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Executive summary

Introduction and background to the study

The Teacher Development Programme (TDP) is a six-year (2013–19) UK Department for International Development- (DFID-) funded education programme that is seeking to improve the quality of teaching in primary and junior secondary schools (JSSs) and in Colleges of Education (CoEs) in five states in northern Nigeria. TDP currently operates in Jigawa, Zamfara and Katsina in the programme’s first phase (2014/2015), with plans to extend to Kano and Kaduna states during its second phase in late 2016.

TDP’s in-service training model (ISTM) seeks to create effective teachers by combining the delivery of pedagogical training with the promotion of a supportive teaching environment through head teacher support to provide mentoring and supervision to teachers; peer interaction among teachers; school support visits by trainers; and the provision of learning materials. **EDOREN has been commissioned to carry out this formative research study in order to provide an in-depth qualitative description and analysis of how TDP’s in-service activities have been implemented in its Phase I**, with the development of a series of formative lessons and recommendations that will help the design and implementation of Phase II of the programme. **As a formative research study, this is not a mid-line evaluation report.** Nine schools across the three states (three in each) comprise the sample for this study. Stakeholders who were engaged in the research included teachers, head teachers, pupils, school-based management committees (SBMCs) and other state and local government representatives.

Research questions

The formative research questions underpinning the study were as follows:

1. Given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, how can TDP make its cluster training more effective?

2. In what ways can TDP improve its printed and audio-visual training materials to make them more useful and more used – in terms of content, language and usage?

3. Given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP (a) establish the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school, and (b) ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as school support visits (SSVs))?

Embedded within these questions were a series of multiple sub-questions – there were 41 sub-questions in total – that required the research study to look at key issues in some depth, and that comprise a comprehensive research matrix that has guided this study. The matrix can be found in Annex C.

The following key conclusions follow through from the core research questions the study answered, with recommendations that respond to the sub-questions presented.
Overarching conclusions and programme recommendations

The following overarching recommendations aim to address some of the common trends that emerge from the findings. These recommendations are particularly pertinent to key adjustments that will need to be made by TDP in readiness for the roll-out of Phase II of the programme.

1. Feedback and utilisation of data

Spaces for feedback across the ISTM have clearly been well thought-through and crafted. This was evident in the recognition amongst stakeholders of the role that cluster training and SSVs play in both giving and receiving feedback, for teachers, head teachers and Teacher Facilitators (TFs). Building on this by strengthening feedback mechanisms in certain areas whilst also having greater transparency around feedback utilisation will be an important step forward as part of Phase II’s roll-out. This recommendation cuts across feedback mechanisms in cluster training, standalone channels of feedback for head teachers, and improved mechanisms within the SSV process.

2. Language

The challenge of language barriers came through clearly in both Research Questions 1 and 2. The language of instruction within the cluster training needs to be carefully considered, given the low levels of English competence amongst many teachers. Teachers generally preferred to be taught in Hausa, and consideration needs to be given to whether learning materials for teachers also need to be able to respond to that fact. More broadly, however, a key suggestion in terms of English language learning itself is the importance of having English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes for teachers to improve their fluency. This is both in order to better take instruction in English, and therefore close the cognitive gap that currently exists with the training materials that are also in English, but also to improve the quality of their teaching in the subject. If it remains unaddressed, this language barrier could prove a major challenge to translating the approaches within TDP into pupil learning outcomes.

3. Technological applications

The use of technology within TDP ISTM has been innovative in the area of materials, both for learning and for data capture as part of the teacher and head teacher support process. However, various challenges, from the absence of SD cards for phones used by teachers to the damage of the Tangerine tablets TFs use to collect their data during SSVs. A more detailed review of the varied technological innovations being delivered is needed to assess the ongoing relevance of their functionality, their current status as working/workable items, the appropriate usage and processes relevant to them (e.g. such as the appropriate use of the trainer-in-the-pocket), and what corrections, solutions or alternatives might be needed going forward.

4. Knowledge sharing

As with feedback, knowledge sharing between TDP and non-TDP teachers appears to be occurring regularly overall, with many non-TDP teachers indicating that their own pedagogical skills have improved following the introduction of the programme and the participation of their colleagues. To build on this evident good practice two key areas need further improvement where knowledge sharing is concerned. The first is to introduce a more efficient system of peer learning and knowledge sharing between head teachers across TDP schools. The second is to address the apparent current lack of knowledge sharing that occurs between TDP and non-TDP teachers.
during the SSV process, by revamping the SSVs so that they include wider group sessions, both in terms of feedback and further embedding of skills learnt in the cluster training.

5. Programme needs beyond the current remit of TDP

The research highlighted various challenges affecting the work and potential success of TDP, despite being beyond TDP’s ability to control. This is in line with the findings at baseline. Specifically, these are the absence of key in-school materials, such as textbooks and science kits, and shortages/poor classroom infrastructure, which affects the quality of the learning environment. Despite the fact that these areas are the responsibility of other actors, such as State Universal Basic Education Boards (SUBEBs) and the Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs), TDP should consider what role it can actively play going forward to help address them – in particular if sustainability of the gains made by the programme are not to be lost when TDP exits and responsibility for the TDP ISTM approach is handed over.

6. Leadership around harmonising wider ISTM approaches in TDP schools

A consistent finding of the research across the research questions has been the overall positive perceptions of stakeholders towards TDP’s ISTM approach. These positive perceptions cover areas ranging from the participatory approaches of the cluster training to the kind of feedback and support offered at the SSVs. Given this finding, it is recommended that TDP consider the possibility of playing a coordinating and harmonising role across its target states in key areas of the ISTM, by working with other partners currently delivering activities such as Jolly Phonics to maximise the overlap of knowledge that has been noted as beneficial within this research. Harmonising activities at the state and school level has the potential, in time, to be a contributor to easier ownership of activities by state actors when programmes finishes in 2019, leading to greater sustainability.

Specific findings from the research questions

The following sections summarise the key findings that emerge from the research questions and the multiple sub-questions guiding this study. Substantial targeted recommendations for each section can be found in the main body of the report.

TDP in-service cluster training activities

In exploring the question ‘given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, how can TDP make its cluster trainings more effective?”, the findings showed that attitudes and perceptions towards cluster trainings are generally positive, and administrative and logistical aspects run mostly smoothly. However, poor communication with regards to notifying teachers of cluster training is highlighted in all case study schools, with a lack of clarity around who is ultimately responsible for informing schools of cluster training: suggestions for who is responsible include the LGEA Education Secretary and TFs themselves. Short notice also affects female teachers more than male teachers. The importance therefore of the need for enhanced clarity around communication channels, and advance notice to teachers, clearly emerges from the research findings.

The level of teacher attendance at cluster training is reported to be high, but punctuality is poor. Teachers are mainly late due to distance and inadequate notice. As a consequence of training
sessions starting late, they also close late. Teachers complain about training sessions lasting for too long. Moreover, women teachers are affected since they need to be home on time for house chores and responsibilities. As such, participants would prefer half-day training sessions held over more days.

TFs face some challenges in regard to preparing for cluster training, mainly due to inadequate notice from TDP. Additionally, TFs feel their remuneration is not commensurate with their preparation time, as remuneration stays the same whilst the amount of time needed to prepare varies between training sessions. Similarly, stakeholders consider allowances sufficiently large to cover expenses, but face issues with regard to the delivery and punctuality of payments. Though payments mostly used to be made on time, the introduction of e-payments has led to delays. Although teacher attendance remains high, the possibility of gradual negative impacts over time due to slow payments of allowances and perspectives on inadequate remuneration should not be underestimated. This could gradually impact attendance, punctuality and overall motivation.

Respondents also indicated that the food provided at cluster training sessions is not adequate. In states where a hot meal is provided, participants are more content than at training sessions where only a snack is provided. Some Teacher Development Teams (TDTs), TFs and teachers prefer food to be provided rather than allowances to purchase food – as either teachers will not have received allowances to spend, or if they have they will often return late for the next session.

Challenges arise due to low levels of subject knowledge amongst teachers, particularly in cases where teachers are trained in a subject that they previously have not been teaching/studying. Teachers find it easier to understand the science training, as a whole day is dedicated to the subject. In comparison, teachers struggle with English and maths, and would prefer one day per subject (or two half-days).

Participation in cluster training is enhanced by the use of group work, which makes teachers more comfortable about engaging with the training. However, participation and understanding are both hindered by language barriers, with teachers often struggling to understand training in English. As such, teachers mainly use Hausa during group work. Teachers prefer Hausa as the language of instruction.

Participation is also affected by gender. With few female teachers in cluster training, a level of shyness is experienced by female teachers. Female teachers also struggle to balance their childcare and household responsibilities with training. Additional notice for cluster training, as well as half-days, could help with this balance. Gender inclusivity, though attempted, is not adequate and TFs need to do more to include female teachers in training.

Teachers face some challenges in regard to implementing what they have learnt from cluster training in their classrooms, due to low subject knowledge, large class sizes and lack of materials. Though teachers mix English and Hausa, it is evident that English subject knowledge is low. Despite challenges with class size, the child-centred approach they learn from TDP has made it easier for them to engage the whole class. Though lack of textbooks, or pupil exercise books, make it difficult to use certain methods, teachers actively use no-/low-cost materials as taught in clusters.

Cluster training is seen as the main venue for feedback to TDP. Though teachers, TFs and TDTs feel they have channels to give feedback, there is no adequate mechanism whereby TDP responds to feedback.
Knowledge sharing takes place, both between TDP teachers during cluster training, and between TDP and non-TDP teachers at school level. Schools make use of non-TDP teachers when TDP teachers are away on training. However, this depends on how many teachers a school has. When schools do not have enough teachers, they either merge two classes or classes will be left without teachers, which affects instructional time.

**TDP materials used both inside and outside school**

In exploring the question *‘in what ways can the ISTM improve its printed and audio-visual materials to make them more useful and more used in terms of content, language and usage?’*, the findings showed that it appears that TDP is promptly supplying recipient schools with most TDP materials. However, the primary issues pertaining to materials provision include a lack of basic science kits and apparatus, a lack of textbooks, especially in the face of large class sizes, and the provision of only an SD card but not a mobile phone to the second cohort\(^1\) of TDP teachers.

Teachers appear to use most of the ISTM materials, placing particular importance on the teacher’s guide, lesson plans and trainer in the pocket designed to help teachers to prepare for their lessons. There is mixed evidence regarding the extent to which teachers appropriately use the materials, with some teachers understanding that these pedagogical materials are to be used to prepare for the lesson while other teachers use the teacher’s guide in the classroom.

Despite the popularity of the lesson plans, teachers face problems with the lesson plans\(^5\) length, scope (lack of subjects covered), and breadth (lack of lesson plans for all three terms as some lesson plans are still being developed by TDP). Furthermore, poor availability of the textbooks referenced in the lesson plans prohibits their effective use.

Low-cost and no-cost materials, such as stones and bottle tops for counting, were found to be widely used in schools as they allow for child-centred activities in the classroom and are easily obtained for use in the classroom.

Teachers face problems in using the amplifiers as a lack of electricity in the majority of schools renders it difficult, and costly, to charge the amplifier. Furthermore, poor security in the schools necessitates that the amplifiers are frequently kept off the school premises, which means that they are not always accessible for use in lessons.

The teacher’s journal, intended as a means for teachers to record successes and challenges faced in the classroom, was the least used material provided by TDP. This may be due to a culture of oral feedback predominating over written feedback, or due to a lack of training in how to use the journal effectively. With more training, this material could become a powerful tool for routing feedback to TDP.

Teachers and head teachers predominantly provide feedback to TDP facilitators during cluster training and through their interactions with the TFs. Most stakeholders reported that they were unaware of how TDP management, at the state and national level, used this feedback and did

---

\(^1\) Originally, four teachers (including the head teacher) in each TDP school were chosen to attend training as part of the programme. In some schools, however, TDP training has been extended to a second cohort of teachers, the number of which differs by school and state.
not often receive a response from TDP regarding the progress of their feedback. This is certainly an area which TDP should address to ensure that the cycle of feedback is completed.

In the majority of schools there appears to be a culture of knowledge sharing, formalised through post-training feedback meetings between the TDP teachers and non-TDP teachers. Non-TDP teachers are able to access TDP materials predominantly through the head teacher and, at other times, through the appropriate subject teacher.

School leadership and management: The head teacher as academic leader and mentor

In exploring the question ‘given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP establish the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school?’ , the findings showed that head teachers are generally perceived as having multiple roles and responsibilities relating to both school management and facilitating teaching and learning. There was somewhat mixed evidence in terms of the extent to which ISTM school leadership and management (SLM) training and materials (specifically the Head Teacher’s Handbook) equip head teachers to deal with the constraints they face in their schools.²

The application and success of SLM strategies seems to vary considerably between schools. Nonetheless, stakeholders in most schools reported some form of improvement in the head teacher’s leadership and management since programme inception and this has been associated with head teachers becoming better aware of their roles and responsibilities.

The frequency with which head teachers attended ISTM SLM training varied by school and state. Head teachers in several schools also received previous or ongoing leadership training from the state (LGEA or SUBEB) or programmes like Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) in Jigawa. This training was often said to overlap in content with the ISTM leadership training and head teachers referred to the usefulness of reinforced learning from the somewhat more regular TDP training.

Head teachers have a role in encouraging teachers to use new teaching skills and materials by assisting in lesson planning, understanding the content or language of topics, and in some cases advising on the use of instructional materials.

All sampled schools across the three states had a system of lesson observations conducted by head teachers, and in some cases senior teaching staff. However, the exact nature of lesson observations varies by school, which indicates a need to enforce greater standardisation of protocols through improved monitoring and accountability. Lesson observations were generally followed by a feedback session with the teacher in which head teachers picked up on aspects of both the teacher’s subject knowledge and pedagogy and classroom administration.

Although schools have different, at times multiple, approaches for peer-to-peer learning, head teachers were almost always mentioned in relation to the knowledge sharing process. There was general awareness about the concept and purpose of peer-to-peer learning as an in-school support and learning resource to improve teaching and both TDP and non-TDP teachers were said

² It is important to highlight in this regard that several SLM protocols have been outlined in the Head Teacher’s Handbook. However, while this material is likely to have been the basis of head teacher SLM training, the actual Handbook has not been distributed to head teachers as a guide to reinforce learning or follow through with the protocols in schools.
to participate. Knowledge sharing in schools generally seems to be facilitated by good relations and cooperation.

The primary mechanisms for feedback on matters related to SLM are during school visits of TFs and TDTs and in ISTM training sessions. TFs appear to use SSVs to check whether head teachers are conducting their SLM activities and for advising on problems. Head teachers also reported using both ISTM cluster training and SLM training to give feedback and raise challenges.

**SLM: Effective SSVs**

In exploring the question ‘given weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as school support visits),’ the research noted that SSVs appear to coincide closely with the scheduling of the cluster training, which indicates a regularity and sequencing, along with an expectation of the timing of the SSVs on the part of the schools. Questions remain regarding whether teachers are told exactly when the TFs are arriving to carry out the visits.

The processes around SSVs appear to be largely established, with most TFs following a similar pattern. This includes initial consultation around the school timetable and pleasantries with the head teacher, followed by lesson observations, which take up the bulk of the visit. However, lesson observations did vary in their delivery in terms of length and the interaction of the TFs with the teacher and pupils. This therefore potentially indicates a lack of consistency in terms of established/known protocols on the procedure within the lesson observations.

Feedback processes to teachers whose lessons have been observed by TFs appear well established, with all TFs giving verbal feedback to teachers. One held a group feedback session as part of their visit, with non-TDP teachers also invited to take part in this. A systematic method of feeding back to teachers was in evidence, indicating the successful implementation of training in this regard. Feedback was pedagogical and reflective of the needs observed by the TF in their SSV capture forms. Head teachers and teacher responses were all appreciative of the feedback given by TFs.

The observation of the head teacher is clearly a very secondary and less well-defined activity within the SSV. Overall, head teacher observation as part of the SSV is based on the TF administering a questionnaire, followed by an overarching feedback session with the head teacher at the end of the SSV.

Other actors within the SSV process are primarily TDTs whose roles are to observe and support the TFs as needed, although mention was also made during interviews of LGEA Quality Assurance officers sometimes accompanying the TFs. As some teacher and head teacher responses also indicated a higher value being placed on the quality of SSVs in terms of process and feedback than on the LGEA quality assurance visits, the potential of how to partner these processes more formally could be explored.

Challenges around the tangerine tablet used to capture data consistently came through in the responses. Shattered screens and the absence of SIM cards were reported. As a result, the tablets are largely redundant in their live use, with paper forms now the norm. Overall, however, the forms were viewed by TFs as comprehensive, offering a clear breakdown of the data as needed. Key requests for improving the content of the tangerine tablets included being able to log more
‘challenges and successes’ during the lesson observation, and to scroll back and forth during the data capture.

Despite the data capture challenges, the data generated from the SSVs appears to be channelled through a clear system of capture and digital upload that goes to the TDP central office. Responses were minimal, although largely positive, on how the data were being used, with some stakeholders indicating that reports generated from the SSVs are contributing to a growing storyboard of supervision for each of the teachers. Others report that the data being generated from the SSVs have been used at the LGEA level to identify and troubleshoot problems that are emerging.
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1 Introduction and background to the study

The TDP is a six-year (2013–19) DFID-funded education programme seeking to improve the quality of teaching in primary schools and JSSs and in CoEs at the state level in northern Nigeria. TDP is being implemented by Mott MacDonald. In the programme’s first phase in 2014/2015 TDP operated in Jigawa, Zamfara and Katsina. There are plans to extend it to Kano and Kaduna states during its second phase in late 2016.

The design of the TDP in-service training component is informed by a theory of change that articulates how in-service teacher training activities can result in the desired impact (improvement in pupil learning levels). TDP seeks to create effective teachers by combining pedagogical training with the promotion of a supportive teaching environment through head teacher support to provide mentoring and supervision to teachers; peer interaction among teachers; SSVs by trainers; and the provision of learning materials. TDP’s in-service delivery model is multi-pronged and provides training and support to teachers both within and outside the school.

This formative research study has been commissioned by DFID to provide an in-depth description and analysis of how TDP’s in-service activities have been implemented, with the development of a series of formative lessons and recommendations that will help to inform the design and implementation of the second phase of the programme. As this research is not impact-focused but formative, the analytical emphasis is on perceptions and processes. As such, this formative research will contribute to the process of adapting TDP as needed, identifying the successes and challenges of programme implementation so far, and will offer options for adapting the original training model before scale-up in Phase I states and roll out to Phase II states. It will also provide learning from TDP’s implementation experience so far on what may or may not work for delivering effective in-service teacher training programmes in northern Nigeria.

This is a formative research study and not a mid-line report. However, the scope of the research questions and the detailed sub-questioning inherent within the conceptualisation of this study are drawn from the baseline report, which identified some key findings that shaped the direction of this study. For example, the vast majority of teachers at baseline had grossly inadequate subject knowledge in English, maths and science, limiting their effectiveness within the classroom. Lack of direct subject knowledge within TDP’s training curriculum was therefore noted as a concern, leading to a questioning of the effectiveness of the programme’s cluster training processes and materials.

The baseline also identified key challenges around the use of English as a language of instruction within the cluster training, given the low levels of English language competency amongst teachers. Additionally, gender barriers were also highlighted as a challenge for women teachers within cluster training, with the baseline noting their lower participation levels and lateness; family commitments were hypothesised as the primary challenge, although this was not elaborated on.

---

3 Annex B.
Challenges around materials were also identified at baseline: this ranged from lack of subject knowledge, to inappropriate use of innovative materials, to insufficient provision of training materials for TFs, who had to fund the photocopying of materials themselves.

Challenges faced by head teachers also came through strongly in the baseline, with a lack of motivation to improve their SLM or to encourage teachers’ adoption of the teaching practices that TDP seeks to motivate. However, the opportunity of head teachers’ potential for pedagogical leadership was noted through a high prevalence of classroom observations taking place. The baseline also found that head teachers are rarely held to account themselves, while a lack of awareness of their rights and responsibilities in relation to the state and local education government bodies mean that they are unable to effectively engage with contextual factors that continue to challenge the quality of learning within their schools, such as infrastructural deficiencies.

Extrinsic factors were strongly highlighted within the baseline report. These ranged from challenges around demotivation of teachers due to poor/late remuneration, to the absence of government textbooks, and lack of adequate physical infrastructure and repairs. Although noted as being outside the purview of the programme, it was nonetheless stressed how critical these factors are to the successful implementation of the programme.

The above summarises some of the key areas that have formed the basis of the questions guiding this formative study.

1.1 Methodology

This is a formative research study using qualitative methods in a case study approach, conducted across nine schools in the three states in which TDP is currently working. These schools have been categorised into higher performing, typical, and lower performing schools. Empirical data collection instruments included key informant interviews (KIs), praxis discussions, focus group discussions (FGDs), and observations of cluster training sessions, lessons and SSVs. Structured and unstructured questions were used throughout. Observation tools were semi-structured qualitative, and were used to complement the perspectives and opinions of stakeholders from the other qualitative data by providing direct researchers’ findings regarding practices and processes at the school level. Stakeholders interviewed and observed included: head teachers; TDP teachers; non-TDP teachers; pupils (both girls and boys in separate groups); TDP TFs; TDP TDT members; and SBMC, SUBEB, and LGEA representatives. All data were transcribed verbatim, with most interviews conducted in Hausa and therefore translated at the transcription stage into English. Reviews of technical data, including training guides and other documentation, were

---

4 A comprehensive Methodological Note with further details can be found in Annex D.
5 Three schools in each state, out of a total of 168 schools. Given the full qualitative approach of the study and multiple instruments, it was determined that nine schools would provide a workable amount of data for this report, without overloading.
also cross analysed and used to guide the analysis of this research from the concept stage.\(^7\) Data analysis included coding in accordance with both the research framework and its attendant sub-questions, along with the identification of additional key themes that resulted in free nodes emerging from the data. Cross analysis of the sample schools took place immediately during the first stage of writing, with individual chapters assigned according to the overarching research questions guiding the study. Analysis was based on ensuring that the narrative voices of respondents delivered experiences and perspectives on each of the sub-questions within the research matrix, with implications arising from those findings then leading to a series of targeted recommendations for each research question. An overview analysis of the most prominent themes was then conducted, identifying the six overarching programme recommendations for the report.

### 1.2 Formative research questions

The formative research questions this report investigates and seeks to answer are as follows:\(^8\)

1. Given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, how can TDP make its cluster training more effective?

2. In what ways can TDP improve its printed and audio-visual training materials to make them more useful and more used – in terms of content, language and usage?

3. Given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP
   (a) establish the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school?
   and
   (b) ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as SSVs)?

Flowing from each of these overarching questions are between eight and 12 sub-questions, comprising a total of 41 sub-questions. These form a research matrix that the research study has attempted to answer systematically.\(^9\)

### 1.3 Limitations

The limitations of the research included social desirability bias, aspects of the field team composition, language, and sampling.\(^10\) Given the qualitative nature of the research and the array of stakeholders encountered, social desirability bias was encountered in certain areas. The field team composition included members from within TDP’s group of teacher trainers, which carried the risk of respondent bias due to power dynamics. Mitigating actions included careful consideration of the choice of instruments and the stakeholders these researchers engaged with. Where language is concerned, although the instruments were

---

7 Summaries can be found in the annexes in Doyle, A., et al. (2016) *Teacher Development Programme (TDP) Formative Research on Output 1: In-Service Teacher Training Activities – Concept Note*, OPM.

8 These questions were formulated by EDOREN in consultation with TDP during the Concept Note development stage of this process, Spring 2015.

9 This full Research Matrix can be found in Annex C

10 A full list of limitations and mitigating actions is in Annex E.
originally designed in English and delivered in Hausa, the training in Abuja involved national researchers in training around the terminology, phrasing and translation for standard delivery of the data. In terms of sampling, associated security risks meant that teams were only able to sample schools that were within the advised distance. However, it is important to underscore that the findings here are indicative of how some schools and stakeholders perceive and experience TDP, and as such give insights into benefits and challenges for TDP to reflect on going forward.

1.4 Structure of the report

This report is structured to offer the reader both a summary of the findings and recommendations emanating from the research, and more detailed descriptive cases pertaining to each of the research questions. Chapters 2–5 respond to each of the three research questions directly. Each chapter offers an initial overview of summary findings, followed by a more detailed narrative of the qualitative voices in response to the questions. Research Question 3 parts (a) and (b) have been given a chapter each. At the end of each chapter is a set of targeted recommendations emanating from the findings. Chapter 6 is the conclusion, offering overarching analysis of the data in response to the research questions broadly. A final set of overarching recommendations can be found there.
2 TDP in-service cluster training activities

Cluster training is a primary means of TDP’s out-of-school support to teachers. The meetings are scheduled monthly, spanning two days, and generally involve TDP teachers from schools within an LGA meeting in a centrally located school to receive classroom-based training on pedagogical material and subject content for that month. These training sessions are led and conducted by the two TFs assigned to each LGEA, who distribute the training load amongst themselves. Prior to these training sessions, the TFs receive training on the contents of the cluster workshops from the state’s ‘master trainers’ in the TDT. In order to assess TDP’s in-service training, this qualitative study explores the question ‘given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, how can TDP make its cluster trainings more effective?’ The sections below discuss the findings relating to cluster training. This includes findings relating to the period leading up to training, findings regarding the training itself, and findings regarding the immediate impacts following the training.

