? How?

Examples of types of activities that are related to:

Introduction activities
Examples:

- *Introduction meetings*
- *What is quality education? (workshop)*
- *School QEIP plans (SWOTs)*
- *Action planning meeting*
- *Review meetings*
- *Implementation and Monitoring (on a 6 monthly basis)*

Teachers' motivation and/or competences
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Motivation to teach*
- *Absenteeism*
- *Understanding of children needs*
- *Knowledge and application of participatory and creative teaching methods*
- *Methods of positive discipline and motivating children*

Learning environment
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Safety*
- *More child-friendly teaching approaches*
- *Chances to complete primary education*
- *Avoid drop out*

The pupils
Examples:

- *Children's clubs*
- *Resources and equipment*
- *Children's trainings (IDEALs, health trainings)*

Accountable and transparent school administration
Examples of activities:
- *The school administration is open and transparent*
- *The money goes where it should go*
- *Records are kept*
- *Annual financial reports are shared with stakeholders*

Community involvement
Examples of activities to improve:
- *Parents willingness to participate and support education of their children (in and outside of school) and attending school days*
- *Support school initiatives*
- *Frequently following up on performance of their children*

Other strategies (included or not in the school QEIP plan)

Results (perceived)

5 Has the QEIP helped to achieve changes? If so, what?

Sustainability

6 Have the school stakeholders made any plans to ensure that the activities and improvements stay, even after the QEIP program has ended? If so, what?

Suggestions for improvement

7 Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the QEIP approach? (training, support by WCH, etc.)

8 Do you have any suggestions for new schools that start using the QEIP? (What should they do? What was most effective?)

C.4 Ending the interview

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Are there any other comments, ideas or suggestions that you would like to share with us?

D Head teacher interview

D.1 Setting

The semi-structured interview aims at gathering information useful for answering the research questions:

How do school stakeholders interpret and perceive the QEIP approach in relation to the four key elements?

C: What are the experiences and the opinions of school stakeholders with respect to the use and implementation of the QEIP approach?
(Based on these experiences, how can the implementation of QEIP be improved?)

E: What is the perceived effectiveness of QEIP according to school stakeholders?

D.2 Instruction for interviewer

Below is a list of questions to be asked. Interviews are semi-structured, this means that the order can change based on how the interview develops. Sometimes more than one question will be answered after one question is asked. After some questions there is some additional explanation/guidelines in *cursive*, these serve as a guideline for the interviewer. If possible, interviews will be carried out after observation at school has taken place.

D.3 Questions

Name school: QEIP Implementation phase 1. QEIP-Implementation 2. QEIP-Completed		Date: Researcher(s):	
Head teacher Gender: Coming from which village/town:		**Years of experience as head teacher:** In general: In this school:	

General

1 What is a good school according to you? Please give some examples.

Perceptions and interpretations of QEIP

2 Could you tell me what you think the Quality Education Improvement Plan (QEIP) is?

3 Why did your school participate in QEIP? (i.e., which problems/situations did your school want to solve or improve?)

Actual implementation

4 Which activities has your school carried out as part of the school improvement plan (QEIP)? (Think of activities that you know of or have been involved in).

For each activity mentioned, ask:
- Where you involved?
- What worked well and what did not? Explain why.
- Do you think something changed in your school due to the activities? Examples.
- Would you do it differently next time? How?

Examples of types of activities that are related to:

Introduction activities
Examples:
- *Introduction meetings*
- *What is quality education? (workshop)*
- *School QEIP plans (SWOTs)*
- *Action planning meeting*
- *Review meetings*
- *Implementation and Monitoring (on a 6 monthly basis)*

Teachers' motivation and/or competences
Examples of activities to improve:
- *Motivation to teach*
- *Absenteeism*
- *Understanding of children needs*
- *Knowledge and application of participatory and creative teaching methods*
- *Methods of positive discipline and motivating children*

Learning environment
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Safety*
- *More child-friendly teaching approaches*
- *Chances to complete primary education*
- *Avoid drop out*

The pupils
Examples:

- *Children's clubs*
- *Resources and equipment*
- *Children's trainings (IDEALs, health trainings)*

Accountable and transparent school administration
Examples of activities:

- *The school administration is open and transparent*
- *The money goes where it should go*
- *Records are kept*
- *Annual financial reports are shared with stakeholders*

Community involvement
Examples of activities to improve:

- *Parents willingness to participate and support education of their children (in and outside of school) and attending school days*
- *Support school initiatives,*
- *Frequently following up on performance of their children*

Other strategies (included or not in the school QEIP plan)

Results (perceived)

5 Has the QEIP helped to achieve any changes in your school? If so, what?

Sustainability

6 Have you made any plans to ensure that the activities and improvements stay, even after the QEIP program has ended? If so, what?

Suggestions for improvement

7 Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the QEIP approach? (training, support by WCH, etc.)

8 Do you have any suggestions for new schools that start using the QEIP? (What should they do? What was most effective?)

D.4 Ending the interview

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Are there any other comments, ideas or suggestions that you would like to share with us?

E Pupil focus group meeting

E.1 Objective

The purpose of the activity is to, in a fun and relaxed atmosphere, involve the pupils in the research/data collection process. Using a visual method such as drawing can help create a stimulating and child-friendly environment for interaction and reflection where pupils can openly share their views, feelings and perceptions about the school and the most important changes experienced in the school.

Underlying question for the evaluation:
What is the impact of QEIP on the children/quality education/the school environment? What do students think has changed as a result of the activities that they have seen or experienced in their school under QEIP? What do students do and think of the QEIP activities?

E.2 Participants

- Selection with the help of teachers/WCH staff members before the visit
- Between 5 and 10 pupils
- Boys and girls (gender balance)
- Age/Grade
- 1 WCH staff member/ coordinator
- Student researcher(s)/observer(s)
- Duration: 1 hour
- Consent forms are already available. **WCH staff takes care of it beforehand.**
- Ideally some of the pupil respondents have also taken part in the introduction activities of QEIP if possible (if not in drawing session, at least in the individual interview such students should be included)

E.3 Materials needed

- 2 large sheets of paper for group drawing
- Pencils, colors
- Adapted consent forms (if under 12 years of age – consent from guardians)

E.4 Activity outline

1. Introduction and welcome to the activity. Explanation of the aim of the activity (5 min).

2. Warming up introduction activity with a ball (5 min.), facilitation by WCH staff member. **WCH selects a suitable exercise**. See example below:

   → Throwing around a ball, the person receiving the ball will introduce him/herself and send the ball to another child until everybody has received the ball and introduced him or herself. Also the researchers take part in this.

