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Introduction

Early in 2018, senior staff from Global School Leaders (GSL) and Dignitas met to consider the synergies across their work, and the alignment of the two organizational missions. The conversations developed, and resulted in the envisioning of a jointly developed and delivered program for School Leaders in Kenya that would leverage GSL’s global expertise, and insights for scale alongside Dignitas’ contextual expertise and experience. In July 2018, GSL invited Africa Educational Trust (AET) to join the conversation to offer expertise in partnering with Sub-County education officials to implement programming in a cohort of government schools.

By October 2018, technical staff from each of the three partners were deep in conversation around the detail of the development and delivery of Ustadi School Leadership Institute to a cohort of 54 partner schools from January to August 2019.

Program Rationale

Kenya’s Education Sector Report states that classrooms are characterized by individual seat-work and dominated by teacher-centered activities. Only 39% of teachers can prepare lesson plans, 33% can assess student ability, and only 29% can evaluate student progress factors which translate to learners’ ability to acquire and master skills. Learners are rarely encouraged to participate in lessons, question new material, expand their reasoning, and collaborate with peers. As a result, 40% of children aged 6-16 years cannot do everyday math (Uwezo 2015), highlighting significant gaps in educational quality, despite impressive gains in school enrolment (national NER currently 91%).

Kenya’s Ministry of Education’s National Education Sector Strategic Plan has highlighted the importance of capacity building for education managers (2018). However, there is still a lack of comprehensive training for head teachers that involves both leadership and management skills, which is detrimental for students’ learning outcomes (Onguko et al 2008).

Kenya is in the midst of a historic reform process to improve the quality of school education. Kenya Institute for Curriculum Development (KICD) have launched a new Basic Education Curriculum Framework which lays out a new competency-based curriculum (CBC). However, Education reforms can only succeed with strong leadership at the school level to ensure its uptake, and deliver on its promise.

Global research indicates that School Leaders have a significant impact on student learning outcomes. Bloom et al. (2015) conducted a comparative study to measure if school management affected student outcomes. They developed a tool combining four management areas; "operations, monitoring, target
setting and people" (p. 647) and found that there was consistent correlation between management efficiency and student outcomes, particularly with respect to the manner in which school leaders adopted sound management principles. While there is a lack of similar studies in the global south, Fryer’s study of the impact of management practices on student outcomes in charter schools suggests that there could be a link for studies to further explore. According to Fryer (2012), "frequent teacher feedback, data driven instruction, high-dosage tutoring, increased instructional time, and a relentless focus on academic achievement " (p. 3), can be associated with almost half the differences in school effectiveness. However, historically there has been minimal, formal professional development for head teachers across the public and private sectors in Kenya. To maximize the impact of School Leaders, GSL, Dignitas and AET created the Ustadi School Leadership Institute to pilot a continuous professional development program focused on instructional leadership.

Program Overview

The program was piloted across two geographies, with the intention of seeking to understand the differences between urban and rural settings, and government and private schools. Ustadi School Leadership Institute partnered with 27 APBET (Alternative Providers of Basic Education and Training) schools in Dandora, Nairobi and 27 government schools in Laikipia North. The Dandora schools were selected in accordance with strict criteria, as a result of a rigorous recruitment exercise run by Dignitas across several of Nairobi’s informal settlements. None of these schools had received support from Dignitas previously. The Laikipia North schools comprised the entire Sub-County, and had been partnering with AET for other forms of support for the last five years. In total, these schools serve 14,263 students.

Program content was a combination of Leadership Academies, Professional Development (PD) Workshops, and In-school Coaching delivered January to July 2019. Overall, Ustadi School Leadership Institute delivered:

- Eight Days of Workshops - Two 2-day Leadership Academies, four day-long PD workshops
- Four monthly in-school coaching sessions in Nairobi, and three in Laikipia North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and on-ground support to School Leaders will improve education practices within the school, therefore increasing teacher performance and student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in number of trained School Leaders in the system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) tools did not measure student outcomes as we did not expect any changes based on the short duration of the pilot.