Table 1: Summary: TDP’s in-service activities outside the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary findings: TDP in-service activities outside the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and perceptions towards cluster training are generally positive, and administrative and logistical aspects mostly run smoothly. However, the poor communication with regards to notifying teachers of cluster training is highlighted in all case study schools, with a lack of clarity around who is ultimately responsible for informing schools of cluster training. Suggestions for who is responsible for this included LGEA Education Secretaries and TFs themselves. Short notice also affects female teachers more than male teachers, as female teachers are not able to prepare their household chores and responsibilities in advance of training. The importance therefore of the need for enhanced clarity around communication channels, and advance notice to teachers, clearly emerges from the research findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teachers’ attendance at cluster training sessions is reported to be high, but punctuality is poor. Teachers are mainly late due to distance and inadequate notice being given. As a consequence of training sessions starting late, they also close late. Teachers complain about training sessions lasting for too long. Moreover, women teachers are worse affected since they need to be home on time for household chores and responsibilities. As such, participants would prefer half-day training sessions that are held over more days. |

| TFs face some challenges in preparing for cluster training, mainly due to inadequate notice from TDP. Additionally, TFs feel their remuneration is not commensurate with their preparation time, as remuneration stays the same whilst the amount of time needed to prepare varies between training sessions. Similarly, stakeholders consider allowances sufficiently large to cover expenses, but face issues with regard to the delivery and punctuality of payments. Though payments used to be largely on time, the introduction of e-payments has led to delays. Although teacher attendance remains high, the possibility of gradual negative impacts over time due to slow payments of allowance and perspectives on inadequate remuneration should not be underestimated. This could gradually impact attendance, punctuality and overall motivation. |

| Respondents also indicated that the food provided at cluster training sessions is not adequate. In states where a hot meal is provided, participants are more content than at training sessions where only a snack is provided. Some TDTs, TFs and teachers prefer food to be provided rather than |
receiving allowances to purchase food – as either teachers will not have received the allowances to spend, or if they have they will often return late for the next session.

Teachers appreciate the participant-centred approach in training, and state that the training is easier to understand because of the active use of demonstrations. Challenges arise due to low levels of subject knowledge amongst teachers, particularly in cases where teachers are trained in a subject that they previously have not been teaching/studying. Teachers find it easier to understand the science training, as a whole day is dedicated to the subject. In comparison, teachers struggle with English and maths, and would prefer one day per subject (or two half-days).

Participation in cluster training is enhanced by the use of group work, which makes teachers more comfortable about engaging with the training. However, participation and understanding are both hindered by language barriers, with teachers often struggling to understand training in English. As such, teachers mainly use Hausa during group work. Teachers prefer Hausa as the language of instruction.

Participation is also affected by gender. With few female teachers in cluster training sessions, a level of shyness is experienced by female teachers. Female teachers also struggle to balance their child-care and household responsibilities with training – often arriving late or leaving early, and bringing their children to trainings, causing distraction. Additional notice for cluster training sessions, as well as half-day sessions, could help with this balance. Gender inclusivity, though attempted, is not adequate and TFs need to do more to include female teachers in training.

Teachers face some challenges in regard to implementing what they have learnt from cluster training in their classrooms due to low levels of subject knowledge, large class sizes and lack of materials. Though teachers mix English and Hausa, it is evident that English subject knowledge is low. Despite challenges with class size, the child-centred approach they learn from TDP has made it easier for teachers to engage the whole class. Though lack of textbooks, or pupil exercise books, make it difficult to use certain methods, teachers actively use no-/low-cost materials, as taught in clusters.

Cluster training is seen as the main venue for feedback to TDP. Though teachers, TFs and TDTs feel they have channels to give feedback, there is no adequate mechanism where TDP responds to feedback.

Knowledge sharing takes place, both between TDP teachers during cluster training, and between TDP and non-TDP teachers at school level. In some instances, the fact that only TDP teachers receive allowances undermines the motivation of non-TDP teachers, making them less inclined to learn from TDP teachers.

Schools make use of non-TDP teachers when TDP teachers are away on training. However, this depends on how many teachers a school has. When schools do not have enough teachers, they either merge two classes or classes are left without teachers, which affects instructional time.

---

11 TDP’s focus on addressing this is discussed in Chapter 3 on materials.
2.1 Perceptions of the administrative and logistical aspects of cluster training

It appears that cluster training occurs regularly, as planned by TDP. However, teachers say that TDP does not communicate the dates and times for training sessions clearly, and they complain of not having adequate notice. TDP teachers in all nine case study schools report often finding out about cluster training sessions the evening before, or even the morning of, a training session:

‘Whenever there is a training on TDP, for example…this coming Monday, it is better to inform within a week before, or three days to the day…The head teacher will just tell you that there is a training tomorrow and the rest, some time you will be informed in the morning the day of the training.’ (TDP teachers, Jigawa, typical performing school).

This means that teachers are unable to prepare for training sessions, in terms of materials, making household arrangements (especially for weekend training), or briefing of non-TDP teachers in the school. Though all schools report having non-TDP teachers step in when TDP teachers are attending cluster training sessions, several schools report not having clear instructions when TDP teachers are away, due to short notice.

This poor communication affects teachers’ punctuality in training sessions, as well as their attitudes towards training. Although attendance is perceived to be high, all stakeholders state that punctuality is poor, with cluster training sessions rarely starting on time. Each of the cluster training sessions observed by the research team saw multiple latecomers, with the majority of training sessions starting at least one hour late. Several teachers link poor punctuality with the lack of sufficient notice of when cluster training sessions will take place.

Lateness is also linked to travel distance, with teachers who are living further away from cluster training venues more likely to arrive late. Whilst teachers are stated to attend most sessions, they ‘...come late because they are coming from faraway places...’ (TF, Jigawa, lower performing school). Still, some TF implement a ground rule that teachers are not allowed to sign the attendance book if they do not arrive on time, resulting in teachers not being paid for that particular day (TDT, Katsina, typical performing school). If teachers are only told about cluster training sessions the morning of a training session, it is unlikely that they will arrive on time, in particular if they live far away from a cluster training centre. Though attendance ground rules may motivate teachers to be on time, a lack of adequate notice counteracts this. There is thus a risk that teachers might feel de-motivated because of what may be perceived as unjust treatment.

Additionally, training sessions end late in order to cover the cluster training agenda. With teachers arriving late, the day gets pushed back and, as a result, many teachers perceive that the training goes on for too long.

‘Well, we have actually had a conversation on this issue amongst ourselves with the organisers of the seminar asking them why they have to keep us and end the programme by five or six, and they respond by saying we arrive at the meeting late and the honest truth is that we do come late. And also, we asked them why don’t they give time within the seminar to go and pray? They further said the problem is actually
from us, because if we do come for the meeting at the right time, then there is the possibility that the seminar might end on time.’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, higher performing school).

However, it is not only the time that cluster training sessions end, but also the length of the day, that bothers some teachers, who feel that the day is too long to maintain concentration. Teachers and other stakeholders report the length of the day as one of the main complaints from teachers, who ask to reduce the time to half-days and to spread training over more days overall.

Female teachers appear to be more affected by the length of training sessions than male teachers. As women often have family responsibilities, such as household chores and caring for children, a full day spent at a training session affects them more: ‘in the cluster meeting I told you the complaints of women, to release them to go back to their home in time to cook food and take care with their children, and the rest’ (TF, Zamfara, higher performing school). In cases where women have further to travel for training than they normally do to school this results in poor punctuality, with women having to stay at home in the mornings to take care of household chores prior to training.12 Women state that they are too tired to attend to family responsibilities after a full day of training. Some TFs state that this could be mitigated through good communication:

‘You know, they are married women, some female teachers when they are informed to attend the cluster meeting they will say they forgot to tell their husbands, or she may come late as a result of not telling the husband. So they must exit out before the closing time, which is 4pm. But if there is not this short notice this is not a problem to the female teachers.’ (TF, Katsina, lower performing school).

A further challenge is that there is a lack of clarity on whose responsibility it is to inform schools of training dates. The data show that it is not clear amongst respondents where the communication fails, nor whose responsibility it is to communicate trainings dates, and the challenge does seem to be getting the information to schools/head teachers. All stakeholders – including teachers – report that head teachers are responsible for communicating the date and time of cluster trainings to TDP teachers.13 However, who informs head teachers seems to vary. At times TFs directly contact head teachers, though mostly it appears that LGEA Education Secretaries are responsible for informing schools of cluster training sessions.

‘...at times the STL, which is the State Team Leader, will...communicate with the local governments’ Education Secretary, which is their main office...then the Education Secretary will...communicate to the TFs and then the TFs communicate to the teachers. Sometimes again they go directly from the local government office to the teachers and

12 Exactly how significant this issue is is not conclusive. However, the data indicate that household responsibilities and child-rearing might be an issue for female teachers, especially as in some of the schools observed many women teachers were seen to also bring their children to school with them. This will need to be further explored as gender was not an explicit focus of this study.
13 Pupils were not asked this.
then the TFs. So a lot of ways of communicating to them.’ (TDT, Katsina, typical performing school).

However, stakeholders claim that communication is poor at the stage prior to schools being informed about training sessions, with TDTs and TFs themselves not being given adequate notice to prepare for cluster training sessions. Short notice means that TDTs and TFs have less time to prepare materials, such as handouts, for the training sessions. It further means that the chain of communication, to inform all stakeholders of an upcoming session, ends up being last minute. Teachers thus suggest that TDP contact them directly, via text, and preferably further in advance of the training session – they make a comparison of TDP to Jolly Phonics, which texts teachers 10 days before a training date (TDP teachers, Jigawa, typical performing school).

‘There is also poor communication, you find out that there is an exercise that is going to be conducted maybe tomorrow, or next tomorrow, or any other day. The problem of TDP, particularly here in Jigawa State, is to be informed late. We need to be informed about the activities or any exercise earlier before the time so that we get prepared.’ (TDT, Jigawa, typical performing school).

Teachers also face challenges concerning the payment of allowances. Challenges around the lateness of the e-payment system was an area highlighted within the baseline report. As part of this study, the data indicate that although teachers receive per diems to cover the essential costs of attending cluster training, most teachers claim to face difficulties paying out of pocket. In several of the cluster training sessions observed, teachers referred to delays in the payment of TDP allowances being a challenge. All stakeholders report allowances arriving late, ranging from weeks to months after a meeting. As teachers often have to borrow money to pay for transport, this becomes complicated if they are unable to pay it back on time due to allowances arriving late.

‘Ah allowance, thank God we enjoy that money. Even though sometimes we get problems with the payment of the money, with the payment. Sometimes we have to take a loan… some 1,000 naira and we will tell the person that when we come back from the cluster meeting we will pay. It is enough for you to transport yourself, eat and go and come back. But the problem is you borrow money, you use it for transport, and you tell the person that…you are expecting it to come tomorrow…And maybe they didn’t pay you until after two or three weeks, or four weeks.’ (TDP teachers, Zamfara, typical performing school).

The delayed payment affects teachers’ attitudes towards cluster training. Stakeholders from all schools report that allowances motivate teachers to attend cluster training sessions. Whilst teachers stress that allowances are not be the only thing motivating attendance (they are also interested in the training), it is continuously highlighted in the data as an important aspect of how teachers perceive TDP.

---

14 It is not clear from the data where these loans are coming from: whether from families, money-lenders or both. It might be the case that this differs depending on connections, as well as the amount borrowed.

15 As already noted, attendance at cluster sessions is still high.
'When this programme was first established, they actually paid on time, immediately after a cluster. But now, even after two clusters they still won’t have paid for the first...’. (TDP teachers, Katsina, higher performing school).

‘If the teachers have not been paid and they are asked to come for another cluster meeting it will be an issue to them. You will see lateness and you will see many things that will make the interaction not as wished, as we want it.’ (TF, Zamfara, lower performing school).

Stakeholders perceive the new e-payment system to be the reason for a change in punctuality of payment. State officials highlight that the delay in payment is at times due to teachers providing incorrect information for the e-payment. Still, even in cases when payments might reach them on time, teachers find it difficult to withdraw money, and do not always have the opportunity to visit a bank. In Jigawa, teachers compare TDP payment to ESSPIN, which pays them on the last day of their training, thus allowing them to take out loans to cover costs and then pay back the lenders promptly. Teachers state that they prefer cash payment.

Teachers acknowledge that whilst the allowance is normally enough, this is dependent on the distance that teachers have to travel, and in some cases this affects attendance. In particular, both delays in payment and significant travel distance mean that teachers struggle to pay for transport to the training venue. As long as teachers receive payments promptly, teachers report being able to borrow any amount needed – whilst spending significant sums out of pocket without a loan discourages teachers from attending.

Lastly, all teachers see the food and refreshments provided as inadequate. The type of food provided varies by state, with Jigawa and Zamfara cluster training sessions mainly serving snacks, whilst Katsina cluster training sessions serve hot meals. All teachers in Jigawa and Zamfara complain that the cake given is insufficient to allow them to stay focused for a full day of training, and that they prefer ‘proper food’, in terms of rice and beans or something similar. Though teachers receive allowances to spend on food, TDTs and TFs state that it would be better to provide food at the venue. This is because when teachers venture out to purchase food they are often late coming back. Moreover, where teachers do not receive payments on time they may not have money to spend on food. Stakeholders also suggest that teachers should get more than one meal a day, in order to ensure that concentration and motivation levels stay high throughout the day.

‘If the food is given, it is better than the lemon and the cake that is being given. Because someone may have left his home without even a breakfast. And if you are giving a training to the teacher while he is hungry, it is a problem.’ (TF, Jigawa, typical performing school).

Several respondents, including teachers, the TF and the Education Secretary in the Jigawa typical performing school complained of the refreshments provided in the training sessions,

---

16 In order to adhere to ethical guidelines around anonymity the report is unable to further disclose which state officials were interviewed.

17 Apart from one cluster training session in Zamfara that also serves hot food.
saying the drinks are not cold and the snack ‘chin chin’ is not fresh and is insufficient to help teachers concentrate.

Overall perceptions of TDP compared to other in-service training teachers have received in terms of logistical arrangements also came through. Respondents from the Jigawa typical performing school spoke of Jolly Phonics, which contacts teachers with the date and time of their training session via text several days in advance. Though fewer teachers were involved, the head teacher claimed Jolly Phonics had ‘done a fair job’ of teaching sound letters and sometimes used the school’s TDP amplifier to explain. ESSPIN was said to be larger than TDP in terms of covering all schools in the LGEA, unlike TDP’s 14 select schools and teachers were also happier with the ‘cooked food’ provided in the training. Similarly, training under the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) was said to be ‘wider’ than TDP since it also covered other subjects, like social studies, and the head teacher claimed the certificate provided at the end of the MDG training encouraged teachers.

2.2 Stakeholders in cluster training

TFs are recruited via SUBEB-administered tests. Most TFs and TDTs are former head teachers, as well as School Support Officers or CoE lecturers. All states report that the selection of TFs and TDTs is often highly competitive and that candidates are invited by the LGEA to undertake written tests and interviews. It is worth mentioning that this does not necessarily mean TDP are able to get appropriately qualified TFs and TDTs, as this depends on how stringent the tests and interviews are, and on the capabilities of the candidates who apply for these posts. Though TDP encourages the process to be gender inclusive, the lack of female teachers in general in the focus states mean that female TFs and TDTs are less common: ‘there is the issue about gender. In fact, the TFs. Out of 28 TFs I have only one female.’ (State official, Jigawa State).

TDTs and TFs report receiving sufficient training and support, and all TDTs and TFs are aware of the cascade-training model. With TDTs training TFs a day or so in advance of cluster training sessions, and TFs ‘stepping it down’ to teachers, stakeholders believe the model is effective.

‘When this TDP programme was introduced, we were trained [by TDP] on these techniques and how to support the classroom teachers...and also how to give feedback. The TFs will be given training like a day before the meeting, after which cluster trainings will be arranged with the teachers, during which time we teach them what we learnt.’ (TF, Jigawa, higher performing school).

TFs report working closely in pairs, supporting each other in preparing for, and conducting, cluster training sessions. TFs will collect their teaching aids prior to a session and, ‘read it A–Z, TDP is providing us [with] flip charts, markers and other relevant materials that we need for the facilitation’ (TF, Jigawa, higher performing school). Sessions are then divided between the two TFs and planned and presented accordingly: ‘the two TFs will come
together and prepare for the cluster meeting, like preparing charts.’ (TF, Jigawa, higher performing school).

Materials are prepared according to the outlined sessions and activities, and TFs both write on flipcharts and draw flash cards prior to cluster training sessions. The amount of time spent on preparing materials ‘depends on [what] materials are needed’ (TF, Jigawa, typical performing school), but it normally takes around three days. Printing the materials is a challenge – especially printing sufficient handouts – due to being very time consuming (TF, Katsina, lower performing school). As the remuneration of TFs stays the same, while preparation time varies, TFs suggest revisiting the pay, ‘for the preparation hardship that we are experiencing’ (TF, Jigawa, typical performing school).

The responsibilities of TDTs in cluster training sessions vary: either supporting the TF and actively participating in the training session, or taking on an observational role. TFs are considered the main actors in a cluster training session, with TDTs coming to ‘witness the cluster meeting...not say anything...just observe’ (TF, Jigawa, lower performing school). Still, TDTs often assist TFs, supporting them in their work within cluster training sessions as needed. During cluster training sessions, TDTs play a monitoring role, filling in forms whilst observing. In some cluster training sessions attended by the research team, the TDT would take a ‘fly-on-the-wall’ approach, not participating in the training at all. In other training sessions the TDT would actively take over at times when the TF made mistakes, or lost track: ‘...they don’t normally interrupt us until they see areas where they need to shed light on it’ (TF, Zamfara, lower performing school).

Stakeholders also report that the LGEA Education Secretary is present during cluster training sessions. Apart from logistical support, in terms of organising the venue for training, some stakeholders highlight the LGEA Education Secretary’s role in advising teachers during cluster training sessions. Some LGEA Education Secretaries stress their responsibilities as being ‘monitoring and supervision’ (LGEA Education Secretary, Jigawa, higher performing school), working to ensure that teachers come to the training on time and that they stay the full day. They also monitor teachers’ participation. It is not clear the extent to which LGEA Education Secretaries consistently take on an active role in cluster training sessions, and if they do, whether they are adequately trained and knowledgeable of the curriculum to do so effectively. However, participants only brought these visits up when probed, and did not expand on this beyond stating that these actors take on ‘observational’ and ‘monitoring’ roles. This indicates that the role of LGEA Education Secretaries within the cluster training process needs to be better understood and defined by the programme across states – particularly if they are to have an active role beyond observation (with the necessary quality assurance considerations in place if so).

---

19 The baseline found the TDTs’ role in the actual sessions to be merely that of ‘passive observers’ in the admittedly small sample of sessions observed, and the TDP in-service training and support framework suggested rethinking their involvement so that they play a more active and constructive role in supporting TFs in cluster workshops. It is not clear whether the role of TDTs has been redefined.
2.3 Teaching and learning in cluster training sessions

2.3.1 Materials in cluster training sessions

As aforementioned, after receiving guides from TDP, TFs prepare flipcharts, posters and flashcards. TFs are thus responsible for the teaching aids used during training sessions, and teachers are expected to bring along TDP materials previously provided to them, such as the teachers’ journals and trainer in the pocket20. In all cluster training sessions observed by the researchers, most teachers brought along materials and TFs had prepared flipchart posters. TFs also brought along desktop computers, so as to explain parts of the computer to teachers. However, though teachers had brought along their trainer in the pocket, many said they had not been able to charge them21.

TFs, TDTs and teachers report that some materials22 are inadequate, both due to lack of availability and lack of preparation time. Respondents consider teaching guides to be thoroughly outlined and explained, though they are not always provided. In one of the cluster training sessions, the TF mentioned that there is no teacher’s guide for maths, so he could only use a photocopy of some notes. Teachers complain that photocopies are rarely provided in sufficient numbers: ‘it is important that when they want to do cluster trainings they should make photocopies so that everybody can get a copy, not sharing which is usually difficult’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, typical performing school). Additionally, in one of the cluster training sessions observed, the relevant maths video for cluster 11 was not available, something that the TFs only realised at the time of the training.

2.3.2 Teaching content, methods and practices

TFs use a variety of teaching methods and practices, including group work, presentations, Q&As and demonstrations during cluster training. Upon arrival, TFs divide teachers into groups, and the majority of activities centre on group work. Activities focus mainly on lesson planning and asking groups of teachers to prepare lessons, including teaching aids. TFs walk around the room and offer advice or answer questions where needed. Presentations and wider discussions follow group work. Several teachers state that their level of understanding of cluster training content has improved due to TDP changing its teaching methods and practices. Whilst teachers previously felt that TFs would move too quickly, the current emphasis on demonstration and use of teaching aids makes it easier for teachers to follow.

‘ Truly it is ok, the teachers23 do try... They don’t teach too quickly, but slow...so that we [can] understand them and do as they are doing.’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, lower performing school).

In cluster training sessions observed by the research team, TFs utilise a participant-centred approach, managing the group in a manner that is similar to how he/she trains

---

20 See further discussion in Chapter 3
21 Ibid.
22 Materials are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.
23 Teacher trainers (TFs).
TDP teachers to manage their classrooms. In this sense, most TFs appear to make use of a demonstration-driven approach. The content taught is actively applied to teachers, i.e. the teaching aids they learn to make are the same ones that are used by the TF to teach them.

‘During the cluster meeting they [are] trained on how to manage groups. How you get class control if for example the pupils are in a group [of] six or seven. The teacher should ask the group to choose a leader .... This will result in effective class control.’ (TF, Jigawa, higher performing school).

The emphasis on group work enhances participation. Several teachers consider group work to make it easier to both learn and participate, removing the pressure of having to ask questions and participate in a larger group: ‘...by encouraging teachers in group activities, if he cannot talk in public he is supposed to talk in a group, participating actively.’ (TF, Katsina, lower performing school).

Some TFs make use of ground rules at the start of a training session to facilitate inclusive discussions. Ground rules include the expectation that all will contribute: ‘...right from the beginning when setting our ground rules we...state...that it is a condition that everybody participate...’ (TF, Zamfara, typical performing school). However, in the cluster training sessions observed, apart from the grouping technique and ad hoc attempts to include quieter participants through clapping or direct questions there were no direct techniques to encourage participation, such as circulating group leadership, as is evident from the data collected. Though head teachers and teachers state that most teachers participate24, TFs and TDTs mention that ‘they are not participating, they are not contributing...they remain passive listeners... I have never seen a teacher from this school making a presentation.’ (TF, Jigawa, lower performing school). Although there are attempts to facilitate inclusive discussion, increasing the levels of participation requires further work.

Language25 further poses a barrier to participation. The baseline report clearly identifies the challenge of low English competencies amongst teachers as an issue when it comes to comprehension within the cluster training. Six out of the nine cluster training sessions observed used English as the main language of instruction. In the other three, TFs frequently reverted to Hausa. Group discussions were mainly in Hausa in all cluster training sessions observed. The majority of teachers say they understand the content of cluster training sessions due to the mixture of English and Hausa used. However, TFs and TDTs report that teachers often struggle to follow when instructions are in English. Teachers from all schools suggest shifting the main language of instruction to Hausa to allow for fuller understanding and equal participation.

‘They should teach in Hausa so that a teacher can understand...For instance, some teachers don't understand the lecture until they ask their colleagues to explain it to

---

24 It is worth mentioning that a cluster training session includes teachers from multiple schools, not all of which are included in the sample for this study.
25 Language relating to materials is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.
them. But if taught in Hausa it will be very easy and clear for teachers to understand, since it is your language.²⁶

Additionally, though some TFs emphasise gender inclusive instruction there are certain barriers that prevent female teachers from participating fully. First, the skewed proportion of men and women in the cluster training means that women may be shy about participating in sessions. Second, in some of the training sessions observed, female and male teachers were seated separately²⁷ and were segregated in group activities, meaning that, due to there being so few women present, they would constantly end up working together rather than learning from new people. This was not the case in all cluster training sessions, as several of the training sessions observed mixed female and male teachers during group work activities. Third, female teachers often arrive late due to morning household chores, and they often bring their babies to training sessions. In the observed cluster training sessions, female teachers were often distracted by their children – leaving the classroom throughout the session to tend to their babies. As indicated earlier, this area of gender analysis needs further investigation, particularly given that the baseline reports also emphasised on this problem and now the subsequent observations by the research team in some schools with women teachers having to bring their younger children to school and to training sessions with them. The challenges of gendered constraints around family commitments and child-care arrangements when they are in school, as opposed to when they have to travel longer distances for cluster training sessions, needs to not only be better understood, but TDP needs to look into what gender responsive initiatives it could feasibly incorporate to help address these.

Group work, child-centred learning and the use of teaching aids are the main things teachers say they have learnt from cluster training. The focus lies on the use of pedagogical techniques to a larger degree than subject knowledge: ‘the teacher enjoys this grouping method...or the thing that makes the education better is the introduction of teaching aids.’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, typical performing school). The baseline study found that teachers rarely displayed effective teaching practices and that the average teacher involved pupils for only about a quarter of the total lesson time in pupil-centred and participatory teaching practices that characterise effective pedagogy and classroom practice. Additionally, the baseline findings indicate that existing pedagogical skills focused only on writing/reading from the blackboard or repeating statements for children to learn and repeat. However, teachers refer to making use of teaching techniques and aids introduced to them in training and how these help them to make classroom teaching more engaging.

‘The use of flash cards and full lesson plans given to us...has actually contributed to improvement...because it is participatory in the sense that the pupils participate instead of the teacher to just be teaching.’ (TDP teachers, Jigawa, higher performing school).