3. Drawing activity (20 to 25 min.) facilitation by student researcher and WCH staff member.

4. Group discussion (20 to 25 min) (Facilitation by student researchers and WCH staff member).

5. Closure of the activity, thanking the pupils for their participation and possibly a 'closure activity' facilitated by a WCH staff member (5 min.)

Date:
Name of school:
WCH moderator:
Researcher(s):

Participants
No Boys:
No Girls:
Age range:

Consent forms obtained:

E.5 Introduction

Hello, my name is…I am a student and I come from…. I also work for War Child. War Child is working/has worked in your school.

We have the permission from XXX to do an exercise with some pupils from your school. We would like to learn more about what you think of your school and activities in your school with WCH. We would also like to know if something in your school or your school environment has changed.

During this session we will first make a drawing all together and then we will discuss the drawings together. You will make two big drawings, all pupils together. The activity will take about an hour of your time.

E.6 Part I: Thematic drawing activity (20-30 minutes)

The activity aims to allow pupils to think and reflect on their school and aspects in their school community. The exercise aims to find out whether students have experienced any changes in their school environment. Changes can be related to aspects inside and outside the school, their own learning, their teachers, peer pupils, parents, the community or something else that the pupils come to think of. There is no right or wrong, it is about changes, not answers.

Pupils are asked to draw how their school was (1) *before* and (2) *now* (after or during QEIP). Explain that the idea is to see, from these pictures, what has changed in the school.

1. **First, ask pupils to draw a picture of their school and persons involved - how they think it was before (before QEIP).**

2. **Next, after having finished, students are asked to draw another picture of their school and persons involved today - how they think the school is now (after or during QEIP).**

Interpretation of drawings (pay attention to):

- Overall impression
- The school building drawn: inside/outside
- *What* is in the picture? E.g. resources in the pictures: book, furniture, other, etc.
- *Who* is in the picture and *who is not* in the picture before and after? Why?
- The people: how do they look like (e.g. happier smiling pupils, possible indication of higher self-esteem?)
- Colors used/Sizes/emphasis on some things
- **Most important: let the children explain their drawing! (part II)**

E.7 Part II: Topic list for discussion and explanations (20-30 minutes)

The drawings made during the first part of the session will serve as the basis for the discussion in the second part. The combination of visual and oral methods can result in a richer set of data. The children are asked to talk about and explain their two drawings and experiences related to them. The group discussion is useful for identifying the changes experienced by the pupils, making comparisons before and after.

For the researcher/observer it is important to carefully listen to the oral explanations, to gather a correct understanding of the pictures, any other additional information given and to avoid misinterpretations. The picture is a tool to make pupils talk. While the pupils describe the pictures, notes and comments should be written down for later analysis.

Question for the group discussion:

1 In the first picture you drew your school before. Ask children to talk about the first picture → Please explain how your school was before QEIP? What was good about and what was bad?

2 In the second picture you drew your school now/today. Ask children how they think their school is today? → What can we see in the picture? What has changed? → Let them explain.

3 What activities have produced these changes?

4 In general, are other things, not included in the drawing, that have changed in your school? *(think of teachers, other pupils, your parents, the school environment, building inside/outside)*

5 In general, what still needs to change?

E.8 Closing

Children are thanked for their participation. They can also be asked how they experienced the exercise and if they have **any other questions** or if they want to **share something else** with the researchers, facilitators. **Also ask children if it is OK to keep the drawing or make a picture of it.**

Other general questions that can be used, if needed:

- Do you enjoy going to school? Why/Why not?
- Do you receive help with homework?
- Do you get guidance from your teachers?
- Is there a code of conduct at your school? Did children play a role in its development?
- Do you feel safe in your school?
- With whom do you go to school?

E.9 General guidelines for working with children:

1. Introduction of the research and the researchers

Explain what the session will include. Also repeat that the children can stop taking part in the session at any time if they feel like it.

2. Time management

Stick to the time given, and make sure that there is time to finish the drawings and to properly reflect on them. Also important that all pupils who want to speak can have their say and those pupils are carefully listened to.

3. Sensitivity towards the pupils

It is important not to press the students for information or leave them with a feeling that they have not answered all the questions (can give a feeling of failure).

It is also important not to interrupt the children, but wait for a natural pause if you want to ask more questions. If children are interrupted, they might fear that they have said something wrong.

4. Listening and communicating with children

Respect and interest
Using words that the pupils are familiar with
Body language, facial expressions, general atmosphere
Everybody sitting on the floor, same level?
Give encouragement – that was an interesting answer

5. Recording and confidentiality

If the discussions after the drawing session are recorded, this must be explained to the pupils. The children should also know that their identities will not be revealed. If pictures are taken, try to take a group picture from a distance with many children in the picture. If filming, explain that the drawing activity will be filmed.

F Teacher focus group meeting

F.1 Objective

The objective of the focus group meeting is to learn about the experiences teachers have with the implementation of the QEIP and QEIP activities in their school.
Their input is used to improve the QEIP and to improve the implementation of the QEIP in other schools.
The focus group discussion is similar to a group interview: the researchers follow a list of questions. Questions are asked in an interactive setting, which allows respondents to talk with other group members and react on their answers.

F.2 Participants

- Selection with the help of head teacher/WCH staff members before the visit;
- Between 5 and 7 teachers;
- Male and female (gender balance);
- Age/years of experience;
- 1 WCH staff member/ coordinator;
- Student researcher(s)/observer(s);
- Consent forms are already available. **WCH staff takes care of it beforehand;**
- Ideally some of the teachers have also taken part in the introduction activities of QEIP if possible (if not in focus group meeting, then at least such teachers should be included in the individual interview).

F.3 Materials needed

- Large sheet of paper
- Post-it
- Pens

F.4 Activity outline

The teacher focus group meeting will take one hour and consists of:
1 Introduction (10-15 min.)
2 Writing down activities implemented during the QEIP (5-10 min.)
3 Ordering the post-its on the large sheet of paper (5 min.)
4 Group discussion about the activities mentioned (30 min.)
5 Ending the focus group meeting (5 min.)

F.5 Introduction (instruction for researchers)

- Very short introduction round: first researchers (name and role), then the participants (name and title). **Very important to mention all participants with their full titles at the beginning.**
- Explain the goal of the session. We are doing a research about QEIP to learn about the experience that the school has with QEIP and QEIP activities in their school. Explain that their views are very valuable for strengthening and improving the approach for the use in schools in Uganda in the future.
- Explain the discussion will take 1 hour.
- Explain that the discussion will be recorded so that information will not be lost. Ask if they have concerns about that.
- Explain that the discussion is confidential and no names will be asked. All the information from the discussion will be used for research purposes only.
- Explain that the aim is to have an open and comfortable discussion together. There are no right or wrong answers and participants do not have to agree with each other.
- Explain that to have a successful discussion where everybody feels comfortable it is important to have some rules: it is important to listen to each other, not interrupt others and to respect what other participants say.
- Explain how outcomes of research will be shared back to them.
- Ask the first question: Why did your school participate in the QEIP program? Was there a need to improve the school?