**Program Content**

The curriculum and coaching content was designed by a team of technical experts from GSL, Dignitas and AET. The design considered three trajectories of developing School Leader capacity that would deliver on the outcomes of the program:

- Leading Self – Personal Leadership trajectory
- Leading Learning – Academic Rigor trajectory
- Leading Others – School Culture trajectory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Workshop Content</th>
<th>Coaching Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Growing self: Foundations for personal leadership (Exploring mindsets emotional intelligence, supporting adult learners)</td>
<td>No coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Effective Teaching practices and how students learn</td>
<td>School vision and mission alignment School culture, Supporting adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Data driven instruction</td>
<td>Lesson planning Undertaking school walkthroughs Setting rigorous objectives Alternative methods of discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Precise praise, data analysis, differentiation and coaching</td>
<td>No coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Strategic planning, questioning</td>
<td>Data collection in schools Lesson observations and feedback Student engagement strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Stages of team development Reviewing of previous training</td>
<td>Coaching and feedback Strategic plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)**

The Ustadi School Leadership Institute team were keen to leverage the pilot to learn as much as possible about what works in supporting School Leaders in the various settings, so as to inform future programming and investment. Seven monitoring and evaluation tools in total were designed to support...
the gathering of data from all school partners. These tools included classroom observation tools, teacher and School Leader surveys, monthly school visit forms and School Leader competency rubrics.

It is important to note that, given the nature of any pilot programming, the design and implementation of MEL is an informed, yet experimental activity. The collection and analysis of the data for this program presented several challenges such as:

- Inconsistencies in data collection across geographies, and between baseline and endline
- Limited time to pilot the tools before administering them
- Challenges in achieving inter-rater reliability particularly with respect to measuring the school leader competencies, and teachers’ practices
- The tools measured the presence of School Leadership practices, but not the quality of practice
- Difficulties in establishing time-trends due to variances in questions between data points for certain indicators

The data being presented in this report is that in which the three partners have relatively high confidence. The next section of this report will highlight findings that respond to each of the first three outcomes from the Theory of Change above. It should be noted that this report does not share any findings in response to the fourth outcome (Increase in student learning and development outcomes) as the team felt that a six-month pilot was too short to really drive the desired change at student level. With a longer program cycle, the team will develop and test tools to measure the relevant indicators for this outcome, and indeed explore the critically important link between skilled School Leaders, and improved student achievement.

**Outcome 1: Impact on number of trained School Leaders**

Dignitas enrolled 81 School Leaders for the Ustadi School Leadership Institute (USLI). 27 of these were government Head Teachers from Laikipia North, and 54 were Head Teachers and Deputies from Dandora APBET schools. A total of 80 School Leaders completed the program, with one Dandora School Leader dropping out when she relocated from the partner school. It is worth noting that migration of School Leaders and teachers is a persistent and complex challenge within the APBET school sector.

It was important for the USLI team to understand the prior experience and qualification of the School Leaders enrolled in the program (see Table 3 below) so as to understand how this might influence uptake of program content, and shifts in teacher and School Leader practice. The data points to significant difference between the Laikipia North and Nairobi cohorts, which highlights the gaps in School Leader qualification for each sub-set of schools. In addition, approximately 20% of School Leaders have never received professional development training before Ustadi.
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Qualification</th>
<th>Laikipia North (Government)</th>
<th>Nairobi (APBET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or diploma in a different field (not education)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 (Teaching certification)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Diploma</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate (not education)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended KEMI* training</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kenya Education Management Institute

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD* opportunities before Ustadi (Certificate courses that require a minimum 4 months participation)</th>
<th>No PD received</th>
<th>Within the last 3 years**</th>
<th>More than 3 years ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laikipia</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continuous Professional Development

**It is worth noting that many of the CPD opportunities referred to by School Leaders were national, externally funded, interventions targeted at literacy, early childhood education, and girls’ education. None of these opportunities were tailored for School Leaders, but targeted the broader spectrum of educators.

It may be this lack of opportunity for CPD that prompted such a positive uptake for the USLI, with 99% completion rate as pointed out above. Further, the team recorded an average attendance rate across all activities of 82%, with higher attendance rates across both Laikipia North and Nairobi (89% and 85% respectively) for Leadership Academies and PD Workshops, than for coaching (70% and 84% respectively). Feedback from USLI coaches indicated that the coaching schedule was often interrupted by the official responsibilities that government Head Teachers are expected to fulfil outside of the school, and not always in a predictable manner, hence the lower coaching attendance rate in Laikipia North. This is supported by data that revealed 91% of participating School Leaders rated their overall satisfaction with USLI as eight, nine, or ten out of ten, demonstrating a high level of satisfaction with curriculum, coaching, and methods of delivery.
USLI was intended to influence the classroom practice of teachers, without delivery of program direct to the teachers. USLI’s Theory of Change was that the program would build the capacity of School Leaders (Head Teachers and Deputies) as instructional leaders within their schools, as a means of improving classroom practice of teachers. A crucial link in this chain of impact, was the cascade of training and coaching from School Leaders who were participating directly in USLI, to teachers within the same schools. Figure 1 shows the rate at which School Leaders fulfilled this expectation, which was surprisingly high. (Note that coaching did not take place in Laikipia North in June due to other obligations placed on government schools.) The first Leadership Academy delivered content including Supporting Adult Learners, and Conducting Effective Meetings to help facilitate this process, and ensure its effectiveness. Program coaches reported that variances in School Leader delivery of these sessions were determined by what the School Leader thought to be most relevant. Given the initial success observed herein, and the general commitment of School Leaders to cascade learning, future iteration of USLI should provide more guidance and tools on how to cascade training, with a particular focus on cascading practice and setting clear goals for School Leaders and Teachers alike.