²⁶ It appears to be more of a struggle for teachers to understand spoken English than written – potentially as teachers can take time to re-read until they understand – but this is based on perceptions of teachers/other stakeholders regarding materials/cluster training.
²⁷ This segregation is not mandated by TDP but is rather imposed by the teachers themselves when they choose where to sit during training.
Teachers do feel they have improved their subject knowledge. However, many teachers are training in a subject that is different from their degree: for example, having previously studied and taught Arabic. As such, their subject knowledge on the subject they are being trained on is at times already fairly low: ‘...like additional...training on the subject content itself...I don’t know mathematics and I was asked to teach mathematics...Teachers feel reluctant to plan very well because [of being] afraid or [not knowing] how to go about planning...because they don’t know the subject...’ (TF, Zamfara, typical performing school). It therefore appears that teachers at times teach a subject they have not studied (such as the Arabic teacher teaching maths). Whilst this may be due to the head teacher allocating teachers, it still means that certain teachers will attend TDP training with much lower levels of subject knowledge than other teachers (who have studied the subject prior to teaching it), thus requiring training to be targeted at these different levels (no knowledge/basic/some knowledge). The prior education of teachers is therefore something that is likely to affect the effectiveness of training.

The baseline survey also provides useful measures of teacher effectiveness, in terms of their subject knowledge, pedagogical skills and motivation. Using a teacher development needs assessment (TDNA) the baseline finds that the vast majority of teachers do not have sufficient subject knowledge in English, maths or science to be considered effective in the classroom. Despite this, the findings of this study indicate that there is limited acceptance among teachers that lack of subject knowledge is a constraint on their teaching. This formative research is not able to measure any change in subject knowledge, and as such the standalone qualitative evidence may reflect the lack of awareness of teachers with regards to acknowledging low levels of subject knowledge as a problem. However, teachers state that they take away pedagogical skills more than subject knowledge from the cluster training, and that they feel these help them more in the classroom.

TFs and TDTs confirm that teachers often have very low levels of subject knowledge, and teachers are struggling with the ‘stepping down’ of English and mathematics. This was something strongly emphasised at baseline. Teachers refer to having learnt what algebra means, rather than actually doing algebra. It is worth considering whether additional instructional time will be enough, as teachers struggle with English as a language of instruction. It is worth considering whether teachers require EFL training themselves, in order to engage with the English language materials more effectively, and to teach English more effectively as a subject. At baseline, concerns were raised regarding the lack of direct emphasis on subject knowledge in TDP’s training curriculum. Cluster training observations by the research team for this study show that both subject knowledge and pedagogical skills are included; however, there remains a greater emphasis on pedagogical skills.

Some teachers think the time allocated to training sessions is too short to cover properly all the content for English and maths. Most teachers consider the full day given to science to be enough time, but the half-days assigned for English and maths to be insufficient.

‘...science subjects, there is enough time, but math and English...like math is started between 10.00–13.00, then English 14.30–16.00. Science is a whole day, which is why we understand it better...’ (TDP teachers, Zamfara, higher performing school).
Many stakeholders thus suggest increasing the number of days allocated for training sessions, whilst making each day shorter. In particular, the suggestion is to allow full days to be dedicated to English and maths, similar to basic science training. Overall, the perception is that there is too much content for too few hours – an issue that is compounded by punctuality challenges. Teachers, TFs and TDTs all believe allowing two half-days per subject will aid in the stepping down of these subjects. Adopting this approach could further allow for a shorter training day/slightly less content per day, making it easier for teachers to absorb the content and concentrate throughout the modules.

2.3.3 Translation to school level

Though the formative research focuses on perceptions and processes rather than impact, this section briefly discusses the direct implementation of what teachers learn from cluster training at the school level. Overall, the data do not vary across schools and as such substantive reference to the school context has not been made. Overall, teachers in the majority of case study schools make use of grouping and use lesson plans. During classroom observations, teachers grouped pupils during activities, and used lesson plans. Moreover, during the pupil FGDs, pupils drew their classrooms, and several pupils drew their desks facing each other in groups of four.

‘...before, we didn’t group pupils, but now, we group them. They...deliberate and share ideas within themselves. [When] they don’t understand, I will explain it to them...But now a teacher no longer explains and explains, he explains a little and the students understand him better.’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, lower performing school).

Teachers face difficulties in regard to implementing group activities due to large class sizes. However, they also feel better equipped to manage large classes than before TDP. By grouping pupils and asking them to bring their own no-/low-cost materials, teachers accommodate the learning of more pupils at once. However, teachers find it difficult to implement some of the TDP training, such as group work, due to not having relevant materials like chalk or textbooks. When not all pupils have exercise books, it is more difficult to implement group activities. Some teachers try to solve these challenges by making use of no-/low-cost materials:

‘It is not easy handling 160 to 200 pupils...if I am to get bottle tops in order to demonstrate...how will I get bottle tops to give all the pupils...? In such a situation, we learnt that if each pupil is to use eight bottle tops [and] I will require 800 bottle tops, one should tell the pupils to bring bottle tops because they can easily get the bottle tops and bring. These are techniques that can improve quality of teaching.’ (TDP teachers, Jigawa, higher performing school).

---

28 Including head teachers, teachers, TFs, TDTs and LGEA Education Secretaries.
29 Lower-performing, typical performing and higher-performing relates to the pupil learning impact evaluation – and is thus more likely to feature in that evaluation, though as seen at baseline, findings did not vary according to sampling.
30 See further discussion in Chapter 3 on materials.
On a related point, teachers explained how their own school environments are not conducive for teaching computer lessons since they do not have electricity to run computers. This is discussed further in the next chapter on materials.

Moreover, some teachers report struggling with implementing gender inclusive instruction in their own classrooms. Though teachers acknowledge the importance of mixing boys and girls, this was not the case during the majority of classroom observations conducted. Several teachers did utilise gender-sensitive teaching techniques of alternating between boys and girls when asking questions. However, teachers report struggling with this principle. Data show that teachers are aware of TDP saying that grouping boys and girls together is better, but it seems that most teachers find more problems with grouping them together than they do benefits:

‘...in the cluster meeting we were told not to separate genders, [and] grouping them together is best but these pupils are stubborn, by the time you ask him to sit here with a girl, he will start thinking something differently in his mind. So we don’t group them together...But when we report this to them [TDP], they will ask you to just join them together like that.’ (TDP teachers, Katsina, lower performing school).

It is not clear from the data whether it is the pupils or the teachers that face problems with the mixed-gender group activities. It may be that teachers have not internalised the cluster teachings around gender inclusivity, but have only learnt the teaching practices. As such, TDP might benefit from additional gender-sensitive training of teachers.

Teachers in all schools used both English and Hausa during classroom observations, in a manner similar to how TFs mix languages during cluster training sessions. This was observed across grades. Teachers stress that as some pupils do not have any background in English at home it is necessary to mix English and Hausa to enhance pupils’ understanding.

2.4 Other providers of training and support

Teachers view TDP cluster training as preferential to other training due to the focus on how to use teaching aids, and the use of group work in training sessions. Overall, TDP’s participatory agenda is emphasised by teachers as being a reason why they prefer TDP to other forms of training which they might also be a part of. Several stakeholders stress TDP’s active use of demonstrations, and focus on how to incorporate teaching aids into a more child-centred approach, to complement previous Nigeria Certificate of Education (NCE) degrees. Several teachers also stress TDP’s emphasis on mixing English and Hausa to help them understand more, and the benefit of TDP’s training being continuous. As a TDP teacher in Jigawa, higher performing school put it:

‘No, now a day it is the others that should borrow a leaf from TDP. Do you know why? The TDP training includes practical demonstrations. Each group will plan their own demonstration.’

31 The research team observed computer training during the cluster training observation.
TDP training is thus seen as having similar models to programmes such as ESSPIN, whilst differing in the teaching methods used and the content covered. TDP covers science as well as literacy and numeracy (the two areas covered by ESSPIN), and makes use of additional teaching aids, such as visual tools. Though teachers consider other training as very good at their specific focus, TDP is preferred since it covers a broader range of learning. For example, teachers perceive Jolly Phonics to be strong in teaching certain skills. However, teachers prefer a broader range, allowing them to teach full classes: ‘TDP covers everything while jolly phoenix embarks on only word formation and the sounds of letters.’ (Head teacher, Zamfara, lower performing school). Still, teachers see it as useful to attend other training programmes, since these help teachers pick concepts up faster during TDP cluster training.

2.5 **Mechanisms for feedback on cluster training**

Respondents consider cluster training to be the main venue for teachers to provide TDP feedback. When one participant was asked whether he had provided feedback to the head teacher he stated, ‘No, because we know he doesn’t have a role to play, so we complain about it at the cluster meeting.’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa, lower performing school). As such, teachers perceive cluster training sessions to be a space for providing feedback. Furthermore, teachers bring their teacher journals\(^{32}\), and the cluster training agendas observed included dedicated time for teachers to discuss any challenges they had faced during the implementation of lessons.

Additionally, all cluster training sessions observed included a closing feedback activity in which teachers wrote down the achievements and challenges of the training, after which there was feedback from each group. This success and challenges form is sent with the TF’s summary report, which includes the number of participants during the session, the number of TDP materials and the number of teachers involved in group teaching, to TDP (TF, Katsina, lower performing school).

However, teachers are not sure how their feedback is used, or to where it is sent. Other stakeholders, such as LGEA Education Secretaries, report meeting with TFs and TDTs to discuss challenges and feedback directly. Similarly, TDTs and TFs mention meeting with SUBEB regarding the programme, to discuss the challenges experienced. According to one TDP state official: ‘the TFs provide feedback and all these feedback are being, you know, analysed by the ICT and sent to Abuja. Some of the feedback are with the SUBEB; you know the SUBEB also go to monitor the cluster trainings and school visits.’ (State official, Jigawa State). Neither TFs nor TDTs are clear on how LGEAs, SUBEBs or TDP use feedback.

2.6 **Knowledge sharing**

Stakeholders in all schools refer to a continuous knowledge sharing with non-TDP teachers following what they learn in cluster training sessions. In several of the case study schools, the head teachers actively organise meetings to share experiences from cluster training. In these meetings, TDP teachers share knowledge with non-TDP teachers, as well

---

\(^{32}\) See further discussion in Chapter 3.
as discuss and reflect on information together with TDP teachers: ‘...our colleagues that participate in TDP whenever they come back from their meeting they gather us in a class and teach us what they learnt. We have learnt many things, like grouping of pupils, the use of simple, simple words when giving examples, allowing the pupils to also contribute.’ (Non-TDP teachers, Jigawa, higher performing school).

In the majority of schools, teachers state that there are good interactions between TDP teachers and non-TDP teachers. However, in one of the schools non-TDP teachers believe TDP teachers enjoy some financial benefits and as such they do not want to learn from TDP teachers (TDP teachers, Zamfara, higher performing school).

Teachers also refer to knowledge sharing taking place between TDP teachers from different schools during cluster training sessions. In the group work sessions in particular, teachers feel they get an opportunity to share ideas, or ask other teachers for help when they do not understand something (TDP teachers, Katsina, lower performing school).

As TDP teachers share their training with non-TDP teachers, schools normally have another teacher pick up a TDP teacher’s lesson plan when they are away on cluster training (TDP teachers, Katsina, higher performing school): ‘whenever we come back, those teachers that we used to impart our knowledge to, usually go to help teach our classes in our absence. They don’t leave the classes like that without [a] person inside.’ (TDP teacher, Katsina, lower performing school). If a school does not have enough teachers, they will merge two classes so that they can be taught by one teacher at a time (head teacher, Katsina, typical performing school). In Jigawa higher performing school, the four teachers left in school when cluster training is happening are not sufficient to handle all the classes and as such most of the classes will be without teachers. This implies challenges with regard to learning continuity and quality for pupils, which TDP will need to address.

2.7 Targeted recommendations

Table 2: Recommendations: TDP activities outside the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted recommendations: TDP activities outside the school</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There need to be clear channels of communication around the dates and times of cluster training sessions, and determination of whether LGEA Education Secretaries or TFs are responsible. In addition, schools and teachers need to be informed of cluster training sessions, with adequate notice. Teachers suggest preferably 10 days, but at least three days in advance. This will likely improve punctuality and attitudes.</td>
<td>Programme, with LGEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TDP is advised to consider whether the introduction of e-payments has been successful. Teachers prefer to be paid in cash, at the time of training sessions. If e-payments are stuck with, it might be worth paying well in advance to ensure the punctuality of payments, and to allow teachers flexibility in regard to when they are able to access their accounts.</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. TDP should consider half-day training sessions. This will allow for teachers to balance training with their other responsibilities, and will be particularly relevant in regard to encouraging female teachers to attend since they struggle more with child-care and other household responsibilities. As transport time to attend training will be longer than that to attend school, the time spent away from home during training could be more detrimental than is currently realised.

4. TFs also need to be given adequate notice and time to prepare before cluster training sessions. It would also be useful for TDP to consider how preparation time might vary from cluster to cluster, due to different training sessions requiring different materials. TDP should consult with TFs on how they prepare, and offer guidance on issues that they face, such as lack of time and difficulties in printing and accessing materials.

5. As LGEA Education Secretaries appear to be present during cluster training sessions, and taking on a supporting role, TDP might want to consider more clearly defining LGEA Education Secretaries’ role in offering advice and guiding teachers in training sessions, so as to ensure that the LGEA Education Secretaries’ presence aids training and is more clearly positively contributing to the process.

6. TDP should consider how to ensure the participant-centred approach is equally inclusive of all participants. This includes mixed-gender groups and the targeted engagement of women participants. TDP might also want to consider a rolling leadership scheme to ensure that all teachers take turns both leading a group and presenting.

7. Using English as the main language of instruction affects both participation and understanding. TDP is advised to ensure that using Hausa as the main language of instruction, with English used to translate key concepts and terminology, is consistent across the board, rather than based only on the TFs’ or TDTs’ initiative.

8. As the level of teachers’ subject knowledge is low, and teachers and TFs struggle to fit all content into one day, and to absorb all content in a single day, TDP should explore the possibility of having one day per subject, which is currently done with science. This will have further pupil learning continuity implications for the programme as it moves towards a whole-school model of training. TDP will need to find ways to address this innovatively if the impetus for enhanced teacher knowledge is to be maintained.

9. The low level of knowledge and understanding of English warrants English language courses – possibly EFL – for teachers, before they will be able to learn techniques and teach it efficiently.
10. Due to teachers being without prior experience in the subjects being taught in clusters (such as Arabic teachers now learning maths) TDP may need to consider additional subject-specific training for those teachers.

11. TDP is advised to reflect on their feedback system with regards to responding to feedback. Transparency needs to be present with regards to how feedback is dealt with, and in cases when it is not possible to address feedback, the reasons for this should be conveyed to stakeholders.

12. Gender sensitivity needs to be emphasised in training, both to include female teachers, but also for teachers to efficiently and consistently make use of gender-sensitive techniques in their classrooms. Potential socio-cultural attitudes towards mixing boys and girls need to be explored further, and sensitively addressed.
3  TDP materials used both inside and outside of schools

An integral aspect of the ISTM is the provision of printed and audio-visual materials to head teachers and teachers at TDP schools. Some of the materials provided are designed for use by teachers outside the classroom, in order to facilitate their lesson planning, improve their pedagogical skills and deepen their subject knowledge. Other materials provided, such as flashcards and posters, are designed to be used in the classroom during lessons in order to facilitate child-centred and activity-based learning. In order to assess the usefulness and usage of TDP’s in-service training materials provided to schools, this qualitative study sought to explore the question ‘in what ways can the ISTM improve its printed and audio-visual materials to make them more useful and more used in terms of content, language and usage?’

Table 3: Summary: TDP materials used both inside and outside of schools

Summary findings: TDP materials used both inside and outside of schools

It appears that TDP is promptly supplying recipient schools with most TDP materials. However, the primary issues pertaining to material provision include a lack of basic science kits and apparatus, a lack of textbooks (especially in the face of large class sizes) and the provision of only an SD card but not a mobile phone to the second cohort33 of TDP teachers.

Teachers appear to use most of the ISTM materials, placing particular importance on the teacher’s guide, lesson plans and trainer in the pocket designed to help teachers to prepare for their lessons. This may be linked to the ease of use of these materials, as well as the use of both English and Hausa to explain key terms and concepts. There is mixed evidence regarding the extent to which teachers appropriately use the materials, with some teachers understanding that these pedagogical materials are to be used to prepare for the lesson while other teachers use the teacher’s guide in the classroom (despite the fact that it is designed for use outside the classroom), in the face of a shortage of textbooks.

Despite the popularity of the lesson plans, teachers face problems with the lesson plans’ length, scope (lack of subjects covered), and breadth (lack of lesson plans for all three terms as some lesson plans are still being developed by TDP). Furthermore, poor availability of the textbooks referenced in the lesson plans prohibit their effective use.

Low-cost and no-cost materials, such as stones and bottle tops for counting, were found to be widely used in schools as they allow for child-centred activities in the classroom and are easily obtained for use in the classroom.

Teachers face problems in regard to using the amplifiers as a lack of electricity in the majority of schools renders the amplifiers difficult, and costly, to charge. Furthermore, poor security in the schools necessitates that the amplifiers are frequently kept off the school premises, which means that they are not always accessible for use in lessons.

33 Originally, four teachers (including the head teacher) in each TDP school were chosen to attend training as part of the programme. In some schools, however, TDP training has been extended to a second cohort of teachers, the number of which differs by school and state.
The teacher’s journal, intended as a means for teachers to record successes and challenges faced in the classroom, was the least used material provided by TDP. This may be due to a culture of oral feedback predominating over written feedback, or due to a lack of training in how to use the journal effectively. With more training, this material could become a powerful tool for routing feedback to TDP.

Teachers and head teachers predominantly provide feedback to TDP facilitators during cluster training sessions and through their interactions with the TFs. Most stakeholders reported that they were unaware of how TDP management, at the state and national level, used this feedback and that they did not often receive a response from TDP regarding the progress of their feedback. This is certainly an area which TDP should address to ensure that the cycle of feedback is completed.

In the majority of schools, there appears to be a culture of knowledge sharing, formalised through post-training feedback meetings between the TDP teachers and non-TDP teachers. Non-TDP teachers are able to access TDP materials predominantly through the head teacher and, at other times, through the appropriate subject teacher. In a number of schools, non-TDP teachers used improvised flashcards in the classroom, which they had been taught about by TDP teachers.

### 3.1 Provision of materials

According to TDP’s documentation, the materials provided by the ISTM to teachers and head teachers at recipient schools include materials for use inside and outside the classroom, such as the pedagogical framework, teacher’s guides (English, maths, science and technology and general pedagogy), audio-visual materials (including the trainer in the pocket and amplifier), lesson plans, textbooks and classroom materials (including flashcards, charts, story books and posters, among others)\(^{34}\). TDP’s ‘Summary of training materials’ document describes the teacher’s guides, video clips and lesson plans as being designed to be most useful outside the classroom and to be used as reference guides aimed at improving pedagogy and providing guidance on lesson content. The lesson plans, in particular, are the main way in which teachers’ subject knowledge is developed and they provide teachers with ideas on lesson methodology and appropriate materials, including specific textbooks, to be used inside the classroom. According to TDP, participating teachers had received the majority of the materials and equipment at the initial orientation in mid-December 2014.\(^{35}\)

It appears that most TDP materials are provided to schools and teachers promptly and, generally, in the quantities specified. Respondents mentioned, in order of frequency, receiving the amplifiers, mobile phones, lesson plans, posters, charts, flashcards, teacher’s guides and the teacher’s journal. It is noteworthy that the provision of the teacher’s journal was mentioned most frequently by those involved in implementing TDP (i.e. TFs, TDTs, in-

---

\(^{34}\) See Annex A for a description of the materials provided to TDP schools.

\(^{35}\) As noted in the materials survey of the Concept Note for this study, which states, ‘According to the programme, participating teachers had received the majority of their materials and equipment at the initial orientation, which occurred in mid-December, 2014.’
state coordinators) who have knowledge of what schools should be receiving relative to the few times teachers spoke about the journal, which mirrors the finding that the teacher’s journal is infrequently used (see Section 3.2). In some schools, the amplifiers and other materials, such as lesson plans, posters and flashcards, were observed in the head teacher’s offices, indicating that schools had been provided with TDP materials.

However, in eight36 of the nine schools, teachers (both TDP-trained and non-TDP teachers) and head teachers complained about the lack of science kits and apparatus, materials that are provided by the government but which the TDP training is reliant upon. Teachers spoke about the way in which TDP’s teaching methodology and lesson plans have made it much simpler to teach science, but that they struggled because there was little to no apparatus to demonstrate basic science to the pupils. Furthermore, even in cases where they may have materials, poor infrastructure at the school, such as a lack of electricity, prohibited their effective use:

‘There is a topic that is covered in basic science under TDP, the computer. Now, if, for example, you bring a computer to this school and install it, you’ll find that we don’t have an engine to run it, generator to run it. Yes, we were taught about the computer – this is a monitor, this is a keyboard, this is hardware, this is software, etc. – but, … we, the teachers, alone have gained from the knowledge and we don’t have any way that we can impart this knowledge to the children.’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara typical school).

Seven of the nine schools37 reported problems with the SD card. In schools where there was a second cohort of TDP teachers receiving training, respondents – in particular, teachers – reported that they had only received an SD card but no mobile phone, noting that ‘giving an SD card to teachers alone cannot work, because not all phones are compatible with the SD card’ (TF, Zamfara higher performing school). This issue of compatibility was confirmed at the state level, where state officials noted that the ‘teacher cannot use it [the SD card] properly’.

‘Batch B don’t have it [the trainer in the pocket]. The recent teachers recruited don’t have it. They were given an SD card, and when we go to training, you will see them with the SD card in their hands and the handset to one side because they are not compatible.’ (TF, Zamfara higher performing school).

Some teachers were, however, able to put the SD card in their personal mobile phone and use it in the same way as the TDP-provided trainer in the pocket, or alternatively to ‘join someone else who has a phone to watch the video.’ (TDP teacher, Katsina higher performing school).38

Teachers encountered a number of problems with regard to accessing the videos. In two schools (Zamfara and Katsina) all TDP teachers complained that their SD card ‘was

36 The school that does not report having a lack of science kits is a higher performing school that is politically well connected and therefore well resourced outside of the usual channels of support.
37 The schools that did not report problems with the SD card were a typical and a lower performing school from different states.
38 Given the qualitative nature of this study the exact number is difficult to determine as not all teachers were spoken to, and those that were spoken to only in focus group discussion groupings.
formatted, now I have lost everything’ (TDP teacher, Katsina higher performing school). Furthermore, two groups of teachers noted that ‘the videos are not playing in the trainer in the pocket’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa typical school), and that ‘the videos are not clear’ in terms of audibility, requiring teachers to ‘use a ear piece sometimes’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school). During the cluster training observations in Jigawa, the research teams noted that the appropriate videos for cluster training 11 were not available on the trainer in the pocket.

Textbook shortages, particularly shortages of those books specifically mentioned in the lesson plans, are a problem in all schools sampled. Although many respondents reported that they had received textbooks from TDP and from other sources, such as the LGEA, multiple stakeholders from all schools in all three states complained about the lack of textbooks. Respondents criticised both the availability of some pupils ‘textbooks as well as the quantity of pupils’ textbooks provided to schools in the face of large class sizes. This problem was reportedly worse in ‘remote areas’ (TF, Zamfara typical school), but all types of schools in all states brought up the issue, suggesting it is universal. Teachers ‘are trying to implement some of the training that they have received from TDP but they don’t have the relevant textbooks’ (head teacher, Zamfara typical school).

‘When we [teachers] come into the class, we have the lesson plans that TDP gave us but we don’t have the textbooks that we can use directly in class. So you, the teacher, will have to find a way to follow the lesson plan and improvise for the children, and this gives us problems.’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara typical school).

Furthermore, the TDP lesson plans directly reference pages to be covered, from certain textbooks, and the absence of these materials means that teachers sometimes do not ‘have the textbooks that they can use directly’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara typical school). Some schools are provided with the relevant textbooks but, in the context of large class sizes, often with more than 100 pupils in a single class, there are not enough textbooks for each pupil. Furthermore, such large class sizes mean that ‘there is no book for the child to take home and refer to when he is less busy’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school). In order to overcome the shortage of textbooks, children are grouped when using books. However, this is distracting, as the pupils will then start to behave noisily.

‘We are faced with a challenge regarding textbooks. In one class, you will find out that you may have 100 copies [of the textbook] and the number of the pupils is 200, or sometimes there are 50 textbooks to 200 pupils. You face a challenge to group every five pupils to one book, as the process will distract you through the noise generated. But, if every pupil has his own textbook, the class will be silent and you will be able to conduct the lesson peacefully.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Zamfara higher performing school).

All three lower performing schools, as well as the typical Zamfara school, reported that lack of security on the school premises posed a threat to the materials provided by TDP. Head teachers or teachers, therefore, had to ‘carry them [materials] home and bring them back every day’ (head teacher, Jigawa lower performing school). Pupils in the lower

---

39 Textbooks are considered the responsibility of the SUBEB and the UBEC who distribute textbooks to schools. TDP also provides some textbooks to schools; however, TDP lesson plans reference the state-provided textbooks and hence textbook shortages affect the usage and efficacy of TDP’s materials.
performing Katsina school noted that ‘some people come to our class to steal books’ and that ‘they even steal from our bags’. The security in schools varied but many schools did not have shutters on the windows or, in some cases, there were not even doors to the classrooms, which meant that materials could not be locked away anywhere in the school. The lack of security was of particular concern for the amplifier, which was observed during the school support visit in Zamfara and cluster training observation in Jigawa to be brought to the school by a teacher or head teacher, indicating the value placed on TDP materials.