F.6 Part I: writing down all the activities implemented in the QEIP

The teachers are given post-its and pens. Ask them to write down as many activities implemented during the QEIP as they can think off. One activity per post-it. These can be activities they were involved on themselves, but also activities they were not involved in, but aware of.
To get them started, ask for a few examples. If teachers do not know where to start, give a few examples (training, SWOT analysis, clubs, parents day).
At the end of this activity, the post-its are collected and ordered on the large sheet of paper. Ordering is done according to the subject of the activity.

Pay attention to:
- The type of activities mentioned
- What is not mentioned?
- Who was involved in the activities

F.7 Part II: discussing the activities mentioned

Show how their post-its are arranged according to subjects. Discuss the post-its per subject in a group discussion. For each activity ask:

1. Did the activity work well?
2. Did you like the activity? If so, why?
3. Is there a change in your school as a result of the activity? If so, what? *(Ask for examples)*
4. Would you do it differently now? (Can it be improved?)

Then ask the following question for a group discussion:

1. Do you think that the participation of all school stakeholders has helped to create change in your school? If so, how?
2. What suggestions for improvement would you give to War Child when implementing QEIP in primary schools in Uganda?
   (think about the first implementation activities, the role of facilitators, the type of activities, the number of activities, helping engaging the school community in school affairs)

F.8 Ending the focus group meeting

Summarize the main point and conclusions.
Thank the group of teachers once again for their time and cooperation. Mention that all the information from this discussion is used for research purposes only and that their ideas and suggestions are very useful for the future.
Finally, **ask if there is something else that the teachers would like the share before ending the session or if they have any additional questions.**

F.9 Taking notes

School: **District:** **QEIP phase:**	**Date:** **Researchers:**
Teachers Number of males: Number of females:	**Other remarks:**

Type of activity (related to …)	**Activity (Post-its)**	**What worked well/could be improved? How?**	**What changes because of activity? (effect)**	**Suggestions for improvement**
INTRODUCTION ACTIVITIES a. Introduction meeting b. What is Quality Education Workshop c. School QEIP Plan (SWOT) d. Progress monitoring activities e. Other meetings, etc.				
TEACHERS a. Motivation b. Qualifications c. Quality of teaching d. Reduce absenteeism				
BETTER and SAFER LEARNING ENVIRONMENT a. Safer school building b. Cleaner environment c. Washing facilities d. Child friendly environment (playground, decorations in class) e. Materials and resources f. Accountable, transparent school administration				

PUPILS a. Children's club b. Resources c. Children's training (IDEALs)			
COMMUNITY/PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION a. Take part in school affairs b. Participate in school open days c. Support school construction d. Support other school initiatives e. Accompany children to school			
OTHER ACTIVITIES			

Aim of the questions	Questions
Knowing what teachers would improve in general. Suggestions are very valuable for improving the implementation of QEIP also in other schools in Uganda in the future Think about: • the first implementation activities • The role of facilitators • The type of activities • The number of activities • Helping engaging the school community in school affairs	**What suggestions for improvement would you give to War Child when implementing QEIP in primary schools in Uganda?**

G PTA/SMC focus group meeting

G.1 Objective

The objective of the focus group meeting is to learn about the experiences parents have with the implementation of the QEIP and QEIP activities in their school. Their input is used to improve the QEIP and to improve the implementation of the QEIP in other schools.
The focus group discussion is similar to a group interview: the researchers follow a list of questions. Questions are asked in an interactive setting, which allows respondents to talk with other group members and react on their answers.

G.2 Participants

- Selection with the help of head teacher/WCH staff members before the visit
- Between 5 and 7 parents
- Male and female (gender balance)
- Age/years of experience
- 1 WCH staff member/ coordinator
- Student researcher(s)/observer(s)
- Consent forms are already available. **WCH staff takes care of it beforehand.**
- Ideally some of the parents have also taken part in the introduction activities of QEIP if possible (if not in focus group meeting, then at least such parents should be included in the individual interview)

G.3 Materials needed

- Large sheet of paper
- Post-it
- Pens

G.4 Activity outline

The PTA-SMC focus group meeting will take one hour and consists of:
1 Introduction (10-15 min.)
2 Writing down activities implemented during the QEIP (5-10 min.)
3 Ordering the post-its on the large sheet of paper (5 min.)
4 Group discussion about the activities mentioned (30 min.)
5 Ending the focus group meeting (5 min.)

G.5 Introduction (instruction for researchers)

- Very short introduction round: first researchers (name and role), then the participants (name and title). Very important to mention all participants with their full titles at the beginning.
- Explain the goal of the session. We are doing a research about QEIP to learn about the experience that the school has with QEIP and QEIP activities in their school. Explain that their views are very valuable for strengthening and improving the approach for the use in schools in Uganda in the future.
- Explain the discussion will take 1 hour.
- Explain that the discussion will be recorded so that information will not be lost. Ask if they have concerns about that.
- Explain that the discussion is confidential and no names will be recorded. All the information from the discussion will be used for research purposes only.
- Explain that the aim is to have an open and comfortable discussion together. There are no right or wrong answers and participants do not have to agree with each other.
- Explain that to have a successful discussion where everybody feels comfortable it is important to have some rules: it is important to listen to each other, not interrupt others and to respect what other participants say.
- Explain how outcomes of research will be shared back to them.
- Ask the first question: Why did your school participate in the QEIP program? Was there a need to improve the school?

G.6 Part I: writing down all the activities implemented in the QEIP

The parents are given post-its and pens. Ask them to write down as many activities implemented during the QEIP as they can think off. One activity per post-it. These can be activities they were involved on themselves, but also activities they were not involved in, but aware of.
To get them started, ask for a few examples. If parents do not know where to start, give a few examples (training, SWOT analysis, clubs, parents day).
At the end of this activity, the post-its are collected and ordered on the large sheet of paper. Ordering is done according to the subject of the activity.

Pay attention to:

- The type of activities mentioned
- What is not mentioned?
- Who was involved in the activities

G.7 Part II: discussing the activities mentioned

Show how their post-its are arranged according to subjects. Discuss the post-its per subject in a group discussion. For each activity ask:

1. Did the activity work well?
2. Did you like the activity? If so, why?
3. Is there a change in your school as a result of the activity? If so, what?
4. (Ask for examples)
5. Would you do it differently now? (Can it be improved?)