‘When the materials are kept here, in the school, even with the security, it’s not very safe because anything can happen in this school. If the materials are stolen, it will mean the school has lost an important thing.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Zamfara lower performing school).

Schools are given materials from other sources, including other programmes, as well as the SBMCs, LGEA, SUBEB and teachers’ own income. Teachers and head teachers in seven of the schools 40 said that, in the face of a shortage of working materials, such as notebooks or chalk, they used their own money or money collected from the SBMC/parent–teacher association (PTA) to buy materials from the market, which is ‘why we have to explain that the money we collect from the PTA, that is 20 or 30 naira, isn’t collected for ourselves, but we use it to buy boards, diary, registers, and dusters’ (head teacher, typical Zamfara school). In a few schools, respondents said that they were able to borrow textbooks and other materials from neighbouring schools.

‘I have a good relationship with teachers in the school in which I previously taught so when I, or any other teacher, need any materials, I request them from the school and they lend them to me. That school is well equipped.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Katsina lower performing school).

Other providers of working materials, such as chalk, textbooks, exercise books, and dusters include the SUBEB, the LGEA, and other programmes, including ESSPIN, Jolly Phonics, Life Player and MDG. In particular, six of the nine Education Secretaries stated that it was the SUBEB’s responsibility to provide schools with working materials, while three head teachers stated that the LGEA either did supply them with working materials or was responsible for the supply thereof rather than the SUBEB.

3.2 Usage of materials

Head teachers, teachers and TFs spoke about the way in which a variety of materials are used inside the classroom, with the most frequently used classroom materials including posters, charts, homemade materials, counters, flashcards and the amplifiers. Researchers most frequently observed teachers making use of no-/low-cost materials, posters, and the amplifiers, while pupils spoke about the way in which teachers predominantly used the blackboard and their exercise books, with some mention of the amplifiers and pictures in the classroom, stating that ‘he [the teacher] does come with the radio’. When asked about materials used in the classroom, however, pupils predominantly mentioned the use of the blackboard and the classroom technique of copying board work into their exercise books,

40 This included all schools in Zamfara and Katsina and the higher performing Jigawa school.
indicating that teachers may either lack the confidence to use the TDP materials in the classroom, and hence use traditional methods of teaching, or that there is, in fact, a shortage of materials.

‘Whenever a teacher is teaching, he [the pupil] should bring out his book and copy what the teacher is teaching.’ (Pupil, Katsina typical school).

When asked to rank the importance of various materials, a range of stakeholders spoke about the relative importance of materials designed for use outside the classroom – in particular the teacher’s guides, lesson plans and trainer in the pocket – as the most integral materials since the teacher’s guide ‘is what you will read to understand the lesson plan’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara lower performing school), and ‘when you open the lesson plan you will know what to teach the children’ (head teacher, Zamfara typical school). Teachers placed an emphasis on properly preparing for their lessons and this notion was promulgated by those associated with the programme, such as the TF in the typical school in Zamfara, who told TDP teachers, during the SSV, that they ‘would not have encountered problems if he [the teacher] had sat down yesterday to write and prepare for the lesson’.

The relative importance of the teacher’s guide, and frequency with which it is used, may be linked to the ease of understanding the guide. Although the teacher’s guides are written in English, ‘after every module there is a summary of that module which will be translated in Hausa to enhance the teachers’ understanding’ (TF, Zamfara lower performing school). During a review of the training materials provided to teachers it was confirmed that key terms and the module summary are translated into Hausa.

‘You find that in the teacher’s guide, the terms and phrases where they [TDP] think teachers may find understanding difficult are translated into the [Hausa] language to assist them.’ (TDT, Katsina typical performing school)

Across all schools, low-cost and no-cost materials appear to be widely used by both TDP and non-TDP teachers. In maths lessons, teachers used sticks and stones to teach arithmetic, giving ‘the pupil stones to count to 10 and then you ask him to remove nine, and ask him, “how many are remaining?”’ (Non-TDP teacher, Katsina lower performing school). Pupils were asked to bring no-cost materials from home, as seen during one lesson observation in the Jigawa higher performing school, in which pupils produced bottle caps that they had been asked to bring to the English lesson, with which to play Bingo. Children across states were asked to bring no-cost materials to school, with pupils in the higher performing Zamfara school reporting that the maths teacher asks them to bring materials ‘like matches, like water, like viju, like bread, like bottles. She will ask us to bring them to the class if we have’.

Many respondents felt that the lesson plans were one of the materials that facilitated teaching the most by providing ideas for easy ways to teach the content. TDP and non-TDP teachers across schools and states felt that ‘there is no way you can do without it [the lesson plan]’, and that it is ‘one of the most important tools in the school’ (non-TDP teacher, Zamfara lower performing school). The TF at the lower performing school in Katsina felt that the lesson plans were ‘the back bone of teaching the lesson’. The heavy reliance of teachers on the TDP lesson plans may indicate their lack of confidence with the curriculum and weak
pedagogical skills, as teachers spoke about the way in which the lesson plans simplified teaching the topics. Initially, teachers struggled with the terminology used in the lesson plans; however, with the training received from TDP, this confusion appears to have dissipated and teachers feel comfortable using the lesson plans in preparation for their classes:

‘We use the lesson plan the most because when you open it, you will know what to teach the children.’ (Head teacher, Jigawa lower performing school).

Despite the popularity of the lesson plans, lesson plan length, lack of topics covered and textbook availability all prohibit effective use of the lesson plans. The ‘TDP lesson plan is based on one hour’ (TF, Katsina lower performing school), while, typically, lessons in most primary schools in the three states are scheduled for 35 minutes. Most teachers therefore found that ‘time is actually short’ since ‘every period is 35 minutes’ (non-TDP teacher, Jigawa lower performing school). Therefore, teachers were seen ‘to adjust how they spent the lesson time to cater to the lesson plan’ (TF, Katsina lower performing school), or alternatively were able to mitigate the problem ‘when you have double periods and you use it from the beginning you really enjoy the class’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school). Another aspect of time management relates to the amount that is expected to be covered during one lesson. Teachers felt that the lesson plans did not allow enough time to revise topics taught in the previous lessons, which is especially important in the face of high levels of pupil absenteeism observed in the nine schools, particularly during the rainy season when pupils spend time working on farms rather than attending school.

‘Sometimes, the reason why the lesson is too hard for the pupils is that the topic has been split into day one, day two, day three, up to day five. So, in some lessons you may come across a topic that has been done a little, or some topics may even be done over a few days in parts ... so the children will understand. But given the pupils’ academic level, when you give the lesson for day one, and you do not revise it and you move on to day two and add to it, then you keep moving forward and the previous lessons are wiped from pupils’ memories. That is the problem.’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school)

Furthermore, due to the level of English of pupils, the content to be covered in one lesson, as outlined in the lesson plans, is too demanding. This was exacerbated by the English language demands in the lesson plans and the fact that pupils ‘aren’t very conversant in English since they don’t speak it all the time; it’s not their language’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school). The language problem faced by pupils is exacerbated by teachers’ lack of English proficiency, especially in schools ‘with not enough nor qualified teachers’ (TF, Jigawa lower performing school). Teachers’ pronunciation of English words was indicative of their English ability, and confidence about teaching, in English. During a lesson observation in the typical Zamfara school, the TF noted, and researchers observed, that the teacher was ‘having problems with pronunciation, so I told him it’s supposed to be pronounced “weight” not “wheat”. I told him that it is his duty now to go back to that class and correct the
mistake.’ Furthermore, teachers are expected to teach pupils vocabulary in English but at times this is challenging for the teachers who may not know the English word relating to certain topics.

‘For instance, you are teaching English and there are local words used by our local children that is in their local language which are not in Macmillan like Dinya [blackberry in Hausa] and Kadanya [shea fruit in Hausa] and other local fruits. While teaching, you teach the child the names of fruits like oranges and so on which they can identify at home but you can’t tell them the names of those local fruits, so we had little challenges in that regard.’ (Head teacher, Jigawa lower performing school).

TDP has not provided lesson plans for the third term curriculum, which is a challenge for many teachers who are heavily reliant on the lesson plans.

‘In the first term we use the lesson plan, in the second term we use the lesson plan, but, unfortunately, from this [third] term, only the primary one lesson plan is available. There was no lesson plan for primary one or three. If it was available, it would provide continuity, and even you [interviewer] would be able to know which day they are teaching, what we are going to do. If you have the lesson plan, it is common, and so even if the teacher goes wrong, you can get him back on track. The teachers that are teaching class three, they can follow the process and the format of the lesson plan given to them and write their own plan in their exercise book.’ (TF, Zamfara higher performing school).

This reliance on the lesson plans indicates that teachers also need to be have a greater sense of autonomy and confidence in being able to develop and innovatively pull together their own lesson plans. Furthermore, some of the topics that teachers are expected to cover in the national curriculum are not covered in the lesson plans, and the current reliance on lesson plans makes this a challenge. However, according to the TDP teachers at the Zamfara high performing school, those who had distributed the lesson plans had corrected this by printing insertions for these topics.

‘But afterwards when I got another topic [from the curriculum] and it was not in the book at all, there are a lot of topics that are given to us and you do not know where to go and get information about it from.’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school).

Many teachers were able to demonstrate their understanding of how to effectively use flashcards and also how to make their own flashcards. Teachers mentioned flashcards as being one of the materials provided by TDP that they made use of the most often. Flashcards were said to facilitate pupils’ understanding because ‘when you show the class a flashcard once, and ask the pupils, they will answer immediately’ (non-TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school).

‘TDP gave us flashcards which carry letters like “A” sound eh….. Where the letter “A” and there is a picture of an apple. The sound is there and the word is there. So you see, the quality of teaching has improved because the picture of the apple is also there. Maybe a child may have seen the picture before but doesn’t know its name
and now he has been told the name, and has been told what it is used for.’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara typical school).

Teachers felt that they were such a valuable teaching aid that when the appropriate flashcards are not available they ‘get cardboard paper and cut it into small shapes as required and write on them’ (TDP teacher, Katsina typical school). The use of improvised flashcards was also observed during a school visit in the higher performing school in Katsina. In the typical Zamfara school, ‘there are some flash cards we [TDP teachers] made for him [the Arabic teacher]’ – the only teacher in the school not receiving training, indicating the extent to which all teachers felt flashcards are an integral teaching aid, especially to increase child-centred learning.

‘If you bring one [flashcard], then you can replicate and produce your own. You can get cardboard paper to improvise. You can draw your own. If the original material is orange, you can draw a mango on your own. In that way you will be able to produce your own.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school).

When asked about materials used in the classroom during pupil FGDs in the Jigawa typical school, boys referred to teachers using books (however, these appeared to belong primarily to the teacher), pictures, and ‘things to play with’. Pupils of both genders mentioned the teachers coming with chalk and using low- or no-cost materials like bottle tops and stones (counters) that pupils were encouraged to bring from home. However, the TF seemed to suggest that TDP materials are not uniformly being used well. As he mentioned: ‘they (teachers) are applying [the materials] but not doing it adequately unless there is visitation or the other supervision. There is very few of them that are doing it on that way’. The TF also commented on the need for proper use of group work and better techniques for using materials in the classroom, such as the positioning of posters or flipcharts in the classroom.

Many schools faced problems with electricity, which made it difficult to charge both the amplifier and trainer in the pocket, and therefore made it difficult to use them effectively. In seven of the nine schools, head teachers and teachers said that they ‘are facing an electricity challenge’ in regard to charging the amplifiers, and so ‘even if you wanted to use them, it is not possible’ (non-TDP teacher, Zamfara higher performing school). During the cluster training observation, even though teachers had brought the trainer in the pocket to the training, many teachers were unable to switch on the phone as, in this particular urban LGA, there had been ‘no electricity for the past one week’ (TDT, Jigawa higher performing school). In other LGAs in which power outages were less severe, teachers were observed to leave the school with the amplifiers in order to charge them at home while others ‘have to take it [the amplifier] to business charging points for 30 Naira’ (Head teacher, Jigawa typical school), and, even then, multiple teachers complained about the short battery life, stating that if you ‘start working with it, after one hour the battery will easily have gone flat’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa typical school).

The teacher’s journal was one material that was rarely mentioned by respondents and was reported to be under-utilised by programme members, despite being a crucial mechanism for feedback. When asked about the materials provided to schools by TDP, few teachers and head teachers brought up the teacher’s journal, indicating its relative unimportance, and government staff stated that ‘they just dump the teacher’s journal’ (TF,
Zamfara typical school). The disuse of the teacher’s journal was attributed to the fact that ‘they are finding it difficult to write everything in English’ (TF, Zamfara typical school). Furthermore, teachers may be used to an oral culture of feedback, rather than providing written feedback. Another teacher said the lack of interest in the journals was because they were given ‘one copy for two teachers’ (TDP teacher, Katsina lower performing school) while one TF attributed this to poor training on the use of the teacher’s journal.

‘There is a complaint about the materials, about the teacher’s journal. ... There is not enough training on it to allow teachers to confidently fill in the teacher’s journal. They don’t have enough training, even the TFs and the TDTs don’t receive enough training on the teacher’s journal. Some people are using the teacher’s journal based on the calendar, but the teacher’s journal is based on TDP’s modules, and it only assists on the modules or general challenges.’ (TF, Katsina lower performing school)

Many teachers demonstrated inappropriate and therefore ineffective use of the trainer in the pocket, amplifier and teacher’s guides. Inefficient use of the trainer in the pocket was an area that was already highlighted at baseline, and the findings of this research indicate that challenges remain. While the trainer in the pocket and teacher’s guides are designed for use by teachers outside the classroom to prepare for their lessons, there is evidence that many teachers are using both materials as teaching aids inside the classroom. Specifically, some TDP teachers in low and typical schools in Jigawa and Zamfara are using the trainer in the pocket, with the amplifier, to play the video lessons for the pupils where, ‘after explaining the lesson to the kids, we play the video on the phone and increase the volume on the speaker. They will hear while also seeing.’ (Head teacher, Zamfara typical school). This usage led a number of respondents to request a tablet for their classrooms, as they complained that the mobile phone screen ‘is too small for them [pupils] to watch from’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa lower performing school). This inappropriate usage also occurred amongst non-TDP teachers – even in higher performing schools – indicating imperfect knowledge sharing. However, in higher performing schools and schools in Katsina, teachers trained by TDP displayed an understanding of the appropriate usage of the mobile phone and amplifier:

‘You see, since we were given mobile phones we have agreed that any teacher teaching anything that involves sound, even if it is not already in the memory card, because it is not a TDP subject, he should record [the audio] and use the amplifier to play it to the pupils when he is teaching. For instance, if Arabic teachers have story in Arabic, or any type of sound of the Arabic alphabet, they should record it and use it in the classroom.’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school).

3.3 Mechanisms for feedback on materials

The primary mechanisms for providing feedback on TDP’s materials are through the teacher’s journal, during cluster training sessions or direct feedback to TFs during school visits. As mentioned previously, the teacher’s journal is one of the materials that is used most infrequently. However, one TF felt that when it is used, ‘the feedback is always encouraging – it’s like some of them, at times, try to hide their problems’ (TF, Zamfara typical school). This phenomenon of not discussing problems was found to be common
during fieldwork: teachers and head teachers were reluctant to speak about challenges regarding TDP’s training and materials.

Many respondents, from all states, reported that they ‘share feedback with the TF at the cluster training’ (head teacher, Zamfara lower performing school). TFs associated with multiple schools acknowledged their role in collecting feedback, noting that ‘whenever they [teachers] are having problems with the materials, they refer to us and we take the problem back to TDP’ (TF, Zamfara typical school). During the cluster training observation in Jigawa and in Katsina, teachers were given an opportunity to provide feedback on challenges or successes they had faced in the classroom, to the other teachers. This included feedback on materials, including, for example, the Brilliant English Book 4, which was not available in schools. In this instance, the TF said that this had been reported to the TDT and subsequently the SUBEB, and that they were awaiting a response. Similarly, a head teacher from the Katsina lower performing school noted that ‘they haven’t done anything’ with his feedback ‘in the last cluster’. On this basis, it seems that TDP does not always keep head teachers and teachers informed regarding the progress of a response from TDP to their feedback.

3.4 Knowledge sharing

It appears that non-TDP teachers in all schools are able to access and use TDP materials. In the majority of schools – seven of the nine – the head teacher was reported to be the gatekeeper of all the materials, and non-TDP teachers were able to ‘request the materials’ (head teacher, Jigawa lower performing school) and borrow them from the head teacher, who will ‘give you the go ahead’ (non-TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school), as and when they were needed. In the other two schools, TDP teachers were said to keep the materials relevant to their subject and non-TDP teachers could request the materials from them for the appropriate lessons.

Furthermore, the majority of schools hold sessions after the cluster training in which teachers who do not attend the TDP training are updated on the lessons learnt and how to use the materials. These ‘in-house cluster trainings’ designed to update those teachers who were ‘not opportune to attend the training’ (state official) and classroom observation sessions facilitate peer-to-peer learning and aim to help the non-TDP teachers to use the materials appropriately. The head teacher in the higher performing Jigawa school said that ‘when I am back here [at school], I gather them [non-TDP teachers] and tell them that, “you have not attended the training and this is what is now needed to teach. You must do this and that, you must get the available materials to use in the classroom”’.

Peer-to-peer learning has been mandated by TDP and many head teachers agreed that ‘they [non-TDP teachers] are also permitted to use the materials, because, at cluster trainings we are told that we should share our experiences with the non-TDP teachers.’ (Head teacher, Jigawa lower performing school). As mentioned earlier, there is substantial evidence of knowledge sharing after cluster training sessions, and this covers the way in which TDP teachers are taught to use the materials during cluster training sessions.

‘We request their consent and they [TDP teachers] will lend us the materials. Not only do they lend us the materials, but they also inform us on the teaching methods. We
meet in the classroom while they are delivering their lesson, and where we don’t know how to use materials, we ask them to show us.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Zamfara higher performing school).

In Jigawa, some TDP teachers felt that peer-to-peer learning extended beyond the participating schools in the state. To this end, all teachers in Jigawa State were thought to have benefitted from TDP, especially because of the complementarities with ESSPIN, which, most notably, shares the same lesson plans as TDP.

‘As a result of the communication with them [non-TDP teachers] in the school or at home or even in the market places when we meet, we tell them about these materials and how we use them, and so they learn from us. Here in Jigawa State, we can say that all the schools are under TDP, even if they don’t have these materials.’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa typical school).

There is mixed evidence regarding the extent to which non-TDP teachers, and, as mentioned before, TDP-trained teachers, are able to use the materials appropriately. The way in which the non-TDP teachers are able to use the materials is a result of the way they are taught during feedback sessions held at the schools. Therefore, if the TDP teachers and head teachers are inappropriately utilising the materials, it is likely that the non-TDP teachers will do the same. Overall, inappropriate usage has implications for the effectiveness of the use of those materials.

TDP teachers share both the materials designed for use outside the classroom as well as those materials for use during lessons. The teacher’s guide was most often cited as being shared to help non-TDP teachers prepare for their lessons. In terms of materials used inside the classroom, ‘it’s not only teachers who went to TDP training that can use them. For example, audio, i.e. the amplifier, we do use them and posters, textbooks, maps, and so on.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Zamfara lower performing school). For those teaching subjects other than maths, English or science, TDP teachers help them ‘to improvise and they will show them how to do it’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school). Another TDP teacher from Zamfara typical school reported ‘there are some flashcards we made for him [the Arabic teacher].’

‘Of course, when they [TDP teachers] come back from the programme and show us the lesson plan that they were given, we [non-TDP] use that lesson plan. You can’t tell that there are TDP and non-TDP teachers in this school because of that. You would think we all attend the workshops.’ (Non-TDP teacher, Katsina lower performing school).

There is limited evidence of barriers to knowledge sharing, except in one school where non-trained teachers were reported to resist learning about TDP materials due to feelings of resentment towards TDP teachers due to the allowances that TDP teachers received during training.

‘The major problem is that we are facing economic problems. We were selected into the programme through an interview. We were given training from TDP. Those that are not included in the training think that we are enjoying some benefits that they are
not receiving. Why would he [non-TDP teachers] cooperate when he doesn’t attend?’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara higher performing school).

However, most teachers who did not receive training felt that TDP’s methods of teaching made it much easier to convey the lessons to pupils and were therefore eager to learn about TDP’s pedagogy, as well as use the materials provided. One head teacher, in the lower performing school in Katsina, said that ‘they [non-TDP teachers] know it’s easier, so they just take them [materials] and use them’.

In one school in Zamfara, the TF was particularly focused on promoting knowledge sharing between TDP teachers within the school. To this end, the TF said that TDP teachers had been assigned a partner within the school, with whom they were expected to share their teacher’s guide and could discuss issues they faced when planning lessons. Although peer-to-peer learning is a central tenet of TDP’s ISTM, which is promoted by ensuring the teachers attend the cluster training in pairs, a specific focus on peer-to-peer knowledge sharing between TDP teachers was only explicitly mentioned in this typical performing school.

### 3.5 Targeted recommendations

**Table 4: Recommendations: Materials used inside and outside the school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted recommendations: Materials used inside and outside the school</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TDP should be cognisant of the constraints that schools face in regard to providing all pupils with textbooks. TDP should work with the SUBEB to ensure that textbooks are provided to schools (including non-TDP schools) in adequate quantities and that the textbooks provided are in line with those books mentioned in the lesson plan.</td>
<td>Programme and SUBEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The lack of provision of science kits and materials to schools continues to hamper the effectiveness of TDP’s work. TDP needs to determine the extent and cause of the problem, and to work with the relevant government bodies towards ensuring that all schools receive science kits when they are provided with new materials.</td>
<td>Programme and SUBEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In scale-up in Phase I states, all teachers should be provided with both the mobile phone and SD card as the SD card cannot be used unless the teacher has a phone with which the SD card is compatible.</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TDP should ensure that videos are constantly updated in time for the cluster training, to enable participants to have access to the videos during training sessions.</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training should focus on appropriate use of the materials, especially those designed for use outside the classroom. For example, teachers should be using the trainer in the pocket videos outside the classroom in preparation for lessons, rather than inside the</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

43 See Error! Reference source not found.
classroom as a replacement for teaching a lesson. Additional training on the teacher’s journal would be helpful as a means to effectively route teachers’ feedback and challenges to TFs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>6. The lesson plans should be redesigned to make them compatible with the lesson length in schools, as well as to include a component on revision of previous lessons, especially because of high absenteeism so that pupils who miss the previous day still cover the content of the lesson, to some extent, and pupils present are able to consolidate their knowledge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>7. The lesson plan for the third term needs to be developed and distributed as soon as possible. It seems that it is still being developed by the new experts (i.e. material development consultants and TDTs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>8. The amount of English versus Hausa expected to be used in lessons should be appropriate for both the teachers’ and pupils’ levels of English. At present this is too demanding for both teachers and pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>9. Amplifiers could be redesigned to make them solar powered so that schools without electricity can use them without needing to take them to a charging station. This will, of course, depend on the parameters of the roll-out and expansion budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>10. TDP should institutionalise a mechanism for responding to teachers’ feedback. This could either be done by routing responses through the TFs to specific schools during SSVs or by beginning each cluster training session with a response from TDP to specific concerns as a specific item on the agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 The TDP baseline impact evaluation report states that pupil absenteeism was frequently cited to be a constraint – especially during the rainy season and harvest season, when pupils spend time working on the farm.
4  SLM: The head teacher as academic leader and mentor

Findings from the TDP impact evaluation baseline survey conducted in 2015 suggest weak SLM practices in the sample schools. The baseline report identifies enhanced head teacher leadership and management as one of the key outputs within the ISTM theory of change. In addition, it is assumed that teachers will require appropriate leadership support from head teachers to be motivated to learn and adopt new teaching practices. Under the ISTM framework a head teacher is said to operate ‘effectively’ if he or she conducts a certain number of lesson observations (with feedback) and professional development meetings each term, adheres to school and lesson timings, and has more than one strategy to promote the attendance of teachers and all pupils.

To facilitate head teachers in regard to leading effective schools, with the principal aim of improving teaching and learning practices, the ISTM proposes to support head teachers in the areas of academic leadership, school leadership, and improving school development planning. To assess the ISTM’s school-based interventions towards enhanced SLM this study aimed to explore the question, ‘Given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP establish the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school?’

Table 5:  Summary: SLM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary findings: SLM – The head teacher as an academic leader and mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers are generally perceived as having multiple roles and responsibilities relating to both school management and facilitating teaching and learning. There was somewhat mixed evidence in terms of the extent to which ISTM SLM training and materials (specifically the Head Teacher’s Handbook) equip head teachers to deal with the constraints they face in their schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree of application and success of SLM strategies seems to vary considerably between schools. Nonetheless, stakeholders in most schools reported some sort of improvement in the head teacher’s leadership and management since programme inception, and this has been associated with head teachers becoming better aware of their roles and responsibilities.

The frequency with which head teachers attended ISTM SLM training sessions varied by school and state. Head teachers in several schools also received previous or ongoing leadership training from the state (LGEA or SUBEB) or programmes like ESSPIN in Jigawa. These training courses were often said to overlap in content with the ISTM leadership training and head teachers referred to the usefulness of reinforced learning from the somewhat more regular TDP training.

---

45 The Impact Evaluation of TDP’s In-Service Teacher Training Output: Final Baseline Technical Report assesses the quality of SLM in the sample schools by identifying three headline assumptions (related to head teacher motivation, head teacher ability, and head teacher management of school infrastructure and resources) and assessing the strength of evidence against each assumption, while breaking them down into their main constituent parts to allow for a more nuanced interpretation. For further details, see De, S., Pettersson, G., Morris, R., and Cameron, S. (2016, April).

46 It is important to highlight in this regard that several SLM protocols have been outlined in the Head Teacher’s Handbook. However, while this material is likely to have been the basis of head teacher SLM training, the actual Handbook has not been distributed to head teachers as a guide to reinforce learning or follow through with the protocols in schools.

48 SLM training by the SUBEB/LGEA appears to be quite randomly scheduled, with significant variations reported between states and schools. Although there are also some variations in the frequency with which TDP SLM training session are
Head teachers have a role in encouraging teachers to use new teaching skills and materials, by assisting in lesson planning, providing an understanding of the content or language of topics, and in some cases advising on the use of instructional materials.

All sampled schools across the three states had a system of lesson observations conducted by head teachers and, in some cases, senior teaching staff. However, the exact nature of lesson observations varies by school, which indicates a need to enforce greater standardisation of protocols through improved monitoring and accountability. Lesson observations were generally followed by a feedback session with the teacher, in which head teachers picked up on aspects of both the teacher’s subject knowledge and pedagogy and classroom administration. While the occurrence of lesson observations could usually be verified, in the case of some lower performing schools they were reported to be ‘faked’. There was also some concern about the quality of feedback.

Although schools have different – at times multiple – approaches for peer-to-peer learning, head teachers were almost always mentioned in relation to the knowledge sharing process. There was general awareness about the concept and purpose of peer-to-peer learning as an in-school support and learning resource to improve teaching, and both TDP and non-TDP teachers were said to participate. There was also some evidence of teachers advising head teachers in schools. Knowledge sharing in schools generally seems to be facilitated by good relations and cooperation.

The primary mechanisms for feedback on matters related to SLM are during school visits of TFs and TDTs and in ISTM training sessions. TFs appear to use SSVs to check whether head teachers are conducting their SLM activities and for advising on problems. Head teachers also reported using both ISTM cluster training sessions and SLM training sessions to give feedback and raise challenges, and there appears to be a considerable degree of overlap between the two forms of training in this regard.

4.1 Leadership in practice

While the focus of the present study is primarily on the head teacher’s academic leadership and mentorship role in the school, this section provides an introductory contextual background to their broader roles, activities and challenges, and considers the appropriateness of ISTM support in this regard. Head teachers across the sampled schools were described by respondents as having multiple roles and responsibilities pertaining to both managing school activities and facilitating teaching and learning. Stakeholders described the roles of head teachers as relating to school administration, monitoring teacher and pupil attendance, supervising and supporting teaching activities, school planning, liaising between and communicating with external and internal actors, trouble-shooting problems, and providing materials, amongst others. Often the role was described as conducted in each of the three states, these training sessions are still somewhat more regularly arranged in comparison (likewise, ESSPIN SLM training sessions in Jigawa appeared to be quite periodic as well).

48 SLM training by the SUBEB/LGEA appears to be quite randomly scheduled, with significant variations reported between states and schools. Although there are also some variations in the frequency with which TDP SLM training session are conducted in each of the three states, these training sessions are still somewhat more regularly arranged in comparison (likewise, ESSPIN SLM training sessions in Jigawa appeared to be quite periodic as well).
as ‘really tasking’ (TDT, Jigawa higher performing school), and the efforts of the head teacher appreciated were appreciated.

Managing teachers’ behaviour and activities appeared to be a principal activity of head teachers in several schools. Head teachers in at least six schools across the three states mentioned problems with teacher attendance or punctuality, or with getting teachers to ‘enter the class’. The Head Teacher’s Handbook, an SLM training material provided by TDP, outlines strategies to promote learning time, such as making sure the school opens on time, monitoring the teacher attendance register, walking around the school to check that lessons start on time, that teachers are in classrooms and that learning is taking place, etc. While it was difficult to directly tally head teacher responses to the steps outlined in the Handbook, it appears that some of the strategies were being applied in schools, to varying levels. ‘Going round classes’ as a form of checking, and holding meetings, has assisted in managing teachers and the head teacher in the Zamfara typical school made reference to monitoring teacher attendance and punctuality using a ‘time book’, which ‘ensured that the teachers come on time’.

In other instances, head teachers were said to face challenges when there was a shortage of teachers, or with ‘teachers that will not cooperate with him and refuse to work as they are supposed to’ (non-TDP teacher, Jigawa higher performing school). Head teachers were reported to receive training on how to handle teachers under the ISTM, and the Handbook refers to their role in working effectively with stakeholders, including teachers, through principles of adult learning and managing change. TFs in schools in Jigawa and Zamfara made reference to teaching these principles of adult learning ‘to help the head teacher ... [because] the way that he’s dealing with the teachers will be entirely different from the way the pupils are going to be treated’ (TF, Zamfara typical school). Head teachers from at least four schools, and a TF from a fifth, also mentioned learning about ‘division of labour’ and the allocation of responsibilities between teachers.

‘...indeed, there are certain things that I learn there and apply here in the school, like the delegation of duties. Most of the time, I used to do everything myself, then later I was directed that duties should be delegated to the teachers, so that all teachers are involved and you will be in peace.’ (Head teacher, Jigawa typical school).

In all nine sampled schools, head teachers were reported to have instituted systems for the delegation of leadership duties in their absence. A TDT from Jigawa reported head teachers being directed to do this in their leadership training, although the Handbook does not refer to this. Where available, the head teacher’s deputy or assistant was left in charge. Where this was not the case, some teachers (often non-TDP teachers) were designated to manage school affairs. Teachers across all schools appear to cooperate and remain committed to their teaching in the head teacher’s absence, with non-TDP teachers in a lower performing school in Katsina claiming they ‘try to work more in his [head teacher’s] absence so as to cover for him and also so it won’t be said that we don’t work when he is not around’\(^4\). Non-TDP teachers in one school in Jigawa, however, mentioned they faced

\(^4\) Since teachers themselves were often one of the major respondent groups here, there is a chance of response bias.
problems if they ‘are looking for assistance’ when both the head teacher and his deputy are in training. TDP teachers in the same school did not refer to any such problems.

Although head teachers themselves usually did not refer to the issue, stakeholders associated with at least four different schools across the three states mentioned challenges for head teachers resulting from teacher recruitment and posting decisions taken elsewhere. These decisions may not reflect school needs and it was mentioned that because ‘participating schools sometimes don’t maintain the staff that’s started the training... in that case that training is wasted because we want a kind of continuity’ (TDT, Katsina lower performing school). Such situations seemed to be dealt with to varying effects through the head teacher highlighting the issue and involving either the SBMC or TFs to attempt to liaise with the LGEA to reverse or provide alternative solutions to the issue. For instance, in the case of the Katsina lower performing school referred to above, the TDT said they first coordinate with the LGEA to try and maintain the teacher, but if the transfer becomes inevitable, they then get a replacement who they can bring up to speed through supplementary training.

In addition, teachers’ political connections were highlighted as influencing head teachers’ abilities to manage their teachers in at least four schools. Head teachers complained of some teachers having ‘status’ and ‘godfathers’, and explained ‘if you have a godfather then you are untouchable’ (head teacher, Katsina typical school). It appears that the ISTM provided some sort of training to head teachers in this regard, as references were made to learning to deal with such situations through speaking with such teachers in-house to advise them of their duties, and forwarding the cases to superior offices. There was also mixed evidence from respondent interviews across schools about the workability of each of these strategies.

The issues of pupil attendance and punctuality were frequently listed amongst the head teachers’ constraints. Reference was made to a lack of cooperation from parents in regard to sending their children to school, particularly during the rainy season when children were required to work on farms, for planting or harvesting. There was some evidence that these issues may have been more common in rural areas, and in Zamfara these issues were also linked to the herding profession. Head teachers in several schools across the three states had contracted the assistance of SBMCS in this regard and appeared more aware of dealing with issues of pupil attendance and late-coming since the introduction of the SLM training. SBMC engagement is also emphasised in the Handbook, which further provides guidelines on creating an ‘inclusive school environment’ where pupils of all backgrounds enrol, regularly attend and participate in learning. In almost all such instances, interviews with the concerned SBMC or PTA confirmed they had assisted the head teacher in regard to issues of pupil enrolment and attendance.

50 These included the Jigawa higher performing school, typical and lower performing schools in Katsina, and the Zamfara higher performing school. Only the head teacher in the Jigawa higher performing school made a (hypothetical) reference to the issue of teacher transfer.

51 It was also interesting to note that in two of the four schools respondents used female pronouns when discussing issues of teacher politics, which may suggest a gendered dimension to the issue. However, this was not explored further as part of the current study design.

52 The Handbook also directs the reader to the SBMC Guidebook in relation to these issues, although the research team did not have access to this to review its content.
‘Our pupils were coming late in the past, but now as a result of the training on leadership, the head teacher will make sure that pupils are coming on time, which is part of the training on leadership.’ (TF, Jigawa typical school).

The above quote is an indication of the head teacher’s realisation of their own top-level accountability and leadership responsibility. Similar sentiments were reflected by the head teacher in the Katsina lower performing school when he explained:

‘Before I wasn’t a leader in the school but now I have been given the position of a leader, so because of that when I see a person doing something wrong, I will call his attention and tell him what he is doing is wrong, and they take to my correction.’

There was some indication of head teachers identifying and attempting to resolve problems internally at the school level since the introduction of TDP. The head teacher of the Zamfara typical school reported ‘usually call [-ing] for a meeting when there is a problem ... I call the staff. We discuss and make a decision’. In the case of the typical school in Katsina the head teacher reported solving many problems of the teachers and the school because they had ‘written and identified’ them in their ‘books’ as part of their school self-evaluation, which they did not do before the ISTM SLM training. In a third higher performing school in Katsina, the head teacher reported that his ‘TDP teachers use their journals to draft any problems’, which they then solve in school meetings. Some head teachers reported that they had been encouraged to take their own initiative during their training, and the Handbook, as an example of the SLM training materials, includes guidelines on facilitating teachers (through, for example, professional development meetings), improving school planning, and conducting a school self-evaluation. However, there is limited and inconclusive evidence of head teachers actually adopting all the steps involved.

In light of the previous discussion it appears there is somewhat mixed evidence in terms of the extent to which ISTM SLM training and materials (specifically the Head Teacher’s Handbook) equip head teachers to deal with the constraints they face in their schools. In regard to issues where the training does provide guidance, head teachers appear to adopt the recommended protocols contained, with varying degrees of application and success.

In seven of the sampled schools, respondents (including teachers, head teachers, TFs, and external actors) reported that there had been some sort of improvement in the head teacher’s leadership and management of the school as compared to before TDP. The changes appeared to be both in terms of activities the head teacher undertook in the school and also in his/her attitude and behaviour:

‘There were so many things I didn’t bother about before receiving the training, but I now consider those things... [For instance] before I didn’t take school records

53 The most pressing constraints, as well as the ability to deal with them, varied across schools. So, for example, infrastructure constraints were very significant in the Jigawa low performing school, but in other cases, such as the Katsina high performing school, were not relevant, while in yet other schools they may have been partially resolved through involvement of the SBMC. The same was the case with the other constraints (like teacher/pupil attendance, authority vis-à-vis teachers, political connections etc.). Thus, it would be difficult to give a single prioritised list that applied to all schools. Instead, this section attempts to cover the main recurring problems across schools.
seriously but after the training I realised those records are very important…” (Head teacher, Zamfara, lower performing school).

Two head teachers, in Jigawa and Zamfara, stated that before the leadership training ‘most of us [sic] head teachers didn’t know our roles’ (head teacher, Zamfara typical school). However, while frequent reference was made to ISTM SLM training and its varying application, it was somewhat more difficult to assess head teacher engagement with the SLM training materials themselves as they were rarely directly mentioned in head teacher responses. This may be because, as the TDP’s Central Programme Management mentioned, head teachers do not currently possess the Handbook, which is still being printed. The Handbook is linked to video resources (similar to the teachers’ guides), but these too have not yet been distributed. The programme has not developed or provided any further SLM materials to date. In one higher performing school in Jigawa the head teacher spoke of receiving ‘a book on lesson observation’, although he was unsure if this book was from TDP or ESSPIN, and head teachers in some other schools were reported to use lesson observation forms. Likewise, another head teacher in Jigawa (typical school) mentioned that he had done ‘Leadership 1–6’ with ESSPIN, for which they were given ‘handouts’. In two schools, reference was made to records of school evaluations, while the head teacher in the Katsina typical school made the following recommendation:

‘…whenever there is a leadership training, it is important that facilitators, supervisors and every other person involved provide materials that will help the head teacher carry out his leadership roles…For example, the school development plan was talked about [in the training and even mentioned during facilitator visits] but most of the schools don’t have them, they don’t even know something about school development plan and how to fill it.’ (Head teacher, Katsina typical school).

It was difficult to establish a clear pattern of recall from the data regarding the frequency with which head teachers across the sampled schools attended ISTM leadership training. Head teachers on the whole appeared to have attended more than one TDP leadership training session over the course of the previous year, but responses of different actors (both associated with the same school, and with the same state) generally referred to from one to six training sessions in the last year. In this regard, representatives of TDP’s Central Programme Management were able to confirm that, although SLM training had been conducted in Jigawa, Katsina and Zamfara had had only one training to date. Two head teachers in Katsina and a TDT in Jigawa suggested that the TDP SLM training sessions should be held more frequently, as was the case with cluster training: ‘to remind us about our job, because you know if there is no reminder on many things, so you may forget’ (head teacher, Jigawa typical school). There were also frequent requests to include other (non-TDP) head teachers in the SLM training, as well as other teachers who may be required to act in the head teacher’s capacity when the head teacher is absent.

54 The Head Teacher’s Handbook has been produced with technical assistance from DFID under ESSPIN using the collective expertise of the SUBEBs, State School Improvement Teams, head teachers and education specialists from three UK Aid-funded programmes: ESSPIN, TDP and Girls Education Programme Phase 3 (GEP3). It is a two-year training programme for head teachers comprising six terms.

55 The research team could not at this point determine whether these are the same handouts used under the ISTM.
In addition to SLM training under TDP, head teachers in several schools were said to have received some sort of leadership training from their states (i.e. the respective LGEAs and SUBEBs). It was somewhat difficult to establish the exact details of the state leadership training from interviewee responses. Leadership training under the LGEA and SUBEB appeared to be irregularly arranged and was variously reported as covering aspects of school administration, teacher management, and community relations – similarly to the ISTM that supports head teachers in ‘school management’. One head teacher and the SUBEB representative in Zamfara, however, suggested that the TDP ISTM was ‘wider’ than the LGEA and SUBEB training.

In terms of state-specific results, ESSPIN leadership training was mentioned by respondents in all three schools in Jigawa, as well as by the In-State Coordinator, and the SUBEB representative. Generally, TDP and ESSPIN were seen as ‘sister projects’, and their leadership training was reported to be very similar – ‘like climbing a ladder, every step you are forwarding up’ (Education Secretary, Jigawa typical school). The In-State Coordinator for Jigawa also spoke of the ‘specialists’ of the two programmes interacting and ‘share[ing] things together’ so that TDP would know what ESSPIN was providing to head teachers and how this compared with TDP’s SLM support, which would lead to further integration. Overall, it appears that there is still considerable room for better coordination, communication, and potential complementarities in terms of SLM training content and scheduling between the ISTM and other leadership training provided by the SUBEBs, LGEAs and state-specific actors (e.g. ESSPIN).

4.2 Head teachers’ role in encouraging teachers to use new skills and materials

Across all sampled schools there was reference to some type of support or interaction between head teachers and teachers with regards to teaching in classes. Often this was linked back to head teachers being advised during training to ‘make sure’ that what was taught to the pupils in class was the same as what was taught by TFs during training. The Head Teacher’s Handbook, as an example of the ISTM SLM training materials, includes a section on ‘Improving Teaching and Learning’, emphasising several specific areas, including supporting teachers to use lesson plans, how they should carry out lesson observations, mentoring, and other areas. In five schools in Jigawa and Zamfara head teachers were reported to be encouraging the use of lesson plans, by going over their contents and identifying and assisting with areas of concern.

‘He [head teacher] will see your lesson plan as whole, [in the past] anywhere he sees error he will mark… but now he will look for the outcome, what it contains, and then evaluation. He will then call you aside and advise you.’ (TDP teacher, Jigawa typical school).

Three schools in Zamfara and Jigawa made reference to the head teacher’s oversight of instructional materials used in lessons and the head teacher in the Zamfara school said he cautioned and corrected teachers if he noticed the materials were ‘not right for the lesson’. In addition to providing guidance on the overall organisation of teaching activities, it
appeared that teachers were also likely to approach the head teacher if they had problems understanding the content or language of a topic.

‘I wanted to teach a topic and while I was doing research regarding the topic before going to class I realised I [had problem with] the English and words pronunciation... when I met him [head teacher] he said no problem and helped me out.’ (TDP teacher, Zamfara lower performing school).

Evidence from schools aligns with a review of the SLM Handbook, suggesting that SLM training materials do attempt to train head teachers to encourage TDP teachers to use the teaching and pedagogical skills and materials in the classroom. However, head teachers (and therefore teachers) across schools are applying this training in varying ways, indicating a need to enforce greater standardisation through strong school support systems. Section 4.3 and Section 4.4 provide further details in this regard.

4.3 School lesson observation system

All nine schools sampled in the survey reported having a system of lesson observations conducted by the head teacher, and in some cases senior staff members, but the exact nature of this system appears to vary by school. The process of lesson observation was frequently reported as having been introduced as a result of head teacher training under the ISTM, in order to see what is being taught in classes. As indicated, the Head Teacher’s Handbook, an SLM training material provided by TDP, outlines a series of procedures in this regard.

While in most cases it appeared to be the head teacher who went around observing lessons, some references were made to deputies or other senior teachers supporting the head teacher in this role. Head teachers were variously reported as either sitting in on the lesson or observing it through the window. While in some cases head teachers were simply said to ‘listen’ to the lesson, the two typical schools in Jigawa and Zamfara reported them video recording their observations and the remaining two schools in Jigawa said head teachers used lesson observation forms.56

In almost all cases lesson observations were followed by a feedback session with the teacher, in which mistakes were highlighted and advice was given for improvement if necessary. The head teacher in the Jigawa typical school used ISTM terminology when referring to this, saying he would ‘award the teacher with maybe two stars and one wish’ when the class was over, so that the teacher could make improvements. Feedback was usually reported as being discussed on an individual basis with the teacher, and head teachers in two schools (low and typical performing schools in Katsina) were also specifically mentioned as not correcting the teacher in the presence of students.

Schools also had varied responses regarding how frequently these lesson observations were conducted and how they were usually scheduled. There appears to be no real pattern

56 In the Jigawa lower performing school the assistant head teacher reported that the head teacher had taught them how to use these forms.
across either state or type of school for this, as, for example, at least four schools\textsuperscript{57} reported conducting multiple observations daily, while in two others\textsuperscript{58} head teachers (or their assistants) were said to carry out lesson observations ‘when free’. These findings are significant as they indicate a lack of standardisation of this practice. The new head teacher at the Zamfara higher performing school responded that while he was conducting lesson observations regularly, he lacks clear guidelines to refer to on the process. Similarly, while several schools reported having no fixed timetable for lesson observations and a head teacher could arrive in class ‘unannounced’, in others teachers would be notified in advance as ‘if you did it without consent of the teacher it will eventually end up worrying them’ (head teacher, Jigawa typical school).

**Head teachers appear to pick up on aspects of both teacher subject knowledge as well as pedagogy and classroom administration during lesson observations, although the relative weights assigned to the two seems to vary by school.** In two schools, observers were reported to go ‘through the books of students just to see what the teachers are teaching’ (TDP teacher, Katsina higher performing school), and to pick up on ‘writings on the board which are wrongly spelt, while pupils have already copied them into their books and the teacher also thinks they are correct’ (head teacher, Zamfara lower performing school). In terms of teaching methods and classroom management, respondents in five schools variously mentioned things like head teachers checking if teachers had stated their lesson objectives, if they could control and engage pupils, and the use of grouping when they conducted lesson observations.

**Across all the schools, teachers’ responses appeared to confirm the occurrence of lesson observations, and pupils’ responses also seemed to largely verify these claims for high and typical performing schools.** In the case of the Zamfara typical and lower performing schools, however, the evidence was less conclusive as both groups of male and female pupils in each school indicated that they had not seen the head teacher entering their classes to observe teachers\textsuperscript{59}. This was also the case for female pupils in the lower performing school in Katsina. Overall, most pupils suggested that their teachers were ‘happy’ when they saw someone observing their lessons and did not change their style of teaching, although there were a couple of references to teachers feeling encouraged or starting to ‘teach even better’ when they were being observed (male pupil, Jigawa typical school).

However, two TDTs associated with the lower performing schools indicated that the reported lesson observation ‘are more or less faked’ (TDT, Katsina lower performing school). This appears to corroborate pupil responses in these two lower performing schools, where pupils could not confirm the occurrence of lesson observations. Possible explanations for this given by the TDT in Katsina were a shortage of time and the fact that ‘the head teacher may not know all the subjects in the school for effective observation’.

\textsuperscript{57} These include the Jigawa higher performing school, Katsina typical school, and Zamfara typical and lower performing schools.

\textsuperscript{58} Katsina higher performing school, Katsina lower performing school.

\textsuperscript{59} In the case of the Zamfara typical school, pupils did however refer to the head teacher coming in to teach or greet the teacher, which may be indicative of the fact that this school had a shortage of teachers and only two rooms, and often had to resort to multi-grade teaching.
Likewise, a TDT associated with the higher performing school in Jigawa suggested problems with the way in which feedback was given following lesson observation – for example, ‘giving feedback in a kind of open environment’ and ‘not even wait[ing] for the teacher to come out before they start talking to the teacher’ – and recommended further training in this regard.

4.4 Facilitation of knowledge sharing in schools

At baseline the report highlighted that peer-to-peer learning involving TDP and non-TDP teachers was not happening, with only rare cases of this happening being noted. However, head teachers, teachers (both TDP and non-TDP) and programme representatives across schools in all three states generally now seem to be aware of the concept and purpose of peer-to-peer learning and knowledge sharing, viewing it as an in-school support and learning resource to improve teaching, and the practice has increased. Teachers were reported to ‘share ideas’ and seek assistance from others who had more knowledge whenever they had trouble with their teaching or understanding. The purpose of this peer-to-peer knowledge sharing exercise was described by a TF (Zamfara typical school) as encouraging teachers to work in groups as ‘two heads are always better than one’.

Schools appear to have different, at times multiple, approaches for how peer-to-peer learning takes place and across all schools the head teacher was mentioned in some relation to this knowledge sharing process, indicating that they had likely been encouraged to do so in their SLM training and materials (the Handbook for instance maps how a head teacher is to conduct a professional development meeting). The majority of the schools reported their head teachers organising some sort of experience sharing meeting for teachers (TDP and non-TDP) following ISTM training, whereby the learning from the training was delivered and explained to those that had not attended so that they could benefit and ‘take corrections’ as well. In the case of two schools, the typical school in Zamfara and the lower performing school in Katsina, such meetings of teachers were also said to be arranged following visits to the school by a TF/inspectors, whereby their feedback was shared with other teachers. Reference was made in the Zamfara typical school to a partnering system for peer learning to take place. In four schools (low and typical performing schools in both Jigawa and Katsina) reference was made to professional development meetings. These meetings with teachers were generally described as platforms for discussion of challenges and successes that had been observed by head teachers as they went around classes, or to discuss what was going to be taught and how. The Zamfara higher performing school reported having no formal mechanisms for knowledge sharing, with the TDP teachers, head teacher and TF all reporting that there is no time when TDP training content is shared.

There also appeared to be less structured mechanisms of knowledge sharing in several schools, whereby teachers could simply approach the head teacher or other teachers for explanations of, or assistance with, their lessons or help in understanding the content or

---

60 With regard to experience sharing following ISTM training sessions, respondents often appeared not to distinguish between the head teacher’s attendance at cluster training and SLM training.

61 It was somewhat interesting to note that direct references to ‘professional development meetings’ in these schools came from TDP staff (two TFs and a TDT), while head teachers in the typical schools in Jigawa and Katsina referred to them as ‘teacher development meeting’ and ‘school meetings’, respectively.
language of a topic. There was reference to this happening in the head teacher’s office during breaks, and in one higher performing school in Katsina a TDP teacher reported that his non-TDP colleague ‘stays by the window to listen and pick up some of the methods you exhibit to your students, which he doesn’t use while teaching’.

There was also some evidence of knowledge sharing or advice flowing the other way, i.e. from teachers to their head teacher, in at least four schools. Teacher and head teacher responses suggest that head teachers were more approachable and open to accepting teachers’ recommendations on solving problems than they had been before the ISTM training started. A TDP teacher in the Zamfara higher performing school described this in the following way: ‘if you brought advice he [head teacher] will accept it, and if he brought advice we will also accept it. At times he investigates – if we sit down together we solve the problems’. Likewise, teachers in another school in Zamfara reported that they had decided, without involving their head teacher, to demote all pupils after realising they were not on a par with what TDP was teaching, but the head teacher had analysed and heeded their advice – which was in contrast to what would have happened before the teachers had begun to receive training. Similarly, head teachers in two schools mentioned seeking informal SLM support and guidance from older, more experienced, teachers in school.