Then ask the following question for a group discussion:

1. Do you think that the participation of all school stakeholders has helped to create change in your school? If so, how?
2. What suggestions for improvement would you give to War Child when implementing QEIP in primary schools in Uganda?
   (think about the first implementation activities, the role of facilitators, the type of activities, the number of activities, helping engaging the school community in school affairs)

G.8 Ending the focus group meeting

Summarize the main point and conclusions.
Thank the group of parents once again for their time and cooperation. Mention that all the information from this discussion is used for research purposes only and that their ideas and suggestions are very useful for the future.
Finally, **ask if there is something else that the parents would like to share before ending the session or if they have any additional questions.**

G.9 Taking notes

School: **District:** **QEIP phase:**	**Date:** **Researchers:**
Parents: Number of males: Number of females:	**Other remarks:**

Type of activity (related to …)	**Activity (Post-its)**	**What worked well/could be improved? How?**	**What changes because of activity? (effect)**	**Suggestions for improvement**
INTRODUCTION ACTIVITIES a. Introduction meeting b. What is Quality Education Workshop c. School QEIP Plan (SWOT) d. Progress monitoring activities e. Other meetings, etc.				
TEACHERS a. Motivation b. Qualifications c. Quality of teaching d. Reduce absenteeism				
BETTER and SAFER LEARNING ENVIRONMENT a. Safer school building b. Cleaner environment c. Washing facilities d. Child friendly environment (playground, decorations in class) e. Materials and resources f. Accountable, transparent school administration				
PUPILS a. Children's club b. Resources c. Children's training (IDEALs)				

COMMUNITY/PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION a. Take part in school affairs b. Participate in school open days c. Support school construction d. Support other school initiatives e. Accompany children to school			
OTHER ACTIVITIES			

Aim of the questions	**Questions**
Knowing what parents would improve in general. Suggestions are very valuable for improving the implementation of QEIP also in other schools in Uganda in the future Think about: a. The first implementation activities b. The role of facilitators c. The type of activities d. The number of activities e. Helping engaging the school community in school affairs	**What suggestions for improvement would you give to War Child when implementing QEIP in primary schools in Uganda?**

H Statistics

Date(s) of visit:
Name of researcher(s):

Ask the head teacher if he/she can provide this information. Some of these numbers will not be recorded and can, therefore not be collected.

SCHOOL PROFILE		
1	**Name of school**	
2	**District**	
3	**Sub-county**	
4	**Parish**	
6	**Implementation phase**	☐ QEIP ongoing implementation ☐ QEIP Completed ☐ Not implemented (control school)
7	**Implementation under**	☐ L4L ☐ C@N
8	**SWOT available**	☐ Yes, by WCH or the school ☐ No
9	**School plan available**	☐ Yes ☐ No
10	**Key elements listed in QEIP plan**	
11	**Is there a PTA?**	Yes ☐ No ☐
12	**Is there a SMC?**	Yes ☐ No ☐

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES AND INDICATORS		
	NUMBER OF PUPILS	**Try and see what the school / the administration / teachers can tell you. This is not perfect, but will give you an idea of the influence of QEIP.**
13	**Total number of pupils**	For the last 3-4 years
14	**Number of boys/girl**	For the last 3-4 years
15	**Number of pupils per grade**	For the last 3-4 years
16	**Number of boys/girls per grade**	For the last 3-4 years
17	**Total number of dropouts**	For the last 3-4 years
18	**Number of boys/girl dropout**	For the last 3-4 years

19	**Number of dropout per grade**	For the last 3-4 years
20	**Number of children taking PLE**	For the last 3-4 years
21	**Number of boys/girls taking PLE**	For the last 3-4 years
22	**Primary school completion scores**	For the last 3-4 years
23	**PLE-scores for boys/girls**	For the last 3-4 years
	TEACHERS	**Try and see what the school administration / teachers can tell you. This is not perfect, but will give you an idea of the influence of QEIP.**
24	**Total number teachers**	For the last 3-4 years
25	**Number of female teachers**	For the last 3-4 years
26	**Teacher absenteeism (estimated occurrence)**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
27	**Teacher qualification:** Qualified vs. non-qualified teachers (diplomas)	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
28	**Teachers housing available**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
	Governance	
29	**SMC number of meetings per term**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
30	**PTA number of meetings per term**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
	QUALITY EDUCATION	
31	**Number of inspections by DIS in a year**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	**This information is probably easy to collect. Try and make sure about timelines. Did this happen because of QEIP and during the implementation or before? You are asking people to look in retrospect, which can be hard.**
32	**Safety**	☐ Electricity / solar power ☐ Safety of school buildings ☐ Separate toilets girls/boys
33	**Hygiene/Sanitation**	☐ Teacher toilets ☐ Special needs toilets ☐ Water (wash hands) ☐ Cleanliness of school

34	**Learning Materials**	☐ Furniture ☐ Blackboard ☐ Books ☐ Writing materials for pupils (pens, notebooks) Other (creative) materials, namely:……
35	**Infrastructure (teaching)**	Classrooms with roofs Teachers houses school garden(fenced) Classrooms with concrete floors Play ground Sport ground
	PSYCHO-SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT	**These questions may be difficult to answer: on the one hand there is the idea that learning and punishment belong together. You are not a good teacher if you're not strict. On the other hand teachers may give socially acceptable answers and say that they don't use corporal punishment. Compare observations, teacher interviews and children interviews.**
36		☐ Corporal punishment ☐ Respect & safe environment ☐ Code of conduct is available Code of conduct is understood by teachers Developed jointly with children
	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	**This information may be hard to come by. This is probably not recorded anywhere. Ask what parents did before and do now. Compare interviews teachers, children and parents. Also use observations.**
37	**Number parents bringing children to school**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
38	**Number of parents participating in activities in school**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:
39	**Number of parents/open days per year**	Before QEIP: During/after QEIP:

I Observations

I.1 Purpose and instructions for the researcher

The goal of doing observations is to gain 'situational information' about the school environment, the stakeholders, and the teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil dynamics both inside and outside of the classroom.

If the researcher is not allowed in the classroom during lessons, only the first part of these observations can be carried out.