Initiatives relating to peer-to-peer learning in schools appear to be implemented both through the facilitation of the head teacher and on the part of teachers (both TDP and non-TDP) themselves. As indicated earlier, head teachers in several schools went around classes and would organise knowledge sharing meetings amongst their staff. Teachers were also reported to exercise their individual initiative in seeking assistance from others if they had any problems in teaching or using materials. Head teachers and teachers both frequently made reference to Tfs’ instructions to share information during their respective training and school visits: ‘They tell us all the time we must be together with teachers. To continue sharing different ideas amongst each other’ (head teacher, Katsina higher performing school). During the SSV conducted as part of this study a TF in one school in Zamfara was also observed to give similar advice to a teacher regarding asking others for assistance if he could not explain a concept.

Knowledge sharing generally seemed to be facilitated by good relations between teachers. Teachers were said to cooperate and understand each other, and to heed each other’s advice. This also appeared to be the case in terms of teachers’ relations with head teachers.

‘There is a good relationship between a teacher and another teacher in this school. As the headmaster of this school I have a very peaceful coexistence with my teachers due to that if I have any problem or any of my teachers we sit, share ideas and solve that problem together.’ (Head teacher, Zamfara lower performing school).

Overall, most schools appeared to have established either structured (e.g. experience sharing meetings or professional development/school meetings) and/or less formal mechanisms (e.g. informal contact or observations between teachers) for peer-to-peer learning, since the inception of TDP. Head teachers often had a central role within this

---

62 In the case of TDP teachers, ‘training’ referred to cluster training, while for head teachers ‘training’ included both cluster training and head teacher SLM training.
knowledge sharing process, suggesting a relatively strong effect of their training. Although it was difficult to assess the quality of these processes, or the specifics of the feedback shared, from interviewee responses, both TDP and non-TDP teachers across multiple schools claimed that they participated in them, and that they found them beneficial for their teaching.

4.5 Mechanisms for feedback on SLM training

The primary mechanisms for feedback on matters related to SLM are during SSVs of TFs and TDTs and in ISTM training sessions. A number of TFs, TDTs and head teachers in schools across the three states reported TFs using their SSVs to check with head teachers on things like the number of lesson observations they had conducted and to look at things like the school development plan, both of which are mandated as part of the head teacher observation, or to ask and advise on problems head teachers had encountered.

‘Some head teachers have to be in the classrooms [to teach], apart from being in the classroom there are some questions the TFs usually ask them, ... whether they have been holding meetings in their schools, how do they find the TDP programme, and so on and so forth. If there is any problem, they [head teachers] report to the TFs and the TFs now will take decisions on what to do. If it necessary to take the problems to TDP, they may do that.’ (TDT, Katsina typical school).

TFs appeared to ask for evidence of these SLM activities and this was also observed during a SSV conducted in Katsina where the TF asked to see a record of the lesson observations and asked the head teacher what had been discussed during the school’s staff meeting. However, a TF in Zamfara reported that although they had instructed head teachers to document everything so that they could assess progress, there was a problem in documentation and meetings with staff and the SBMC, for example, were not recorded. As mentioned earlier with regard to lesson observations, some TDTs associated with lower performing schools in Zamfara and Katsina also stressed that school visits were necessary to check the head teachers activities and to verify the information they were giving.

‘We pay visits to the head teachers to have a chat with them... to see whether there is any problem with the teachers or any problems with the TFs, so to have some confidential discussion... if there’s need to make any contribution then we make that contribution.’ (TDT, Katsina lower performing school).

Head teachers also reported using both ISTM cluster training and SLM training to give feedback and raise challenges. However, it was difficult to assess from their responses whether they distinguished between the type of feedback (i.e. related to teaching and learning or their leadership activities) they gave in each session. Thus, there appears to be a degree of overlap at present in the function of cluster training and SLM training as a platform for head teacher feedback. It is likely, however, given that head teachers attend cluster training sessions much more frequently, that they use these training sessions to give most of their feedback and to seek advice.

---

63 This was not produced and the TF advised the head teacher to keep one next time.
4.6 Leveraging the role of the community and other actors

Community actors who play a role in improved management and accountability, such as the SBMC, were referred to on several occasions. **Taking responsibility for addressing challenges faced by schools came up in several schools, where local initiatives to solve infrastructural problems saw head teachers approaching SBMCs for input (financial or otherwise), as well as contributions from parents, community members or even teachers themselves.** However, school responses to whether such initiatives had resolved infrastructural and resource problems appeared to vary from case to case, and requests for additional support in terms of school and classroom infrastructure were put forward in most schools.

More specifically, the strengthening of the SBMC through leadership training was also recommended:

‘For example like our community leader for any SBMC; if he can [be] selected – one of the educated [ones] – and involve him during cluster [training] I think it will make him support. He will come to the school and will talk all that he did not know.’ (Head teacher, Katsina typical school).

This was echoed in the Zamfara lower performing school, where a TF stated that ‘Yes the SBMC is very important – if TDP can get in touch with them it will increase the effectiveness of the school, like in terms of enrolling children and [making them] punctual’.

**One head teacher highlighted the importance of the wider community being a part of the management and accountability processes for schools:**

‘There is also need to extend this training on leadership, to mobilise people...that not only head teachers are responsible.’ (Head teacher, Jigawa high performing school).

In the Katsina high performing school, community actors, such as the SBMC, PTA and Mothers’ Association, are involved in the management and running of the school. For example, the SBMC and PTA are said to attend most school meetings, to provide contributions (financial or otherwise), to assist with pupil enrolment and attendance, and to help resolve other school problems (like providing material to prevent damage from rainwater). **However, while the SBMC and PTA are involved in the school, they are not included in, or aware of, TDP activities.** The TF also mentioned she had no relation with the SBMC. The TDT stressed the importance of including the SBMC in TDP activities as they could provide an additional layer of monitoring. He also recommends inviting them (for example, the LGEA Quality Assurance officers), to cluster training sessions so that they know what to look for and where to support schools.

The data therefore indicate that there is an openness to capacity building on role of the wider community, SBMC, PTA, and key leaders within the community – in particular towards enhancing SLM. **The data indicated that SBMCs would sometimes play a role in trying to mitigate pupil absenteeism and liaising with / observing teachers, and would become engaged with funding to refurbish broken furniture or water sources.** For example, in the Zamfara higher performing school the PTA provides the head teacher with...
funds to make repairs. **However, these are not consistent practices and the effectiveness of the SBMCs and PTAs at present is highly variable**, with many meeting irregularly and being in need of further capacity building. This needs further consideration, in terms of what TDP is able to do with them, in order to strengthen the aims of its SLM component. The role of the head teacher within this process will be crucial: at the Zamfara low performing school the head teacher noted that he had indeed been trained on how to build on community relations during TDP SLM training. However, the PTA and SBMC were not included in any TDP activities, creating a disconnect in follow-through between the two.

### 4.7 Targeted recommendations

**Table 6: Recommendations: SLM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted recommendations: SLM</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TDP should now start focusing on the ‘how’ or ‘quality’ dimension of head teacher SLM activities and should enforce aspects of standardisation both across states and types of school, through stronger school support systems and more stringent monitoring and accountability processes, as it appears that awareness of SLM duties has generally increased but there are still significant differences in how these duties are carried out.</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Head teacher subject knowledge should be assessed and further consolidated beyond what head teachers learn alongside TDP teachers during cluster training. Head teachers should additionally be trained on how to explain/convey this content to teachers, as they are often a primary source of in-school assistance. | Programme |

| 3. Head teacher training on SLM should be conducted more frequently, as is the case with cluster training. This will reinforce learning and also provide a more regular, designated channel for head teacher feedback on SLM. | Programme |

| 4. TDP should coordinate with other providers of SLM training, particularly the SUBEBs, LGEAs and ESSPIN in Jigawa, on the timing and content of head teacher training, to maximise the benefits of reinforced learning. | Programme/other SLM training providers |

| 5. SLM materials, such as the *Head Teacher’s Handbook*, should be distributed to head teachers on an immediate basis as currently few head teachers appear to refer to them or use them. Instead, their references to ‘TDP materials’ were usually made in the context of the teaching and learning materials provided. | Programme |
6. SLM training and SLM training materials should be updated to cover all the major constraints head teachers may face in schools (beyond teaching and learning activities), such as dealing with political appointments or communicating requests/problems to the LGEA, and effectively mobilising and engaging with the SBMC.

7. There is a need to monitor the carrying out, and processes, of lesson observations since these presently appear to be at the discretion of the head teachers. Distribution of the *Head Teacher’s Handbook* may also help in this regard as it outlines relevant protocols and could serve as an in-school guide for follow-through. Head teachers should be given further training on delivering feedback to teachers and feedback processes should be monitored.

8. TDP should investigate opportunities for knowledge sharing or peer-to-peer learning amongst head teachers (perhaps initially between TDP schools in the same LGEA) as a local system of support on SLM activities, similar to what has been instituted for teaching and learning activities.

9. Head teachers should have designated and functional channels for providing feedback *in their role as head teachers*. This could either be through more regularly arranged SLM training sessions, via designated time for feedback on SLM activities or problems as part of cluster training session agendas (sessions that are independent from teachers), or through school visits.

10. Head teacher constraints in terms of shortages/poor school and classroom infrastructure should be recognised as impacting the teaching and learning environment, and these should be highlighted to authorities at the state level by TDP.

11. TDP should provide support to head teachers in liaising with the LGEA/state officials for stronger ‘voice’ and accountability. For example, the head teacher of the Zamfara lower performing school wanted TDP to intervene on the school’s behalf in requesting working materials from the SUBEB and a security guard from the LGEA, because he felt they would ‘know the right channels better than we do’, and government officials were likely to ‘respect TDP’s opinion’ given that it is an international organisation that is there to help them.
5  SLM: SSVs

SSVs are also integral to the ISTM. They are supposed to take place twice per term in each of the TDP supported schools. The TFs are mainly responsible for conducting the SSVs as they are directly involved with the training and support the teachers and head teachers receive at the school level. Their purpose is to provide a channel for providing ongoing support to teachers and head teachers. The TDTs also play a role in SSVs as they supervise and support the TFs during the SSVs. Classroom observation of teachers and observation of head teachers whilst teaching and/or in their leadership roles are the key activities of the TF. During the SSV, TFs are expected to complete three forms: a classroom observation form for teachers, a head teacher observation form, and a summary form. At the end of the day each teacher is meant to be given constructive feedback by the TF, which will include things they have done well and things he/she hopes they will improve on during their next visit.

In order to assess TDP’s in-service training, the qualitative study asked the question: ‘Given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as SSVs)? As all sub-questions within this research question were related to SSVs, the following key findings attempt to respond to these sub-questions and offer formative lessons for TDP to consider:

Table 7: Summary: SSVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary findings: The effectiveness of SSVs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSVs appear to coincide closely with the scheduling of the cluster training sessions, which indicates a degree regularity and sequencing, along with an expectation regarding the timing of the SSVs on the part of the schools. Questions remain over whether teachers are told exactly when the TFs are arriving to carry out the visits. The remoteness of some schools and challenges around TF mobility also emerged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The processes around SSVs appear to be largely established, with most TFs following a similar pattern. This includes initial consultation around the school timetable and the exchanging of pleasantries with the head teacher, followed by lesson observations, which take up the bulk of the visit. However, the primary activities within the SSV – the lesson observations – conducted by TFs did vary in their delivery in terms of length and the interaction of the TFs with the teacher and pupils. This therefore potentially indicates a lack of consistency in terms of established/known protocols regarding the procedures applied within the lesson observations.

Processes of providing feedback to teachers whose lessons have been observed by TFs appear to be well established, with all TFs giving verbal feedback to teachers. One held a group feedback session as part of their visit, with non-TDP teachers also invited to take part in this. A systematic method of providing feedback to teachers was in evidence, indicating the successful implementation of training in this regard. Feedback was pedagogical and reflective of the needs observed by the TF in their SSV capture forms. Head teacher and teacher responses were all appreciative of the feedback given by TFs.

The observation of the head teacher is clearly a very secondary and less well-defined activity within the SSV. Overall, head teacher observation as part of the SSV is based on the TF
5.1  Regularity and sequencing of visits

Overall, responses from the research indicated that the SSVs are carried out regularly. According to one respondent, ‘They do their visitations at the end of every month’ (SBMC, Zamfara lower performing school). Similarly, an increase in regularity was also alluded to in one of the responses:

‘The visit of the TFs is very important because they come immediately [after] we receive a training to see if we are implementing it, unlike quality assurance they usually come anytime they feel like coming.’ (Head teacher, Zamfara lower performing school).

This indicates the degree of regularity and the sequencing of visits, but it also suggests an expectation around the timing of the SSVs on the part of the schools in relation to the cluster training sessions.

Different perspectives emerge regarding whether the teachers are actually told in advance exactly when (on what date) to expect the SSV visit. The TF at the Zamfara higher performing school was clear, however, that this was not a practice he approved of:

‘...we are not informing the teachers that we are coming, as there is an implication in telling the teacher [when] you are coming. By suddenly visiting, this will help you in...’
finding his progress and short-comings, and the type of support that you are supposed to give to him.’

However, TDP teachers at the same Zamfara higher performing school tell a different story. One teacher said: ‘They tell us the week that they visit, so that we are prepared and ready in teaching the pupils all the lessons accordingly. They alert us a day to their coming.’ This inconsistency in responses suggests that, on the one hand, an element of surprise is considered to be important, but, on the other, it is not necessarily being followed through systematically. A further finding is that the visits are often conducted within a week of the cluster training being delivered. While this allows for teachers to demonstrate how they are putting their learning into practice while the cluster training is still fresh in their minds, it may not allow for enough time to ensure that the new approaches have been properly embedded in teachers’ behaviour and practice.

5.2 Introductions and planning of activities during visits

When starting the SSVs, the majority of TFs approach the head teacher to introduce themselves and plan their visit. This was observed consistently by the research team as part of the SSV observations. However, the interview data suggest that this may not always happen. For example, in the Katsina lower performing school the TF appears to circumvent introduction formalities with the head teacher before proceeding to the lesson observation:

‘The moment he came, he didn’t even come into my office, he just proceeded to the classes where the TDP teachers were teaching and sat there to see how they teach. As they were teaching, he is taking notes.’ (Head teacher, Katsina lower performing school).

In contrast, the Zamfara lower performing school head teacher experienced a different approach:

‘They come to school with questionnaires and after asking me some questions. He has a laptop he uses to take my picture, he will snap some of the school environment, after that he will call the TDP teachers and observe their lessons. He observes them one after the other since we have four TDP teachers, he records that in his laptop and next time he visits another school because they have an itinerary of school visits.’

Further to this, some TFs indicated that working in a consultative manner with the head teacher to schedule the itinerary for the visit was paramount and was part of the TDP protocol for starting the SSV:

‘You know that TDP is using about three to four teachers, so I request permission from him as a head [teacher] here to give me the first teacher that we are going to start with. Then he gives me the second one and the third one, because this a directive order from the TDP to follow these procedures; to take permission from the headmaster to give you a teacher. If for instance the headmaster says this is the first teacher to start with...’ (TF, Jigawa typical school).

Overall, TFs appear to work with the schedule in the school, responding as needed to what classes are occurring when they arrive, or planning their schedule based on the timetable
presented by the head teacher. Several TFs indicated the importance of working with the head teacher and how important it is to maintain a good rapport with him or her.

5.3 TF activities during the visit

The TDP documentation indicates that the design of the SSVs makes lesson observations the core activity to be conducted by the TF. Findings from the research team confirmed these observations as being the primary activity with which the TFs are engaged, with many interview respondents referring to, and elaborating on, these most prominently. This was also the major activity observed during the eight SSV observations conducted by the research team. Providing feedback to teachers and head teachers, along with an interview with the head teacher, would also feature. There was one report of some minor inspection of the school environment by the TF. Some TF responses in the praxis discussions also indicated that they would observe head teachers conducting their own lesson observations as part of the SSV, although this was not observed by the research teams when shadowing the TFs.

5.3.1 Lesson observations

TFs appear to conduct multiple lesson observations within one SSV. However, greater clarity on how comprehensive the activities within these visits are is still needed – in the typical Jigawa school, the head teacher indicated that the TF would often come and observe normally one, but sometimes two, teachers, and would then leave.

Based on the data, the length of observations seems to vary, with a wide range of durations across all the TFs observed – starting from as little as 15 minutes in one school observed by the research team conducting the SSV observation.\(^{64,65}\) The TF for the Katsina typical school commented: ‘You see the TDP lesson plan is for one hour but most of our periods in primary schools is for 35 minutes, so sometimes we observe for one hour and sometimes we observe for 35 minutes.’ This evidence of such a broad variance indicates that the 35 minutes of classroom observation stipulated by TDP as part of the SSV is not necessarily being adhered to.\(^{66}\)

There appears to be no set procedure that the TFs follow regarding their observation protocol when in class. In the TF lesson observations followed, there was a clear mix between TFs who would adopt a ‘fly-on-the-wall’ approach, and those who were more actively engaged. For example, the TF at the Zamfara typical school indicated that he does not interact at all during the lesson, even if the teacher makes a mistake, but rather saves his feedback for after the lesson. However, in the Jigawa higher performing school the TF

\(^{64}\) It is possible that where lesson observations were short, the presence of the SSV observation research team as part of this project may have impacted this, with several TFs cutting short their lesson observations due to wanting to further facilitate the SSV observation activities.

\(^{65}\) It is worth noting that the tangerine software TFs use to capture the lesson observation is based on a 15-minute observation and comprises five sub-sections. Each form shows on the tablet for three minutes and then changes to the next form and after 15 minutes the form is complete, which is why many TFs then choose to leave

was actively engaged during the observation, using it as an opportunity maintain pupil discipline and also to assist the teacher accordingly:

‘The TF tried to remain a non-participant but tried to help both the English and numeracy teachers to control the classes. He helped the teachers to put the children into groups and also provided support to the teacher, e.g. when the English teacher asked a pupil to sit down and the pupil did not, the TF interjected. At one point, he instructed the English teacher to repeat a question in Hausa when the pupils did not understand. The TF also spoke to the teacher at one point during the lesson and then carried on the observation... The TF helped to keep the pupils quiet and to arrange them in groups. It also seemed that he would explain some of the activities to pupils once they began to work in groups (e.g. during Bingo word game in the English class). (Jigawa higher performing school, SSV observation notes).

Different approaches taken by the same TF for dealing with teacher mistakes that could not be ignored during the class were also observed by the research team. In two separate observations, the TF felt obligated to correct a teacher’s spelling of certain words on the blackboard. In one case the TF discreetly corrected the teacher by leaving the class and returned with a note for him to read. In another, he corrected his spelling openly in front of the class. This indicates a lack of consistency in observing any defined protocols around intervention within the class.

TFs appear to place themselves primarily at the back of the classroom or in an unobtrusive position, but because some do engage with the class, not all remain stationary and unobserved throughout. Student responses to the TFs’ presence were minimal (they appear to not be much of a distraction), while the teachers’ responses were varied, with most seemingly relaxed and familiar with the procedure.

5.3.2 Feedback to teachers after lesson observations

Feedback appears to be primarily held back until after the classroom observations, when the TF will give feedback to the teachers that have been observed individually, and in one case (Jigawa lower performing school) the TF also conducted a group feedback session with all teachers. Feedback sometimes occurred immediately after the class – in some cases with teachers being taken out of the class before completion – and sometimes at the end of the SSV, with all three teachers turning up in order. The SSV observation in the Jigawa higher performing school noted the TF providing feedback to the teachers individually (immediately after concluding his observation) outside the classroom, while the pupils remained unattended inside the classroom. These feedback sessions ranged from around two to 20 minutes each. Justifications regarding the importance of the individual feedback included ensuring that a teacher would remain ‘confident if you tell him his mistake alone’. (TF, Zamfara typical school).

Group feedback sessions delivered by the TF were mentioned by non-TDP and TDP teachers in the group interviews conducted by researchers, although this was not what was commonly observed in the SSV observations. In some schools, mention was made of non-TDP teachers also being ‘supervised’. The TF at the Jigawa lower performing school
stated: ‘We normally don’t observe non-TDP teachers but during the feedback we normally invite them, we even advise them [on how to] to carry out their lessons also’.

The range and quality of TF feedback will be discussed more substantially in Section 5.4.

5.3.3 Head teacher observation and feedback

Head teacher observation was a secondary part of the SSV, and rather than ‘observation’ should be classed more as an interview and feedback session, if accurate terminology is to be used. Beyond the introductions and timetable scheduling, the SSV observations noted that engagement with head teachers on their own roles as school and academic leaders was a far more secondary part of the SSV process. The majority of TFs appeared to prioritise the lesson observations and feedback with teachers, after which they would meet with the head teacher to go through the head teacher form, which comprises a series of questions and space to provide evidence relating to school management. In some cases, this included discussions around the head teacher’s management and leadership role.

In the case of the Jigawa lower performing school, the TF asked about the head teacher’s own lesson observations, asking about how many observations had been conducted since the last visit. There was no discussion about the techniques used or the protocols followed by the head teacher. However, within the same school the TF held a group feedback meeting that included all teachers (not just TDP teachers). This school therefore exhibited the most interactive and participatory SSV process within this research study, with elements of wider professional development taking place within the school as a community. There was a question and answer space within the group session, making the process more iterative overall, and allowing both the TF and the head teacher to engage with teachers on wider matters of pedagogy, discipline, and peer support. Discussions with TDP central management as part of this research indicated that this is an approach the programme is looking to institute more formally as part of the SSVs.

For most of the SSVs shadowed by the research team, engagement with the head teacher feedback consisted primarily of sharing what the TF had observed as part of the visit and lesson observations, and giving direct advice on that outcomes of that. Whilst some head teachers would ask questions, this was a far less iterative process. The role of the head teacher within SSVs will also be expanded on in Section 5.5 on ‘Other actors’.

5.4 Perspectives on the quality of TF feedback

Overall, teachers and head teachers had positive responses to the quality of the SSVs and the feedback provided by TFs to teachers and head teachers as part of the process. Perspectives of head teachers and teachers regarding the rigour with which mistakes were corrected by the TFs came through in the responses quite strongly: ‘...if they spot any mistake, they call the teacher aside and show him his mistake one by one, they correct their mistakes, really.’ (Head teacher, Katsina lower performing school). This was echoed by the head teacher from the Zamfara lower performing school, who saw the feedback as ‘very useful’, continuing: ‘to be making mistake upon mistake is a problem, but when someone
comes in and finds that mistake and corrects me, then I know that I am corrected and I will not repeat the same mistake in the future.’

Teachers in the schools appeared to corroborate this. In the Jigawa typical performing school, TDP teachers stated that they saw TFs as ‘hard working’ and would like them to visit at least twice a month, as ‘with supervision and correction this will help to improve many things’. TDP teachers in the Katsina higher performing school stated that they were able to use the feedback TFs gave ‘very well’, while they also indicated that feedback was shared with non-TDP teachers as well, often by the head teacher, who would call a group sharing meeting. TDP teachers in the Zamfara higher performing typical school also spoke of how the SSVs provided consistency through follow-up on the cluster training. One teacher said:

‘Their coming is very good because whoever gives you something to do and he has trained you on that, it is good to check up on him and see if he is doing that. So as to encourage us... anywhere we have made a mistake we will be corrected.’

SSV observation notes indicate comprehensive systems of feedback being used by the majority of schools. In the Zamfara higher performing school the researcher observed the TF following a clear procedure after both lesson observations, starting initially with providing praise regarding what the teacher did well, or their key attributes (e.g. confidence), after which there followed a systematic breakdown of each area of improvement that the TF had identified. This differed between each lesson observation and was responsive to the specific needs of that teacher. The TF then closed by reiterating what the teacher had done well. Similarly, one SSV observation record for the Jigawa lower performing school shows a highly comprehensive feedback being given to teachers individually and then also as a group. Also, starting with the positives of what had been observed, the TF went on to detail areas for improvement, ranging from suggestions around use of materials to pedagogical techniques and emphasis on child-centred learning. They also encouraged internal support amongst teachers.

One finding from the research was the perception by some stakeholders of the TDP SSVs as being better overall than quality assurance visits conducted by the LGEA. They were also viewed as bringing about greater improvements. Some perspectives around the greater rigour/trustworthiness of TF feedback and advice was also evident:

‘Okay, like the lesson plan, the TFs told us to do something, while the LGEA said this is how it should be done...but since this is the way TF said we should do it, it is what the TF told us to do that we will do.’ (Head teacher, Katsina lower performing school).

There also appears to be recognition of the SSV as not being a monitoring visit, but more of a supporting visit aimed primarily at helping and guiding the school, rather than evaluating it:

‘...[The SSV] is good plan, is better than monitoring and supervision that is being conducted. The teachers and the headmaster will [be] shocked when they hear that they are going to be supervised, but in SSV it is support given to the teacher, and the supervisor will not take himself superior to you that he is going to supervise, by this you are friends.’ (TF, Zamfara, higher performing).
There is also evidence that TFs are viewed as caring about the schools and their progress, which in turn inspires appreciation of the SSVs and the work needed to meet the expectations of the visit:

‘...I enjoy their coming, because their coming encourages me and makes me feel that they care about my school, they care about the continuation of work in my school, [they] also choose teachers that are slow in working - with their coming it is compulsory to buckle up and also come to work.’ (Head teacher, Katsina lower performing school).

An additional finding from the research is that due to the fact that some TFs have managed to establish a positive relationship with teachers and head teachers (along with in some cases being physically close to the school), teachers and head teachers feel comfortable enough to approach the TF for advice, outside of the remit of the school visit. As noted in the Zamfara lower performing SSV observation, when in conversation with a TF: ‘The teachers seem to know who he is. He said they do meet him even at his place in town to ask for his support, especially on how to teach some topics they found difficult. According to the TF, even the non-TDP teachers once called him to explain some important lesson to them, which he did.’

This ongoing and iterative feedback was echoed by the TF at the typical performing Zamfara school: ‘They don’t even need to call us by themselves; they can either text that they want us to call them back or they can text their problems to us so that we will reply back to them that this is how to tackle it, this is how to come about [and deal with] it.’

The perspectives of the TFs as mentors/instructors for improvement seem to be well accepted, as typified by the remarks of the head teacher at the Katsina typical school: ‘...when they say, they want to check on you, the teacher will enter class for them to check, no argument and we operate with them. They are like our teachers; for example, they show us how to teach and you have to obey your teacher, they are like our teachers, they teach us how to teach.’

In some cases, the close proximity of, and familiarity with, the TFs means that they can be called upon by schools on a more informal and ad hoc basis, as was the case with one of the schools in Zamfara: ‘If we have problem in the school we contact the TF, since we are in the same town we all live in [name of town], we run to them. Sometimes I assign my assistant to go.’ (Head teacher, Zamfara lower performing school).

5.5 Other actors engaged in the SSV

As noted earlier, in some cases the involvement of head teachers in the first instance of an SSV includes consultation with them on the schedule that the TFs will follow. Regarding head teacher engagement with the lesson observations themselves, this seemed to vary. One head teacher was clear that it was important not to follow the TFs as part of the SSVs:

‘We don’t accompany them [the TF) because we have a lot to do in the school and if we go out someone may come looking for one or two things. We also don’t follow them because if we enter the class with the facilitator the teacher may feel scared and the
The fact that some head teachers are absent from the lesson observations was backed up in the Katsina lower performing school by TDP teachers, who noted that during the observations the head teacher would ‘sit in his office, after they are done with their supervision, they will meet him in his office for further discussions within them’.

However, in the Jigawa typical performing school the head teacher did enter one of the classrooms being observed by the TF. When asked, the TF indicated that this was not in accordance with the observation protocol. However, the TF added: ‘the head teacher has the right to come and observe how his teacher is delivering his lessons, because he is also an observer, thereby maybe when I go, he can sit and discuss some advice with him’. The inconsistencies in regard to the role of head teachers within the TFs’ movements around the school indicate the lack of a clear procedure to help enhance the head teachers’ leadership development in this area, given that the SSVs are supposed to also be a part of the head teachers’ SLM support from TDP.

As also noted earlier, some interviews suggested that the head teacher himself would conduct a lesson observation, and in turn be observed by the TF. Although this was not observed as part of any of the SSV observations, this is one of the clearer indications of head teacher supervision by the TF coming through as part of the SSV process, although, overall, this part of the purpose of the SSV seems a lot less prominent across the schools visited as part of this study.

Other actors within the SSV process mentioned by those interviewed varied. In the higher performing Zamfara school, for example, the TF indicated that the TDP In-service Coordinator and his team would sometimes call whilst the TF is at the school to see ‘what we are doing’. In the same interview, reference was also made to members of the TDP central management also visiting the SSV on some occasions. In the Zamfara lower and typical performing schools, reference was made by the head teacher and TF, respectively, to the TDTs sometimes joining the TFs as part of the SSV. TDTs supporting TFs came up consistently in the data, with their role being seen as that of providing additional support to the TF:

‘The TDT observes the same classroom teacher that I observe. The TDT plays two roles: he monitors and supports the classroom teacher and also supports TF.’ (TF, Jigawa higher performing school)

However, no TDTs were observed as part of the SSV observations conducted.  

As regards to a wider government presence, there was reference made by one TF in the Jigawa typical school of delivering the SSV alongside both the TDT and also an LGEA Officer making his own quality assurance visit. This reference indicates more of an overlap with the LGEA Officer than a collaboration. However, in the case of Katsina typical school, reference was made by the TF to the LGEA Officers joining SSVs in order to be exposed to the processes. In the Zamfara typical school the TF made reference to the LGEA supporting the

---

67 This is because of the way SSVs were staged and organised for the purposes of this research and not because it is necessarily rare for TDTs to attend.
visit to schools in remote places, primarily with logistical support relating to transportation and fuel.

5.6 Recording and utilisation of SSV data

5.6.1 Data capture materials

TFs are required to complete three forms at the end of each SSV, on a tangerine tablet: a classroom observation form (for teachers), a head teacher observation form (for head teachers), and a TF summary form (which summaries all the information gathered).

The consistent response in regard to the tangerine tablet completed during the SSV was that of the technological and physical challenges faced in using them. There are various challenges being faced by TFs in this regard:

‘Initially we were using tablets but because the screen has broken this is the reason why I stopped using the tablet and am now using the [paper] form. So the exact questions that are in the tablet tangerine is what we are having as hard copy, which we can use to fill in the information.’ (TF, Zamfara lower performing school).

This issue of the fragility of the tablets was referred to several times, with cracked screens coming up as the main reason why the tablets are no longer being used by some TFs. However, in terms of their usability, the responses were mixed. While on the one hand the TF from the Jigawa lower performing school indicated that the tablets were ‘easier to use than the forms’, the TF from the Zamfara typical school referred to some inherent challenges within the design when using them to record data: ‘The tangerine itself does not give room for making corrections, you cannot go forward and come back again’. Similarly, the TF from Jigawa higher performing school made reference to the fact that ‘when we type our observations in the tablet one cannot scroll’.

More consistently, however, the issue of absent SIM cards/SIM card slots came up across the schools visited as part of this research. This absence leaves the TFs unable to utilise the tablets to their full capacity during the SSV process itself by sending the data on, and means they have to rely on the completion of the data capture and storage process at a later point in time due to a lack of internet connectivity. 68

‘...the problem with the tablet is that there is no provision for SIM card and cannot be connected to the Internet. So even if you have the soft copy of the information you still need to go to TDP office before it can be copied. That is why it cannot be submitted digitally. But when you type and get to TDP office corrections will be made using Wi-Fi, the information will sent.’ (TF, Jigawa higher performing school).

‘the only problem is it has no SD card, any work that I wanted to do, I can’t do it unless I go to the TDP office, even if I saved all what I observed, I can’t send it from here, I must

68 Usually they could only complete data upload at the TDP offices when they could connect to Wi-Fi Internet, and this could be very far away from some LGAs since TDP offices are only located in each state capital.
to go there and use their Wi-Fi and send it, there is no SIM card.’ (TF, Zamfara higher performing school).

As a result, the TFs often resort to using paper forms throughout their SSVs. In some cases, TFs reported that the issue of not being able to charge the tablets in remote places meant that the paper forms were also predominantly used. The TF in Katsina typical school reported that despite using them initially ‘almost 70 percent of the tablets were not working’.

Other responses indicated further examples of TFs having a preference for completing the tablets retroactively. Flaws in their functionality and the absence of an enabling environment for their use is hampering their full functionality in the efficient completion and uploading of information in real time during the SSV process:

‘[Even if] my tablet is working, but I will still write in the form. If I have time I transfer the information either here in school or on other times at home – I will then transfer the information into the tablet where I will send it at a later time.’ (TF, Jigawa higher performing).

Regarding the relevant and quality capturing of data, the responses from TFs were generally positive, although the data here is not so rich. The TF from Katsina typical school indicated that the forms had been designed in consultation with the TFs, with final choice of the forms used being dependent on their responses. As a result, the TFs indicated that overall the forms were considered comprehensive, with a clear breakdown of the data that needed to be completed. In regard to the lesson observation forms in particular, TFs indicated the clear breakdown of timings during the observation, and how this assisted them in completing the task. However, one recommendation for the form was greater fluidity in logging challenges and successes across the forms – currently the form provides for three to be logged but some TFs indicated there would often be far more data that needed capturing than that. Data from the SSV observations indicate that the majority of the TF did not complete their summary forms before leaving the SSV.

5.6.2 Training on data capture materials

Training on the forms was part of the TDP training at the introduction of the programme. TFs corroborated this when asked if they were trained to use the tangerine forms appropriately. However, there were some initial concerns around a lack of training earlier in the programme, which were eventually addressed by the TDP central management team:

‘When the tablet came, there were issues around tablets but this was as a result of the capacity of the people that were not well, you know, kind of trained. They were not trained properly but later on there were follow-up trainings that were carried out by X [name given from TDP central management], ourselves and other people, so I think we were able to kind of manipulate the tablets.’ (Jigawa State official).

Throughout the SSV observations, the TFs were observed completing the forms confidently, except in one case where the TF appeared to be unfamiliar with the forms to a certain extent, although the reasons for what was observed remain ambiguous:
‘The TF did not seem familiar with the head teacher observation form as he had to read it word for word in English. This may have been due to our presence and him wanting to conduct it in English rather than Hausa. The TF also had to explain some questions to the head teacher.’ (Jigawa higher performing SSV observation notes).

5.6.3 Utilisation of data

Mechanisms for utilising the SSV data for appropriate analysis and reporting include the digital uploading of the SSV forms that go to the TDP central office (either through the tablets or by TDP at the area development office), and also through initially developing reports by TF from their visits, which are sent on to the SUBEB. In-State Coordinators confirmed that the data would go on to the TDP Monitoring and Evaluation Team Leader in the central management team. Perspectives regarding the reliability of these mechanisms in regard to effectively utilise the data vary amongst TFs. In the Zamfara typical school, for example, the TF expressed satisfaction with the way the data management system builds data from subsequent SSVs to create a record that ‘at least can make the teachers feel like they are seriously being followed’.

Utilisation of the data in order to understand the implications for future programming appears to be taking place in some cases: ‘The TFs went for supervision and if the report is a similar case we sit down together, both the TFs and Education Secretaries, and we access what the problems are and how to improve on the problems’. (Education Secretary, Zamfara lower performing school). However, there were few responses around the utilisation of the data for the purposes of appropriate analysis and reporting, along with the implications for future programming, indicating the possibility of there being minimal knowledge in this area amongst the majority of school-based stakeholders.

5.7 Targeted recommendations

Table 8: Recommendations: SSVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted recommendations: SSVs</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Currently SSVs occur immediately after the cluster training. The timing of SSVs should be reviewed so that they fall at a later point in the month, when teachers have had more time to practice what they have learnt.</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The purpose of the SSVs needs to be reviewed. It is suggested that there be an overhaul of the SSV process, in line with the considerations already raised regarding ensuring that they foster greater professional development practice using a whole-school approach. Training of TFs in line with this new vision – such as holding effective group feedback sessions/workshops with all</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion with the TDP Central Management on the SSVs indicated that this plan is already underway, with a move away from the heavy focus on lesson observations and individual feedback by TFs, and a greater focus on participatory and group sessions that look more technically at facilitating professional development.
teachers in the school, alongside individual feedback – needs to be followed through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Whilst several aspects of the visits appear to going well, a clearer understanding within TDP of, and a consensus regarding, the contribution of these visits to the SLM and monitoring objectives of the programme are also needed before scale-up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. SSVs need clearer guidelines for protocols and procedures. The guidelines currently in place should be reviewed overall, and should be tightened in areas where at the moment some main protocols/procedures appear to be absent. This will be important for ensuring a minimum standard of good practice across all the SSVs as much as possible, thus minimising the variables that can impact on the outcomes of the visit. In particular, the review can include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the sharing of information with schools regarding when visits are due to be made;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. introductory formalities with the head teacher and procedures for creating an SSV schedule once TFs have arrived at the school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. what lesson observation protocols, if any, should guide TF participation and active engagement during the lesson observation; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. what lesson observation protocols, if any, should guide the presence and participation of other actors in the lesson observation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Following this, a targeted training course aimed at either refreshing or imparting new knowledge to TFs and TDTs on protocols and procedures should be developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Head teacher observation/support is currently secondary within the SSV process – appearing to be more of an afterthought. As a result, the observation and role of head teachers within the SSV needs to be reviewed and redesigned as part of the first recommendation. Head teachers need to be looked at both as those who are being observed/supported, and also as active change agents within the process, who take a stronger role in delivering the SSV process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Feedback processes need to be expanded and need to become more iterative and participatory.** Although feedback appears to be quite constructive, it is primarily corrective and the conversation goes only in one direction – TF to teacher, or TF to head teacher. TDP should introduce the practice of group feedback and discussion alongside one-on-one feedback sessions, and should ensure the discussions go beyond the direct experiences of lesson observations conducted that day. TFs may therefore need further training in facilitation techniques.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. **The SSVs appear to be the one area where knowledge sharing with non-TDP teachers is not taking place so well.** **Non-TDP teachers should be included as part of the new process.**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. **Explore the possibility of more formalised engagement between the LGEA and SUBEB in the SSV system.** As some visits may already be overlapping, taking the opportunity to build on these relationships can potentially embed the good practices of TDP SSVs more firmly at the LGEA level, for greater sustainability of these mechanisms in the long term.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme, with LGEA and SUBEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. **A review of the technological functionality of the tangerine tablet system needs to be carried out.** If the purpose of the tablets is to provide a live and un-tampered with stream of updated data into the TDP system, it is currently failing in that, and the ongoing relevance of the technology (value for money/value addition) should be assessed.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. **A renewed and clear set of guidelines for the SSV should then be developed, for TFs to follow.** These guidelines should clearly outline the activities that should take place, and how they should take place, with a recommended ideal schedule to follow. A TF guidebook/handbook on how to conduct SSVs should be considered. The processes should also be transparently disseminated to head teachers and teachers, so that they are also aware of what to expect.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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6 Conclusion

This chapter offers summary answers to each of the research questions guiding this study, and concludes with overarching recommendations that cut across the programme’s ISTM.

6.1 TDP in-service cluster training activities

Making cluster training more effective:

The data indicate that TDP is facing challenges to its effectiveness, both in terms of the logistics and the appropriate scheduling of the training modules. Perceptions of cluster training is generally positive, but adequate notice and communication regarding training dates will need to be addressed if poor punctuality is to decrease among teachers. TFs are also unable to prepare adequately for training, while remuneration is not considered sufficient for their work in this area.

Food provision at the training sessions across the states needs to be improved, as this leads to further issues around attendance, while delays in the e-payment systems for allowances are causing teachers financial problems, which could have a negative impact over time. This therefore requires review.

Language considerations within the training also need to be addressed, in terms of standardising usage during training, with teachers preferring Hausa as the language of instruction. However, they are arguably also in need of additional EFL training if they are to be effective in their wider role of teaching English at the school level.

Low levels of subject knowledge amongst some teachers continues to challenge the effectiveness of the training, with more time needed for the maths and English modules in particular. Within the training sessions themselves, the participatory approach demonstrably encourages greater engagement; however, the participation of women teachers within the sessions still needs significant improvement.

It is also notable that women teachers are impacted more by inadequate notice, with many coming late and leaving earlier due to unaddressed child-care and household responsibilities. If targeted recruitment and retention of women teachers is to be successful, addressing the current gender challenges will be critical.

Overall, cluster training sessions are viewed as spaces for feedback, but greater clarity and transparency around what is done with the feedback is needed.

6.2 TDP materials used both inside and outside of schools

Improving TDP’s printed and audio-visual materials to make them more useful and more used in terms of content, language and usage:

The data indicate that although the supply of TDP materials to schools is prompt overall, basic science kits and the lack of textbooks, which are the responsibility of the government, continues to hamper the effectiveness of teaching and the intent of the
Lesson plans. The lesson plans themselves should be reviewed in order to align them with lesson lengths in schools, and to enable greater flexibility in catering for the high levels of absenteeism in some schools, allowing teachers to adapt their lessons as needed to ensure all pupils are able to engage.

Language barriers were also present in this area, with the level of English expected in the lesson plans being too demanding, both for the pupils and for the teachers.

Challenges around the adequate provision of audio-visual equipment persist. Mobile phones and SD cards are not always available or compatible, while videos that should be used during cluster training sessions are not always ready on time. Electricity challenges render the amplifiers defunct in some instances, indicating the need for more innovative energy solutions to be considered, such as solar power.

Appropriate and effective use of some materials by teachers also needs to be revisited, with both the trainer in the pocket and the teacher’s journal either being used inappropriately or under-utilised overall. However, all schools showed effective use of flashcards and efficiency in the development and use of no-/low-cost materials. Feedback response mechanisms in relation to materials also need to be improved, either in the cluster training or in the SSV process.

6.3 SLM: The head teacher as academic leader and mentor

Establishing the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school:

The data found that the application and success of SLM strategies seems to vary considerably between schools, although head teachers’ leadership and management since inception appears to have improved overall. Head teachers also vary in their attendance at SLM training, so greater consideration of this issue is needed in order to address it.

Overall, the role of head teachers as mentors and sources of assistance within the school needs further strengthening, through additional training and a review of the quality of the SLM content overall. Lack of access to the Head Teacher Handbook has also been a challenge, with head teachers unable to reference their SLM learning in their own time for further development. Lesson observations by head teachers also need further standardisation in terms of regularity and process, while further training on feedback to teachers is also needed.

Peer knowledge sharing opportunities amongst head teacher should also be explored, while additional training on how the head teacher can engage with relevant state/local government officials and mobilise greater community engagement (including building the capacity of SBMCs and PTAs) needs consideration.

6.4 SLM: SSVs

Ensuring the effectiveness of TDP’s school-based interventions, such as SSVs:
The data indicate that while SSVs are taking place regularly, the purpose of the SSVs and the processes involved need a rigorous review going forward. The purpose of lesson observations by TFs in particular needs to be reviewed, including the protocols surrounding these. This overlaps with the conclusions with regard to head teacher lesson observations and the greater standardisation required there.

Clarification of the role of the head teacher in SSVs is needed, as well as clarification regarding how that correlates with SLM, given the secondary role it currently plays within the SSV process. Although feedback between the TFs and teachers / head teachers is quite constructive it is recommended that it be ensured that the process is more iterative and participatory. Group feedback sessions/facilitated workshop sessions around key issues could be introduced as good practice, in line with a more holistic mentoring and continuing professional development approach. Given the challenges identified in regard to the appropriate use of materials and persistent low levels of subject knowledge, such sessions could be used to address these in greater, more hands-on, detail.

Challenges around the technology of the tangerine tablets used to capture data in the SSV process were prevalent. Potential solutions include upgrading the systems, although a thorough value for money review of the systems in line with the value addition they offer in terms of data capture should be made. Overall, the SSVs are well received by stakeholders within the schools, with favourable comparisons against visits by the LGEA in terms of support and professional development. As a result, consideration should be given to partnering the SSV process with LGEA visits, in the interests of both greater sharing of good practices and sustainability of outcomes.

### 6.5 Overarching recommendations

In addition to the targeted recommendations offered in the chapters dedicated to each of the research questions of this report, the following overarching recommendations are presented, which seek to address some of the common trends emerging from the findings. These recommendations are particularly pertinent to key adjustments that will need to be made by TDP in readiness for the roll-out of Phase II of the programme.

#### 1. Feedback and utilisation of data

Spaces for feedback across the ISTM have clearly been well thought-through and crafted. This was evident in the recognition amongst stakeholders of the role that cluster training and SSVs play in both giving feedback to, and receiving feedback from, teachers, head teachers, and TFs. Building on this by strengthening feedback mechanisms in certain areas, whilst also having greater transparency around feedback utilisation, will be an important step forward as part of Phase II roll-out.

Within cluster training, although teachers, TFs and TDTs feel they have channels through which they can give feedback, establishing a clearer mechanism whereby TDP responds to feedback or demonstrates how it is being used is needed. Where materials are concerned, clearer feedback mechanisms for teachers are needed. Head teachers need a standalone channel of feedback in their role specifically as head teachers, not just through the cluster training. This aligns with the finding regarding SSVs that feedback – while consistent and
constructive – needs to be more discursive and iterative between the TF and teachers/head teachers. More broadly, the SSVs need to be clearer and more transparent as to how the data are utilised to inform the programme’s monitoring and evaluation processes.

2. Language

The challenge of language barriers came through clearly in both Research Questions 1 and 2. The language of instruction within the cluster training needs to be carefully considered, given the low levels of English competence demonstrated amongst many teachers. Teachers generally preferred to be taught in Hausa, and consideration needs to be given to whether learning materials for teachers need to be able to respond to that desire also. More broadly, however, a key suggestion in terms of English language learning itself is the importance of having EFL classes for teachers to improve their fluency, both in order to better take instruction in English, and therefore close the cognitive gap that currently exists with the training materials that are also in English, but also to improve the quality of their teaching in the subject. If unaddressed, this language barrier could prove a major challenge to translating the approaches within TDP into pupil learning outcomes.

3. Technological applications

The use of technology within TDP ISTM has been innovative in the area of materials, both for learning and for data capture as part of the teacher and head teacher support process. However, there are various challenges, from the absence of SD cards for phones used by teachers to the damage of the tangerine tablets TFs use to collect their data during SSVs. A more detailed review of the varied technological innovations being delivered as part of the ISTM is needed to assess the ongoing relevance of their functionality, their current status as working/workable items, the appropriate usage and processes relevant to them (e.g. such as the appropriate use of the trainer in the pocket), and what corrections, solutions or alternatives might be needed going forward.

4. Knowledge sharing

As with feedback, overall knowledge sharing between TDP and non-TDP teachers appears to be occurring regularly, with many non-TDP teachers indicating that their own pedagogical skills have improved following the introduction of the programme and the participation of their colleagues. To build on this evident good practice, two key areas need further improvement where knowledge sharing is concerned. The first is to introduce a more efficient system of peer learning and knowledge sharing between head teachers across TDP schools. This will contribute specifically to the SLM component of the ISTM approach, but will also have potentially wider benefits across other areas as inter-school knowledge sharing becomes more regular at the head teacher level. The second area where further improvement is needed is to address the apparent current lack of knowledge sharing between TDP- and non-TDP teachers during the SSV process by revamping the support visits to include wider group sessions, both in terms of feedback and further embedding of skills learnt at the cluster training. Both of these recommendations will enhance the growing culture of knowledge sharing that TDP appears to be embedding, which in turn has the potential of ensuring wider sustainability of these processes in the longer term.
5. Programme needs beyond the current remit of TDP

The research highlighted challenges that are impacting the work and potential success of TDP which are outside of TDP’s control. Specifically, these are the absence of key in-school materials, such as textbooks and science kits, and shortages/poor classroom infrastructure that impact the quality of the learning environment. Despite these areas being the responsibility of other actors, such as SUBEBs and the LGEAs, TDP should consider what role it should actively play going forward to help address them, in particular if the sustainability of the gains made by the programme is not to be lost when TDP exits and responsibility for the TDP ISTM approach is handed over.

Towards this end, TDP should consider adopting both a stronger advocacy role to address these issues at the central programme management level, but should also look at what can be done to develop school leaders – the head teacher but also the SBMC and wider community – so that they can adopt a similar role when it comes to an accountability relationship with the LGA and the state in relation to the provision of materials and a quality learning environment.

6. Leadership around harmonising wider ISTM approaches in TDP schools

A consistent finding of the research across the research questions has been the overall positive perceptions of stakeholders towards TDP’s ISTM approach. This has ranged from the participatory approaches of the cluster training to the kind of feedback and support offered at the SSVs. Given this finding, it is recommended that TDP consider the possibility of playing a coordinating and harmonising role across its target states in key areas of the ISTM, working with other partners currently delivering activities, such as Jolly Phonics, to maximise the overlap of knowledge that has been noted as beneficial within this research. Harmonising activities at the state and school level has the potential, in time, to contribute to easier ownership of activities by state actors when programmes exit, leading to greater sustainability. This recommendation is supported by the finding that a preferential standard also seems to have been set by the SSV process of engagement and constructiveness in relation to teacher supervision and support.
Annex A  Provision of TDP materials

Table 9:  Materials and equipment provided to TDP teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials and equipment provided by TDP</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pedagogical Framework</td>
<td>The Pedagogical Framework provides an academic foundation and theoretical framework for how children learn and how teachers should teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Teacher’s Guide – General pedagogy and subjects (English, maths and science and technology)</td>
<td>The Teachers’ Guides are meant as a reference source and provide guidance on good teaching practices, both in general and in subject-specific terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Audio-visual materials</td>
<td>Video clips are seen as TDP’s most powerful guide to effective pedagogical principles, providing teachers with a quick and helpful reference point, good practice models, and creative new ideas on classroom approaches and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lesson plans</td>
<td>Lesson plans are the main vehicle for developing teachers’ subject knowledge by preparing teachers for lessons and giving clear ideas on instructional materials and classroom methodology. They also guide teachers on time allocation and classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Textbooks</td>
<td>Textbooks help teachers in planning and preparing for lessons. They are also a source of worksheets, assignments and classroom exercises for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Classroom materials</td>
<td>These include: flash cards, posters, charts, graphs, maps, pictures, globes, counters, science and maths kits, audio stories, songs, story books, Big Books, textbooks, exercise books, slates, as well as a number of ‘no-cost materials’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mobile phones</td>
<td>A basic mobile phone is provided to each teacher as part of a ‘technology pack’ (a phone, SIM card and charger) that will be held by schools but should be made available for teachers to take home for studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Amplifiers</td>
<td>Two mobile amplifier radios are provided per school to play audio-visual materials in the classroom. These are kept under the care of the head teacher, to be given to teachers when required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SD card</td>
<td>The audio-visual materials are produced on secure digital cards with the aim of wide distribution and usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Teacher’s Journal</td>
<td>A journal in which teachers can recorded the successes and challenges they face in the classroom, to be used to route feedback to TDP during cluster training sessions and SSVs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix 7, Materials: Purposes and Linkages; TDP Materials Survey
Annex B ISTM

B.1 Theory of change

TDP was introduced in response to the recognition that ‘children in Nigerian schools are not learning’ and that the quality of teaching, which is of central importance to the learning achievement, is a ‘serious concern’. The design of the TDP in-service training component is informed by a theory of change that articulates how in-service teacher training activities can result in the desired impact (improvement in pupil learning levels). Pupils can be expected to learn more when they are taught by effective teachers who are skilled and knowledgeable, both in terms of pedagogy and subject knowledge. TDP’s ISTM seeks to create effective teachers by combining the delivery of pedagogical training with the promotion of a supportive teaching environment through head teacher support to provide mentoring and supervision to teachers; peer interaction among teachers; SSVs by trainers; and the provision of learning materials. The programme’s theory of change is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

B.2 TDP’s ISTM

TDP’s ISTM is multi-pronged and provides training and support to teachers both within and outside the school. It involves scheduled monthly classroom-based training sessions (cluster training) where pairs of teachers from a school are ‘coupled’ to attend the training together (which is intended to facilitate peer-to-peer learning), along with other participating teachers from the LGEA. Schools and teachers receive numerous training materials. Printed materials, including structured lesson plans and guides, are distributed. Teachers also receive audio-visual resources in the form of a basic mobile phone for each teacher (trainer in the pocket) and two amplifier radios per school for use in classrooms. Finally, TDP teachers receive ongoing guidance through SSVs by their trainers, and head teachers in TDP schools receive training on SLM. Teachers are trained by a selected cadre of TFs, who are in turn trained by a group of ‘master trainers’ recruited from SUBEBs and CoEs, called TDTs. More detailed discussion of the process and implementation aspects of TDP’s training model, based on a review of programme documentation, is provided in Annex A of the Concept Note.