I.2 Background information

School: **Implementation phase:** QEIP Implementation phase 1. QEIP-Planning process 2. QEIP-Implementation 3. QEIP-Completed 4. No QEIP-control		**Observer(s):**	
Grade:		**Date:**	
Subject:		**Teacher:**	
# Boys in classroom:		**# Girls in classroom:**	
Start time:		**End time:**	

I.3 School physical environment (outside the observed classroom)

Aspect	Categories	Observations / Remarks
Safety of the school building	☐ Not safe ☐ Sufficiently safe ☐ Very safe	
Electricity and lightning	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Cleanliness of the school building	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Furniture in the classroom	☐ Tables, number: ☐ Chairs, number:	
Blackboard	☐ Yes, number: ☐ No	
Books	☐ Yes, number: ☐ No	
Writing materials	☐ Yes, number: ☐ No	
Other equipment in the classroom	☐ Yes, number: ☐ No	
Surrounding area of school is clean	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Surrounding area is safe	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Safety of playground	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Teacher toilet(s)	☐ Yes ☐ No	Male: Female:
Teacher washing facilities	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate boys toilet(s)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate boys washing facilities	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate girls toilet(s)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate girls washing facilities	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate special needs toilet(s)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Separate special needs washing facilities	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Availability of teacher housing in the school or nearby	☐ Yes ☐ No	

Other observations:	

I.4 Learning environment/didactical aspects (of the observed classroom)

Element	Categories (more than 1 answer possible)	Observations
Teaching methods	☐ Rote teaching (teacher says, pupils repeat literally) ☐ Direct instruction (teacher tells pupils what to do, one-way instruction) ☐ Active learning (group discussions, work groups, children work independently)	If yes, how many times/how long
Teachers' motivation	☐ Enthusiastic and motivated ☐ Time absent without explicit reason (how long?) ☐ Treating students with respect ☐ No corporal punishment observed ☐ Classroom is kept clean, in order	
Pupils' role	☐ Working independently ☐ Interacting with the teacher ☐ Interacting with other pupils	How many children (approx.)
Type of learning activities	☐ Repeating the teacher ☐ Questions and Answers ☐ Test ☐ Assignments ☐ Group discussion ☐ Games or other interactive activities	If yes, how many times/how long
Pupils' motivation	☐ Enthusiastic, motivated, interested ☐ Treating teacher with respect ☐ Treating other pupils with respect	
Location of activities	☐ In a classroom ☐ Outside a classroom, namely:	If yes, how many times/how long
Participation of pupil's in the classroom	☐ Pupils ask questions ☐ When asking questions, pupils are answered ☐ Pupils follow teacher instructions	

I.5 General school environment

General impression of the atmosphere in the classroom?
General impression of the atmosphere outside the classroom?
Treatment of boys and girls?
Were there problems during the observed session? If so, how was it solved?

J Teacher Questionnaire

J.1 Instructions

J.1.1 Explanation

This questionnaire is about your perceptions, actions and expectations about the QEIP: Quality Education Improvement Plan in your school. We would also like to know if you have any suggestions for improvement of the QEIP.

- What do you think of..?,
- what have you done ..?
- Who was involved in..?
- How would you improve..?)

J.1.2 Your privacy

The answers are handled confidentially and used only for research purposes. The results will not be made available to third parties.

J.1.3 Instructions

Filling out the questionnaire should not take too long (20 minutes). Please select one answer only. Under some sections there is room to write a small explanation for your answer. This questionnaire is not a test, there are no right or wrong answers.

J.1.4 Background information

Name of school:	
Gender:	☐ Male ☐ Female
Age:	
Years of teaching experience:	
Years of teaching experience at this school:	
Teaching in grade(s):	
Highest diploma/Education relevant for your function:	
Involved in	☐ PTA ☐ SMC ☐ Children clubs

A. Perceptions and expectations

1. According to you, how important is the role of the following elements in ensuring quality of education in primary schools in Uganda?	1. Very low importance	2. Low importance	3. Moderate importance	4. High importance	5. Very high importance
Motivated teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Qualified teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Safe learning environment	1	2	3	4	5
Accountable and transparent administration	1	2	3	4	5
Parents/caregivers involvement	1	2	3	4	5
Community involvement	1	2	3	4	5
Motivated pupils	1	2	3	4	5
Regular inspections by district (DIS)	1	2	3	4	5
Active children's clubs	1	2	3	4	5
Child-centered learning approaches	1	2	3	4	5
Other, namely:	1	2	3	4	5
Other, namely:	1	2	3	4	5

2. Can you notice that a school improvement plan is/has been followed in your school?

Yes, how?.....
No

B. Actual implementation

3. To which extent have you been involved in your school in activities aiming at…	1. Not involved at all	2. Not much involved	3. Involved	4. Very involved
Increasing teachers' motivation?	1	2	3	4
Increasing teachers' qualifications?	1	2	3	4
Achieving a safer learning environment?	1	2	3	4
Achieving a more accountable and transparent administration?	1	2	3	4
Increasing involvement of parents/caregivers at school?	1	2	3	4
Increasing community involvement in education	1	2	3	4
Increasing pupils' motivation?	1	2	3	4
Improving pupils' learning?	1	2	3	4
Making children's club more active?	1	2	3	4
Implementing child-centered learning approaches?	1	2	3	4
Improving quality of education in general?	1	2	3	4

C. Participation

4. Would like to be more involved in decision making in your school?
Yes No
Why?
How?

5. How often do you work together with other members of the school community in order to make your school better?

	1. Never	2. Sometimes	3. Often	4. Very often
Principal/Head teacher	1	2	3	4
Pupils				
Teacher colleagues	1	2	3	4
Parents/caregivers	1	2	3	4
Community (PTA/SMC)	1	2	3	4

6. Would you like to work more often together with these members in order to make your school better?

		Please explain why
Principal/ Head teacher	Yes No	
Pupils	Yes No	
Teacher colleagues	Yes No	
Parents/ Caretakers	Yes No	

	Community (PTA/SMC)	Yes No		

7. To which extent do you think that the Quality Education improvement plan activities (QEIP) have helped your school to:	1. Not at all	2. Not much	3. A little	4. Very much
Promote an environment in which pupils feel accepted and valued	1	2	3	4
Decrease pupils' drop outs	1	2	3	4
Increase school completion rate	1	2	3	4
Motivate teachers	1	2	3	4
Reduce teacher absenteeism	1	2	3	4
Stop corporal punishment and promote positive discipline of pupils	1	2	3	4
Encourage teachers to treat pupils with respect	1	2	3	4
Motivate teachers to use active learning approaches	1	2	3	4
Have a transparent and accountable administration	1	2	3	4
Increase parents involvement in education	1	2	3	4
Provide a safe learning environment for pupils	1	2	3	4
Provide out-of-school pupils with a chance to reintegrate in school	1	2	3	4
Enable all teachers to have their teaching diploma	1	2	3	4
Encourage parents to bring their children to school	1	2	3	4
Encourage parents to support their children's education	1	2	3	4
Motivate pupils to attend school	1	2	3	4
Enable parents/caregivers to take part in decision-making at school	1	2	3	4
Enable children to take part in decision-making at school	1	2	3	4

Develop safe school buildings	1	2	3	4
Provide a clean school environment	1	2	3	4
Have enough learning materials	1	2	3	4
Have separate toilets for girls and boys	1	2	3	4
Have active children's clubs	1	2	3	4
Functional SMC and PTA	1	2	3	4
Others, namely:……	1	2	3	4
Others, namely:……	1	2	3	4

8. In general, how would you rate the effectiveness of QEIP activities to…	1. Not effective at all	2. somehow effective	3. Effective	4. Very effective
… increase teachers' motivation?	1	2	3	4
… increase teachers' qualifications?	1	2	3	4
… achieve a safer learning environment?	1	2	3	4
… achieve a more transparent administration?	1	2	3	4
… increase involvement of parents/caregivers in education of children?	1	2	3	4
… increase community involvement in school activities	1	2	3	4
… increase pupils' motivation?	1	2	3	4
… increase pupils' learning?	1	2	3	4
…achieve regular inspections by district (DIS)?	1	2	3	4
…make children's club more active?	1	2	3	4
…implement child-centered learning approaches?	1	2	3	4
… to improve quality of education in general?	1	2	3	4

D. Suggestions for improvement

9. Which suggestions would you give to War Child Holland to improve implementation of QEIP activities in primary schools in Uganda?