---

70 It should be noted that this is an adapted theory of change (adapted from DFID’s theory of change in the business case) that was used in the evaluation framework/design.
71 See Annex A for a description of the TDP materials.
TDP activities and outputs

TDP activities following the in-service strategy are expected to lead to outputs in five areas:

- Improved head teacher leadership and management
- Improved teacher subject content knowledge
- Improved teacher pedagogical knowledge

TDP outcomes

TDP intermediate impact

- Improved teacher effectiveness in classroom
- Improved teacher effectiveness in outside classroom support

TDP final impact

- Improved learning English, maths and science and technology for cohorts taught by selected teachers in TDP schools 2014–2019

Scale outcomes

- TDP in-service training improves performance of other teachers in TDP schools

Sustainability outcomes

- TDP model applied in other schools in TDP states
- TDP model applied sustainably in TDP schools, in other schools in TDP states, and in Nigeria

TDP outputs in five areas:

1. Collaboration and partnership
2. Training and support
3. Materials development
4. Technology use and management
5. INSET programme implementation

Figure 1: TDP’s theory of change
## Annex C  Research matrix

### Table 10:  Formative research matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching research questions</th>
<th>Core sub-questions for this study</th>
<th>Sources of data and instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDP in-service activities outside the school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1: Given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, how can TDP make its cluster training more effective?</td>
<td>1. Are the cluster training sessions <strong>carried out regularly</strong>, as planned?</td>
<td>• Cluster training session handbook review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What is the feedback from teachers, head teachers and TFs on the <strong>administrative and logistical aspects</strong> (transport, lunch, per diems, agenda etc.) of organising/attending cluster training sessions?</td>
<td>• Cluster training session observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What is the range of <strong>activities carried out by TFs</strong> before and during a cluster training session? Have the TFs received <strong>adequate initial and ongoing training</strong> to conduct cluster training sessions effectively? What are their backgrounds and how were they <strong>recruited as TFs</strong>?</td>
<td>• Programme documentation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is a typical TF’s <strong>workload</strong> in terms of time spent preparing for and conducting cluster training sessions?</td>
<td>• Head teacher KIIls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do TFs and teachers receive printed and audio-visual training <strong>materials in adequate numbers and on time</strong> for effective implementation of cluster training sessions?</td>
<td>• TF and TDT KIIls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. What is the level of <strong>attendance and participation</strong> in cluster training sessions and what are their determinants?</td>
<td>• TDP teachers FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, to what extent do teachers <strong>understand the content</strong> of cluster training sessions? In this regard, can the <strong>content, delivery mode and frequency of cluster training sessions</strong> be considered appropriate for the knowledge and skill levels of teachers? Is the level of emphasis on subject knowledge vis-à-vis pedagogical skills <strong>appropriate</strong>?</td>
<td>• TDP central programme management (KII/FGDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Can the content and delivery of cluster training sessions be considered <strong>appropriate in the light of the constraints teachers encounter in classrooms</strong> (e.g. large class sizes, multi-grade teaching, and poor physical infrastructure)?</td>
<td>• TDP in-service state coordinators KIIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SUBEB representative KIIls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LGEA Education Secretary KIIls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching research questions</td>
<td>Core sub-questions for this study</td>
<td>Sources of data and instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How does the <strong>language of instruction</strong> in cluster training sessions (mostly English, with key terms translated in Hausa) facilitate or hinder teachers' understanding of the content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How does the content and timing of cluster training sessions relate to teachers’ previous training (e.g. NCE) or any simultaneous in-service training being received by them (e.g. parallel in-service training by SUBEBs)? Can <strong>complementarities be achieved between various forms of training</strong> that a TDP teacher might be undergoing? How do schools (especially ‘small’ schools with few teachers) cope with the absence of teachers due to cluster training sessions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there <strong>reliable mechanisms to route teachers’ and TFs'/TDTs’ feedback</strong> on any aspect of cluster training sessions to the programme’s central management and on to material developers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are there perceptible <strong>differences in the effectiveness of cluster training sessions</strong> by state and type of school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Based on the sub-questions above, what <strong>formative lessons</strong> emerge for TDP to consider with regard to enhancing the effectiveness of cluster training sessions for future programming and implementation? In particular, how can the role and capacity of TFs be strengthened to enhance the effectiveness of cluster training sessions? In terms of sustainability and scale-up, how can TDP leverage the <strong>role of other actors</strong> (especially SUBEB and LGEA) to deliver cluster training sessions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training materials used both **inside** and **outside** of schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ 2: In what ways can TDP improve its printed and audio-visual training materials to make them more useful and more used – in</th>
<th>1. Have TDP teachers <strong>received the printed and audio-visual materials</strong> in adequate numbers and on time?</th>
<th>• FGD with TDP teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What is teachers’ feedback on the <strong>operational aspects of the design and layout</strong> of both printed and audio-visual materials?</td>
<td>• Head teacher KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To what extent do TDP teachers <strong>use the wide array of printed and audio-visual training materials</strong> disbursed to them, both inside and outside the classroom? Are some materials being <strong>used more</strong> or less than others, and why?</td>
<td>• LGEA Education Secretary KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching research questions</td>
<td>Core sub-questions for this study</td>
<td>Sources of data and instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terms of content, language and usage?</td>
<td>4. Given the low levels of baseline subject knowledge and pedagogical skills among TDP teachers, to what extent do teachers understand the content of these materials? In this regard, can the content be considered appropriate for the knowledge and skill levels of teachers? Is the level of emphasis on subject knowledge vis-à-vis pedagogical skills appropriate?</td>
<td>• TDP teacher training materials review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. How does the language of these materials (mostly English, with key terms translated into Hausa) facilitate or hinder their understanding of the content?</td>
<td>• Non-TDP teachers FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Can the training material content be considered appropriate for the constraints teachers encounter in typical classrooms (e.g. large class sizes, multi-grade teaching, and poor physical infrastructure)?</td>
<td>• FGDs with children taught by TDP teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. How does the content of the materials relate to teachers’ previous training (e.g. NCE) or any simultaneous in-service training being received by them (e.g. Jolly Phonics; parallel in-service training by SUBEBs)? Can complementarities be achieved between various forms of training that a TDP teacher might be undergoing?</td>
<td>• Programme documentation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Are there reliable mechanisms to route teachers’ and TFs’ feedback on any aspect of the training materials to the programme’s central management, SUBEBs and CoEs, and thereon to material developers?</td>
<td>• SUBEB representative KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Are training materials being shared and/or discussed with non-participating teachers in TDP schools?</td>
<td>• TDP central programme management (KIIs/FGDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Are there perceptible differences in materials usage and understanding between teachers by state and type of school?</td>
<td>• TDP in-service state coordinators KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Based on the sub-questions above, what formative lessons emerge for TDP to consider with regard to material development and redesign for future programming and implementation? In terms of sustainability and scaling up, what state government agencies might be well positioned to carry forward materials development and production?</td>
<td>• TF and TDT KIIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TDP's school-based interventions towards enhanced SLM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching research questions</th>
<th>Core sub-questions for this study</th>
<th>Sources of data and instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ 3: Given the weak leadership and management in TDP schools at baseline, how can TDP (a) establish the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school, and (b) ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as SSVs)? | (a) Establishing the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school:  
1. Can the SLM training material be considered appropriate for the constraints head teachers encounter in their schools (e.g. lack of authority in teacher recruitment, unresponsive LGEAs)?  
2. Given the low levels of baseline head teacher motivation and capacity for SLM, to what extent do head teachers in TDP schools engage with the SLM training materials?  
3. Do the SLM training materials train head teachers to encourage TDP teachers to use their newly acquired skills (including regular use of printed and audio-visual materials) in their daily classroom praxis? Are head teachers applying this training in their day-to-day management of teachers in the school?  
4. Does the SLM training enable head teachers to conduct and establish a school system for lesson observations? Are head teachers applying this training in their day-to-day management of teachers in the school?  
5. Does the SLM training enable head teachers to encourage peer-to-peer learning between TDP teachers, and between TDP and non-TDP teachers? Are head teachers applying this training in their day-to-day management of teachers in the school?  
6. How does the content of the SLM training materials relate to any previous or ongoing training received on SLM (e.g. ESSPIN SLM training in Jigawa)? Can complementarities be achieved between various training that a TDP head teacher might be undergoing?  
7. Are there reliable mechanisms to route head teachers’ and their trainers’ feedback on any aspect of the SLM training materials to the programme’s central management, and thereon to material developers?  
8. How can TDP leverage the role of the community (SBMCs and parents) and other actors (especially SUBEB and LGEA) to ensure improved school management and accountability?  
9. Are there perceptible differences in SLM materials usage and understanding between head teachers by state and type of school? | (a) Establishing the head teacher as an academic leader and mentor in the school:  
- SLM training materials review  
- Programme documentation review  
- HT KIIs  
- TF and TDT KIIs  
- SBMC representative KIIs  
- Parents FGDs  
- TDP teachers FGDs  
- Non-TDP teachers FGDs  
- TDP central programme management (KIIs/FGDs)  
- TDP in-service state coordinators KIIs  
- SUBEB representative KIIs  
- LGEA Education Secretary KIIs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching research questions</th>
<th>Core sub-questions for this study</th>
<th>Sources of data and instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Based on the sub-questions above, what <strong>formative lessons</strong> emerge for TDP to consider with regards to enhancing the effectiveness of head teachers and SLM training for future programming and implementation?</td>
<td>(b) Ensure the effectiveness of its school-based interventions (such as SSVs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Are the SSVs **carried out regularly**, as planned? |
| 2. What is the range of **activities carried out by TFs** during an SSV? Have the TFs received adequate **initial and ongoing training** to conduct SSVs effectively? What is a typical TF’s **workload** in terms of days spent preparing for and conducting SSVs? |
| 3. Currently, what is the involvement of **head teachers and other actors** (e.g. LGEA inspectors) in SSVs? |
| 4. TFs are required to complete three forms at the end of each SSV on a tangerine tablet: a classroom observation form (for teachers), a head teacher observation form (for head teachers), and a TF summary form (which summarises all the information gathered). Is the **design and layout of these forms** appropriate? Do they capture **relevant data** on teacher/lesson quality and SLM (aside from monitoring and output-related data)? Are the **TFs trained** to use these tangerine forms appropriately? |
| 5. Are there reliable mechanisms in place to **utilise the SSV data** for appropriate analysis and reporting (what is reported and to whom?), and understanding their implications for future programming? |
| 6. What is the **quality of feedback** provided by TFs to teachers and head teachers after SSVs? Do teachers and head teachers find the feedback useful for improving their skills? |
| 7. Are there perceptible **differences in the quality of SSVs** by state and type of school? |

- TF and TDT KIIs
- HT KIIs
- TDP teacher FGDs
- TF/SSV observations
- SUBEB representative KIIs
- LGEA Education Secretary KIIs
- Programme documentation review
- TDP central programme management (KII/FGDs)
- TDP in-service state coordinators KIIs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching research questions</th>
<th>Core sub-questions for this study</th>
<th>Sources of data and instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Based on the sub-questions above, what <strong>formative lessons</strong> emerge for TDP to consider with regard to SSVs for future programming and implementation? In terms sustainability and scale-up, how can TDP bring about <strong>greater involvement from various actors</strong> (e.g. head teachers, LGEAs and SUBEBs) in developing a system of SSVs? What <strong>training</strong> will TFs and TDTs require to help establish this system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Annex D Methodology

D.1 Methodological framework

This formative research has been designed to provide an in-depth description and analysis of how TDP’s in-service activities have been (will be) implemented. Hence, the goal of this research is neither to evaluate the programme impacts nor to find causal links between TDP activities and final outcomes. Rather, it is to understand the contextual settings of programme activities, the quality of implementation, how particular contexts influence implementation, and whether the implementation model is appropriate for the context.

As such, this study uses a case study approach to address the formative research questions presented in the research matrix in Annex C. Case studies allow this research to explore, describe and intensively analyse the quality of programme implementation in the context of each school, using multiple sources of data to account for different perspectives, and to triangulate the data. Producing such a detailed description of the programme’s implementation will help to identify the successes of, constraints on, and weaknesses in programme implementation. The research questions for this study are geared towards understanding the contexts and implementation quality in each of the nine schools, as well as towards drawing recommendations from the results for developing Phase II of TDP’s in-service activities.

In this study, each case refers to a school receiving the TDP intervention and the associated pupils, teachers, head teachers, SBMC, parents, TFs, TDTs, SUBEB and Education Secretaries. All of these actors, as well as the context of the school, comprise the case of interest. Within this framework, researchers were able to identify key individuals who could provide important insights into the research questions. To this end, a thorough review of the existing documentation on TDP’s implementation has been conducted, detailed in the annexes of the Concept Note, to help understand the operational processes related to in-service training and to determine the actors who are involved in, and will be affected by, implementation.

Despite having detailed information on the case study schools from the baseline impact evaluation, researchers did not use this to create a longitudinal comparative case study framework – i.e. this formative research did not compare each case study school using a before (baseline)/after (mid-line) framework. This is because the types of questions asked and the goals of the research in the baseline impact evaluation are entirely different to the research questions and goals in this formative research study.

Furthermore, this study is not designed to be comparable across the nine cases but rather provides an understanding of programme implementation in different contexts. As such, each case should be considered as a separate instance with a unique context. However, the analysis will draw together common themes from the nine case studies and will consider the contextual variances in which these themes arise, and their implications for the quality of implementation. The tools used will be discussed in greater detail in D.3 below. These were

---

designed to collect data to address questions in the research matrix drawing from KIIs, FGDs, teacher praxis discussions and cluster training session observations, among others.

D.2 Sampling

Sampling of research sites

The qualitative component of the mixed-methods baseline survey had sampled schools based on stratified purposive sampling to select typical and extreme cases of schools. To do this, the 56 treatment schools selected for the quantitative baseline study in each state in 2015 were first listed in descending order of the average of teachers’ baseline scores on the teacher subject knowledge assessment (TDNA). These schools were then divided into three strata representing the top 10% of schools (‘higher performing’), middle 10% (‘typical schools’, i.e. 45%–55%), and bottom 10% of schools (‘lower performing’). From this list, two types of schools were excluded: first, schools that were more than 90 minutes’ travel from the state capital were removed for logistical and security purposes, because researchers could not visit these distant schools and return to the state capital on the same day before dark to carry out team debriefs. Second, schools that were located in LGAs that were deemed ‘insecure’ by security consultants were also removed from each shortlist. After filtering out these schools, there were generally between two and four schools remaining within each strata. Finally, a school was randomly selected from within each strata’s shortlist to study in-depth as part of the qualitative study. The process was repeated within each of the three TDP pilot states, Jigawa, Katsina and Zamfara, giving a total of nine schools across the three states. This method of sampling allowed the researchers to explore schools from different contexts in-depth in order to draw out recurring and divergent themes from each case study. Furthermore, using typical and extreme case sampling allowed researchers to include outliers in the study, which would typically be disregarded in quantitative studies. This formative research study went back to the same nine schools sampled for the baseline survey.

Sampling of stakeholders within schools

Sampling for each interview took place within the schools. Head teachers, TFs, TDTs, and the Education Secretaries were sampled based on their association with the school. Where it was not possible to speak to the head teacher, the assistant head teacher was sampled as a replacement. In three instances the research team was not able to interview the TDT due to overlap between schools (i.e. a TDT was responsible for two of the schools in the sample), the lack of a TDT assigned to a school or the inclusion of the TDT within our research team.

Pupils were randomly sampled from the pupil attendance list. To this end, researchers had to obtain pupil attendance records from each school and only pupils taught by TDP-trained teachers and in Class 3 were considered. From this shortlist, pupils were divided into female and male pupils, from which they were randomly selected to participate in the female or male pupil FGDs. Due to high levels of absenteeism, a list of 12 pupils was sampled for each

---

FGD and the first six pupils present were chosen. In one school in Zamfara there were only seven female pupils present and so all pupils took part in the FGD. In cases where there were not enough pupils in Class 3, pupils in Class 2, preferably, or Class 1 were also sampled.

For the SBMC KII s, the research team sought to speak to the SBMC chairperson and the SBMC PTA representative. However, in cases where it was not possible to speak to these members of the SBMC, one of the treasurers, the village head, the district head or the ward head (if they were an SBMC member) was sampled.

For the TDP teacher group interview, three teachers were randomly sampled from amongst the TDP teachers. The head teacher was not included in this interview despite the fact that they attended the cluster training sessions. In schools in which there were two cohorts of TDP teachers, we used stratified purposive sampling, through which two TDP teachers from cohort one were randomly selected and one TDP teacher from the second cohort was randomly selected. For the non-TDP teacher FGD, four teachers were randomly selected. In some schools there were as few as only one non-TDP teacher, in which case the FGD was adapted into a KII.

D.3 Observation and time in schools

The research was originally planned to take place over three days in each of the nine schools across the three states. However, due to Children’s Day and a public holiday the research teams were only able to spend two days (08:00 – 13:30) in each of the schools in Jigawa and Zamfara, and three days in the schools (08:00 – 12:00 due to Ramadan) in Katsina. During the time in the school, the research team spent time observing the school and the SSV, and conducted lesson observations. Outside of the school, the team conducted cluster training session observations. In Jigawa, the research teams were able to attend cluster training session 11 to observe the morning of training. The research teams did not stay for the sessions covered after lunch. In Zamfara and Katsina, the research teams had video recordings from cluster training session 10, which the teams watched in the evenings, while taking notes.

D.4 Data collection instruments

This study utilised five main instruments during fieldwork: KII s; group interviews; FGDs; praxis discussions; and observations of cluster training sessions, SSVs and lessons. All instruments use both structured and unstructured questions, which allowed for efficient probing of certain aspects of implementation while also allowing for unanticipated and context-specific information to be captured and new assumptions to be explored. These semi-structured interviews were not limited to a set of pre-defined questions and therefore varied between participants. The interviews were designed to allow a free-flowing conversation, structured by the research questions. Interviewers were trained to encourage the interviewee to seek clarification to increase the quality and reliability of responses. Observations and the TF praxis discussion, in particular, were the least structured instruments but these still remained guided by the research questions they were designed to answer. Table 11 summarises the types of instruments that were used to collect information from each participant during qualitative fieldwork.
Table 11: Instruments administered for each participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>TDP teachers</th>
<th>Non-TDP teachers</th>
<th>Pupils (girls)</th>
<th>Pupils (boys)</th>
<th>Parent representative on SBMC</th>
<th>SUBEB</th>
<th>TDP TF</th>
<th>TDP Teacher Development Team</th>
<th>TDP Central Programme Management</th>
<th>TDP in-service State coordinators</th>
<th>SBMC Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs (or group interviews)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multitude of instruments were designed to ensure that triangulation is possible between responses by ensuring that there is an overlap in questions asked of different stakeholders in order to elicit responses on each research question from different perspectives. For example, the head teachers’ responses to questions around SLM training can be triangulated against the responses from teachers and pupils in the school, as well as the SBMC members.

D.5 Research team

There were three field teams, as shown in Table 12, each comprising an international EDOREN qualitative researcher, a national qualitative researcher, a representative from TDP – who was either part of the TDT or a TF – and a transcriber. The fieldwork manager was recruited because of his extensive experience in previous TDP studies, both quantitative and qualitative, as well as experience of other donor-funded projects in northern Nigeria. The international researchers, who were the designated team supervisors, were recruited due to their experience with qualitative fieldwork in northern Nigeria and in other contexts, experience working with TDP, such as on the teacher demand and supply study or contributions to the TDP mixed-methods baseline study. National researchers were chosen based on their experience working on previous quantitative or qualitative studies with TDP, on the EDOREN teacher management study or other qualitative research experience through EDOREN or other school-based studies. The TDTs or TFs were selected for each team by the TDP and their role was to provide assistance in the field as well as to support interviews by probing, given their extensive knowledge of the programme. The transcriber for each team was chosen based on their proficiency in both transcription and translation, as well as their experience with TDP or other qualitative studies. The inclusion of a transcriber in the team and in the field was motivated by the short timeframe in which the findings had to be delivered, given the roll-out of Phase II later in the year. The EDOREN workstream lead was the principal investigator for this study, and is responsible to DFID/TDP for the overall quality and timely delivery of outputs.
### Table 12: Field teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field teams</th>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
<th>Team 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork manager</td>
<td>Charles Umar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOREN international qualitative researcher (supervisor)</td>
<td>Johanna Wallin&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alexandra Doyle</td>
<td>Zara Durrani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National qualitative researcher</td>
<td>Nafinatu Abdullahi</td>
<td>Aminu Dukku</td>
<td>Shafa’atu Musa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDT or TF</td>
<td>TDT Zamfara and TDT Katsina</td>
<td>TF Katsina</td>
<td>TDT Jigawa&lt;sup&gt;76&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriber</td>
<td>Ibrahim Musa</td>
<td>Adamu Madara</td>
<td>Jamila Sali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>75</sup> Johanna Wallin was unable to be part of the field mission following impromptu sick leave needing to be taken just before departure to the field. She was replaced as Team 1 Supervisor by the National Qualitative Researcher, Nafinatu Abdullahi.

<sup>76</sup> TDT Zamfara – Abubakar Garba; TDT Katsina – Mannir Abubakar; TF Katsina – Huzainatu Labo; TDT Jigawa – Muhammed Habu.
## Limitations of, and risks to, the formative research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations/risks</th>
<th>Why this is limiting and what we have done to address this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability bias</td>
<td>Any research risks response bias, in particular with regard to questions that respondents may interpret as having a ‘correct answer’. The research has mitigated this through triangulating questions both ‘on topic’ (within tools themselves) and between respondents. Additionally, the analysis included several researchers and thus decreases the risk of researcher bias at the stage of analysis, minimising the risk of over-emphasising answers that may have been given due to elements of social desirability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field team composition</td>
<td>It is worth noting that some members of the field team were selected from within TDP’s existing teacher trainers, and are themselves an intrinsic part of the organisations and processes which this research seeks to study. Although including researchers from the immediate study population adds value to the interpretation and analysis of data, this may influence the way in which respondents answer questions, due to power imbalances and the perceived need to say what is expected, rather than what may be the case, in front of TDP trainers. Due to this level of research bias from the perspective of the respondent, the training highly emphasised unbiased delivery of instruments and design and analysis have been strict in triangulating the data using responses from multiple respondents and different instruments. Moreover, when assigning tools to each researcher in the field the team carefully considered which instruments and in what contexts the inclusion of these researchers added value, and when it was at higher risk of biasing the respondents. As such, TDP researchers did not directly interact with TDP teachers or with other TFs or TDTs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Though the instruments were originally designed in English, the training in Abuja involved national researchers in discussions around terminology, phrasing, and translation – to ensure a standardised delivery during data collection. However, the limitation of ad hoc probing in order to elicit nuanced responses may not have been sufficiently addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the non-representative nature of the qualitative selection of schools the information provided is indicative</td>
<td>The qualitative methods used for this research provide nuanced individual accounts and perceptions around in-service training processes and the wider TDP programme. The research contrasts individuals’ experiences within and across schools, without claiming that there is one ‘true account or perspective’, or that these perspectives and experiences are representatives of other schools. Nonetheless, the findings are indicative of how some schools and stakeholders perceive and experience TDP, and as such give insight into what benefits and challenges stakeholders are likely to encounter, and accounts are thus useful in reflecting how TDP can improve processes moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling was restricted due to accessibility</td>
<td>Due to the associated security risks with researching in the sampled states, teams were only able to sample schools that were within an advised distance of the state capitals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>