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation! When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it directly to the researchers visiting the school community today.

K District Eduation Officer interview

K.1 Background and instructions for the researcher

The semi-structured interview aims at gathering information useful for answering the research questions:

B: What are the interpretations and perceptions of other stakeholders of the QEIP approach concerning the four key elements and the role of participation? Or: What do stakeholders think of the QEIP approach as described in A?

C: What are the experiences and the opinions of other stakeholders in the use and implementation of the QEIP approach? Or: what do teachers and other stakeholders do and think and how does this reflect the intended approach? Based on these experiences, how can the implementation of QEIP be improved?

E: What is the perceived effectiveness of QEIP according to other stakeholders?

The interview is semi-structured, which means that the order can change based on how the interview develops. Sometimes more than one question will be answered after one question. After some questions there are some additional explanations/guidelines in *cursive*, these serve as a guideline for the interviewer.

Name of interviewer:
Date of interview:

K.2 A background of the DEO

Name:	
Gender:	
District:	
Current position (since when):	
Involved in QEIP since:	Note: Some may not be involved in QEIP anymore or some may find it hard to remember when QEIP was implemented

K.3 Questions for District Education Officers

A. General and background (perception and interpretation)

1 What are key elements in a good school according to you? Please describe briefly.

2 What role does the DEO's play in the development of quality primary education in Uganda/your district?

3 Do you know what the abbreviation QEIP stands for? What does it mean to you?

4 In your opinion, why has your district participated in QEIP – was there a need for improvements in schools in your district, for example in line with district plans and priorities?

B. Participation and community involvement

5 What has been your involvement in the implementation process of QEIP?

5.1 How was the project/activity introduced to you?
5.2 How were the schools selected?

6 What is/was the role and responsibility of the DEO in the QEIP activities? *(E.g. planning, implementation, monitoring*)

If DEO has been involved in QEIP implementation activities, continue with Q7:

7 What was your experience with the first introduction activities?
What worked well and what did not?
What could be improved? Please give some examples.

(These Activities include: Introduction meetings/ 'What is quality education?'- Workshop / SWOT session and QEIP plan, monitoring progress in schools)

8 What is/was the role and responsibility of the school communities (teachers, pupils, parents, community leaders) for improving quality education through QEIP? (*Meaning: How important is community participation in the development of education?)*

9 What is/was the role of the NGO War Child How in supporting the improvement of quality of education in primary schools in your district through QEIP?

10 What are the major 1) advantages and 2) disadvantages of involving school stakeholders in educational decision making processes? Please give examples.

11 What factors can help to motivate stakeholder participation in the school improvement activities (QEIP) and/or in education in general?

Think of factors inside and outside the school (the communities, district, socio-economic status, power relations/structures in schools, trust, design of program)

12 In general, how would you describe the participation of children and young people in the decision-making process in education in schools and QEIP? How could it be improved?

C. Implementation of QEIP in schools in the district

If the DEO has been involved in the implementation of QEIP activities in schools in the district, ask:

13 Which activities have been carried out in the schools in your district that were part of the QEIP plan? What worked well and what did not? Please give some examples.

Examples of activities related to:

a) Teacher motivation
b) Learning environment
c) Improve school administration
d) Parental & Community involvement
e) Other activities

D. Effectiveness of QEIP

14 In your opinion, has the implementation of school QEIP plans in the schools in your district led to expected results in the primary schools? Please explain and give some examples.

Examples of results that can be referred to:

- *Motivated teachers*
- *Improved, safer learning environments*
- *Accountable administration*
- *Parental and community involvement in schools*
- *In addition to quality education elements – has there been any other additional or unintended outcomes? Please give examples*

E. Recommendations for improvement

15 What suggestions for improvement would you give to War Child when implementing QEIP in primary schools in Uganda?

Think of the first implementation activities, role of the facilitators, number of activities, helping engaging the school community, etc.

16 What is required from the district and from schools for a successful long-term implementation of QEIP activities within your district? *(i.e. how to ensure that activities are sustainable and outcomes can last?)*

F. General conclusion

17 Thank you for your time and cooperation! Are there any other comments, ideas or suggestions that you would like to share with us?

L War Child Holland facilitator interview

L.1 Background and instructions for the researcher

The semi-structured interview aims at gathering information useful for answering the research questions:

A. *What motives, principles and characteristics are formulated and proposed by the developers of the QEIP approach?*

The interview is semi-structured, which means that the order can change based on how the interview develops. Sometimes more than one question will be answered after one question. After some questions there is some additional explanations/guidelines in *cursive*, these serve as a guideline for the interviewer.

Name of interviewer:
Date of interview:
Location:

L.2 A. Background

Name:	
Gender:	
Current position (since when):	
Involved in QEIP since:	
Tasks at the schools	
Involved in …. number of QEIP schools	

L.3 Questions for War Child Holland staff members

A. General background

1. How would you shortly describe the main objectives of QEIP?

2. In the schools/communities that you have worked in – what are the major challenges encountered for achieving quality education?

B. Implementation

3. What is your experience from the introduction activities of QEIP?
   (*Examples: Introduction meetings/What is quality education – workshop / SWOT sessions and QEIP plans***).**
   Generally, what works well in schools and what not? Please give some examples.

4. What are the main challenges for creating awareness and attitude change towards education in schools?

5. From your experience, which of the key quality education elements that QEIP focuses on are the most challenging to change? And the 'easiest'? Why? Please give some examples.

   Examples of activities related to:

   a) Teacher motivation
   b) Learning environment
   c) Improve school administration
   d) Parental & Community involvement
   e) Other activities

C. Perceived effectiveness

6. From your experience, what are the most and the least successful activities implemented under QEIP to achieve quality of education? Why?

7. In your opinion, has the implementation of QEIP in schools led to the expected results specified in school QEIP plans? Can you give some examples of indicators of effectiveness?

   For example:
   - *Safer school environments*
   - *Motivated qualified teachers*
   - *Accountable administration*
   - *More parental and community involvement in education*

8. Have you witnessed any unintended results as a result of the implementation of QEIP? (Positive/negative results, individually or collectively).

9. In general do you think that the involvement and participation of the school community members has helped to reach the expected results? Why?

D. Recommendations for improvement

10. Based on your experience in school communities, what suggestions would you give for improving QEIP in Uganda? And in other countries?

    (*Think of the first implementation activities, the role of the facilitators, the number of activities, helping engaging the school community, etc.)*

11. In your opinion, what is required to ensure a successful long-term implementation of QEIP activities? *(Meaning: how to ensure that activities are sustainable after WCH leaves the schools?)*

E. General conclusion

12. Thank you for your time and cooperation. Is there anything else that you would like to share regarding the QEIP approach (comments, ideas or suggestions that are relevant to know)?

M Coding in ELF

1 SCHOOL: gulu pece Completed in 2011 (1)	**(1) Pupils**	**(2) teachers;**	**(3) School**	**4) community**	**(5) country/district**	**(6) WCH**
Target group	**pupils**	**teachers**	**Head teachers** **PTA** **SMC**	**parents and caregivers**	**DEO**	**WCH**
Characteristics			R-OBS: town school. R-OBS: poor availability PTA R-OBS: organized school, good atmosphere. IND: PTA and SMC available.			
PERCEPTIONS QEIP			**Learning environment** T-I: Good environment to learn. **Materials and facilities** T-I: Good materials for teachers and pupils. **Administration** T-I: A good executive members, PTAs and SMCs.	**Participation** T-I: should know their role (incl. pay money).		
INTERVENTION - INTENDED		**Qualified/competent** T-I: provide knowledge and monitor progress of children	**Learning environment** PTA-I: Organise games and debates to bring pupils together. PTA-I: Talk to parents about QEIP. PTA-I: Encourage parents to take their children to school. T-I: Training to reduce corporal punishment.	**Participation** PTA-I: contribute with money.		**P-I:**Water tanks (sanitation) and toilets. **P-**I: fences.
INTERVENTION - PERFORMED	**Materials and activities** HT-I: MDD (Music Dance and Drama), Purchase of instruments anduniforms in school colours HT-I: Scouts & Guides HT-I: Games and sports PTA-FG: Games and sports **Participation** HT-I: involved in cleaning school. .	**Qualified/competent** HT-I: Guidance and Counselling (teachers guide and help pupils with their problems) P-I: Info about HIV/AIDS	Materials and facilities HT-I: Materials for cleaning (‘slushes’). HT-I: Lady care’ materials, shower, change. HT-I: Washing tanks for washing hands. HT-I: latrines boys vs girls. HT-I: Reparation of borehole: provision of water. HT-I: room available; also a relax place when sickness. HT-I :Compound messages for awareness (eg. AIDS Strategies). HT-I: Renovation of teacher housing. T-FG: Compound improvement. T-FG: Hand washing facilities, Water and soap, Sanitary materials for girls. T-FG: Sports uniforms. T-FG: teacher latrines, Reparation of teacher’s houses. T-FG: Repair of borehole. T-FG: Purchase of musical instruments (MDD). PTA-FG: Costumes for MDD. PTA-FG: tents and guides for scouts. T-I: Latrines and a bathing room for girls. T-I: Tents&guides for scouts. P-I: classroom painted.	**Participation schools** HT-I: Payment of school contribution. HT-I: :share views. HT-I: provide advice. **Supporting children** HT-I: Send children to school.		

			P-I: cleaning facilities. Learning environment. HT-I: SMC training over roles & responsibilities. HT-I: Teacher trainings: over roles, conduct, language. T-FG: Training roles SMC& PTA. T-FG: Training teachers on CoC and life skills. T-FG: Training of pupils on their rights. T-FG: Organization of competition in schools (sports). T-FG: SMC trainings on roles and responsibilities. T-I: Training PTAs and SMC. T-I: Teachers training. T-I: No teacher housing built. PTA-FG Training of teachers, pupils and school management committees about life skills.			
OUTCOME- INTENDED	**Performance** QEIP: complete primary education	QEIP: motivated QEIP: qualified	(A) QEIP: conducive learning environment. (B) QEIP docs: accountable and transparent administration.	**Participation school** QEIP: involved community T-I: know their roles better.		
OUTCOME – ATTAINED	**Attitude/Participation** HT-I: Sense of responsibility to keep compound clean. HT-I: Improved discipline . HT-I: Washing tanks: more personal hygiene. HT-I: discipline. HT-I: need to be reminded of some activities such as discipline, own responsibilities. T-FG: compound: more discipline. T-FG: Games and play: promotion of friendship . T-I: Washing cans: cleaner books. T-I: compound: more knowledge and awareness. Discuss with their friends about the topics. PTA-I: football team: more unity (maybe due to uniforms?) PTA-I: More collaboration amongst pupils. More friendship (sports?) PTA-I: More respect amongst teachers, pupils and parents. PTA-I: Sports gadgets: more participation in spot activities. PTA-FG good relationship with other schools due to the inter-school competition in games and sports.	**Attitudes/participation/corporal punishment** HT-I: (Teachers training) Corporal punishment stopped. Better enabled to manage transition to English instruction. HT-I: The teachers come early – attitude change. HT-I: More self-driven teachers. PTA-I: Reduction of Corporal Punishment. PTA-I: More respect amongst teachers, pupils and parents. PTA-FG good relationships between teachers, parents and children. P-I Improved attendance (but not this year because WC too long to make the follow up (monitoring). P-I: more cooperation with pupils. **Qualified/competent** T-FG: Trainings: knowledge on life skills. T-FG: Reduction corporal punishment (other ways to solve problems have been found). BUT still corporal punishment. P-I: listen more to the pupils. P-FG: Number of trained teachers has	(A) learning environment HT-I: Improved welfare of the school. HT-I: SMC: Increased inspection by SMCs made in their school. More contact with teachers and children. HT-I: The compound is clean and well designed. HT-I: fence around school. HT-I: School is safer, gates. (B) administration HT-I: Improved: stakeholders check themselves to see if there are any gaps. T-FG More willingness to contribute (e.g.: to repair of boreholes). PTA-FG good relationship with other schools due to the inter-school competition in games and sports. P-I Better: classrooms painted. P-I: improvement because of latrines. P-FG: Tents are now available for scouts. P-FG: better washing facilities. P-FG: more textbooks in the library. P-FG: electricity at school. P-FG: Painted classes and toilets. P-FG: More talking compound. P-FG: More desks, writings materials, textbooks,	**Participation school** HT-I: Parents come more often to visit school. HT-I: closer to the school and follow up closer to the school activities. T-FG: better community involvement. T-I: they now pay because know their role. T-I: reduced costs (sharing). T-I: More awareness to work with school. T-I: More involvement: come if called by school. PTA-FG: parents helped constructing wall fence. P-FG: Parents more involve, providing necessities/materials and help with fees. **Attitude** PTA-I: More respect amongst teachers, pupils and parents. PTA-FG good relationships between teachers, parents and children. **Participation children**		T-FG: WCH has promoted health through sanitation.

PTA-FG good relationships between teachers, parents and children.
PTA-FG games and sports: more participation.
PTA-FG compound: attitude change.
PTA-FG: better sanitation.
PTA-FG: Headmistress (housing) : improved punctuality.
P-I: pupils friendlier to each other.
P-I: improved girls hygiene.

Performance
HT-I: Improved performance of the pupils.
HT-I: (MDD) learn skills in playing instruments; encouragement; develops skills.
HT-I: (Scouts & Guides): skills development; creativity; skills developed; awareness, help each other (life skills).
T-I: More knowledge about HIV/AIDS.
T-I: More learning.
T-I: better decision making.
PTA-FG: performance improvement (especially in games and sports).
PTA-FG: Headmistress (housing) : improved performance.
P-I: musical instruments: better music performance.

Motivation
HT-I: (MDD) learn skills in playing instruments; encouragement;, help them feel free and motivation.
T-FG: Sport uniform: look good, more motivated.
T-FG: uniform: active participation of children in MDD activities.
T-I: tents for scouts: more pupil activity.
P-I Uniforms: better appearance.

Enrolment, dropout
HT-I: Lady care: stay at school.
HT-I: (Washing tanks): more responsible.
T-FG: compound: Reduction of absenteeism.
T-FG fences: reduced movement in and out.
T-I: latrines:reduced absenteeism girls.
PTA-FG: Counselling and guidance.

increased.

teachers/ IND (but data also subjective)	
Teachers nr	36 has not changed
Nr Male/female	In 2014 more females
Ratio teacher/pupils	2012= 1471:36
Absenteeism	-
Housing available	19 on compound. No new from QEIP, but renovated

QUALITY EDUCATION / IND (but data also subjective, eg HTR)	
Child-centered methods	Positive approach (HTR)
Teacher qualification	EQIP not affecting teacher qualifications. Teacher trainings as refreshment courses
Inspection by district in 1 year	1 x term (HTR)

PHYSCo-social ENVIRONMENT/ IND (but data also subjective)	
Corporal punishment	leimproved (teacher training)
Code of conduct understood	Some need more explanation
Classroom rules developed with pupils	Some yes, some not

library now available.

TEACHERS/ IND (but data also subjective)	
Nr SMC meetings	2 x term, more if needed.Increased because of EQIP
Nr PTA meetings	2 x term, more if needed.Increased because of EQIP

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT/ IND (but data also subjective)	
Safety	-No electricity/solar -improved since EQIP, fence lacks
Hygiene /sanitation	-EQIP: water tank, teacher wc, slushes for cleaning
Learning materials	Yes, but no directly related to EQIP EQIP: musical instruments, MDD support
infrastructure	QEIP: Classrooms with roof Play ground Sport equipment (L4L)

PHYSCo-social ENVIRONMENT/ IND (but data also subjective)	
Respect & safe environment	-
Code of conduct available	yes

PTA-I: better equipment: Parents send children to school.
P-I: help pupils more with homework.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT / IND (but data also subjective)	
Nr bringing children to school	Few (HTR)
Nr participating in school activities	-
Nr open day per year	1 x term classdays

	WCH: reduced school drop outs . PTA-FG: Better sanitation facilities: less girls absent. PTA-FG: fences: more controlled. PTA-I: Classroom improvement: feel like staying in class. P-I: more cooperation amongst the teachers and the pupils → it motivates the students to stay in school. P-FG: more pupil enrolment. **General** T-I: compound signs: exposed children to many good things. **IND** (but data also subjective) Pupils enrolment: in 2012= 1471, appr 150 in 2014 Pupils dropout: not much changed Ratio boys/girls: - Ratio enrolled/attending: - PE completion rates: - **RESULTS/ IND** (but data also subjective) Grade on test same pupils: P7 grades improved EQIP. Performance slowly better Grades subject level: -					

INTERVENTIONS SUGGESTED- **(A) Activities** **(B) QEIP module** **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACILITATORS (at different project locations and other WCH WPAs as well other interested organisations and countries)**		T-FG: Still lack of communication between teachers and children.	**Training/development** HT-I: time management. T-FG: Refresher courses were lacking psychosocial support. T-FG: Not enough time and capacity. T-FG: More people needed for activities, not left to one person. **Materials/facilities** P-I: electricity in all the classes to have longer teaching. P-I: more fences to reduce external to access the school facilities. P-I: Better sanitary pads for girls. T-FG: More training materials.	T-FG: Parents: Expectations and motivations – material or non-material to be improved.	**Materials/facilities** HT-I: More money.	**Role WC** HT-I: listen more to community . HT-I: Do not come with a closed plan. Need to cooperate especially when planning. So that the school looks at their priorities. T-FG: Sometimes facilitators come late. T-FG: Monitoring activities also after implementation. T-FG: '*The schools that WCH has supported, they are the kids of WCH. When going off, they should do like mothers to their children so that you can survive*' . T-FG: Continuous support, and follow-up on the programme. T-FG: Importance of a well-established plan. T-FG: Consider school for new projects when programme ended . T-FG Unorganized poor partnership by the organization → WCH supposed to cooperate with other organizations, but did not. PTA-I: Follow up pending programs. **Training/development** T-I: add more activities. T-I: More emphasis on agricultural activities. PTA-I: Refresher training for all, especially new teachers (eg about responsabilities). PTA-FG: More training the children on different life issues (e.g. agricultural productivity). PTA-FG Refresher courses or training to teachers and management on roles and responsibility.

						PTA-FG: Regular refresher courses. PTA-FG: More sensitisation of the community. **Materials/facilities** T-I: Add infrastructure at schools. PTA-FG: Storage facilities should be provided. P-FG: need more teachers. P-FG: Extension and improvement of classrooms conditions. P-FG: More textbooks. P-FG: Electricity to all the classes, now only teachers office. P-FG: Computer lab. P-FG: school bus.

Distributionlist

The following agencies/people will receive a complete copy of the report.

1	Warchild T.a.v. de heer A. Mulder
2	TNO, location Soesterberg, (Archive)
3/5	TNO, location Soesterberg, H. Stubbé G. Corbalan P. Piek