In summary, analysis of the data collected against the first outcome, indicates four key conclusions. First, there was high engagement, satisfaction and therefore retention levels among participating School Leaders. Secondly, including the Deputy Head Teacher, as was the case for all of the Nairobi cohort, increased attendance and continuity. Third, while government Head Teachers are more qualified academically, both cohorts had limited exposure to CPD designed for School Leadership. Finally, there is a general willingness and commitment from School Leaders to cascade training and coaching to teachers.

**Outcome 2 - Impact on Effective Leadership Practices**

USLI tracked School Leaders’ competencies with a tool designed to rate a detailed list of indicators across eight categories; collecting and recording data, data analysis, relationship building, conducting meetings, coaching and feedback, facilitation and debrief, planning, and implementation. The rubrics were implemented by program coaches in both locations, and in Laikipia North, AET staff supported
It should be noted that the categories are defined as follows:

- Level 1 Beginner: Limited knowledge of good practice
- Level 2 Emerging: Some knowledge but limited influence on practice
- Level 3 Proficient: Changes in practice observed with some consistency
- Level 4 Advanced: Positively influencing the practice of other educators

Interestingly, the competency with the highest rate of growth across both Nairobi and Laikipia North cohorts was Relationship Building, which at baseline had 0% and 19% respectively rated at Level 3 or 4, and by endline had 93% and 96% rated at Level 3 or 4. To progress to Level 4, School Leaders had to demonstrate relationships with staff and students that were healthy, constructive, positive, and exhibited mutual respect.

**Ustadi Story of Change:** Teacher Maurice and Teacher Jane of Wama Educational Centre complained that teachers at their school were not following through with action steps created during staff meetings, and that they rarely participated in the meetings. After learning how to conduct successful staff meetings, they started sharing the agendas for the meetings in advance, and they delegated some of the roles to the other teachers. They have seen increased staff engagement, and ownership of goals during the staff meeting and teachers are following through with action steps created.
The competency with the lowest rate of growth across both Nairobi and Laikipia North cohorts was Implementation, which at baseline had 0% and 27% respectively rated at Level 3 or 4, and by endline had 38% and 89% rated at Level 3 or 4. To progress to Level 4, School Leaders had to ensure planning went beyond paperwork, and moved to action, and assigned tasks should be adequately followed up in a manner that drives progress, and builds a healthy culture of accountability.

USLI focused in on key leadership practices that are documented to impact on student achievement. One of these is the practice of data-driven instruction. For closer analysis, USLI looked at what kind of data School Leaders were collecting, how often School Leaders were collecting it, and how often they were reviewing the data with teachers.

For example, USLI found that only a small percentage of School Leaders and Teachers were collecting crucial student assessment data on a regular basis, as per Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collecting Student Assessment Data</th>
<th>School Leaders (weekly)</th>
<th>Teachers (after every lesson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laikipia</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between baseline and endline, with their participation in USLI, School Leaders started collecting data more frequently (on a weekly basis) which was accompanied by teachers collecting data more frequently (after every lesson). However, a closer look at the types of data being collected and utilized show the need for further support to see this practice replicated across planning and implementation of activities affecting learning so that School Leaders are comprehensively reviewing the full spectrum of data regularly. More support is needed to help School Leaders and teachers collect and review data sets related to teaching and professional records, syllabus coverage, student work, homework, and community. Furthermore, future iterations of USLI should focus on how these data sets are utilized, and what influence they could have for improved learning.

**Ustadi Story of Change:** George and Jeff of Vision Achievers Preparatory, used to look at all the students exercise books, which was cumbersome and time-consuming. “We would start checking the books in the morning and sometimes finish at 8pm, then the next day, we create time to give the teachers feedback based on what we have observed, which was mostly negative.” After Ustadi training, they decided to delegate this to the teachers; they formed subject panels, and allowed the subject heads to lead the meetings. When the teachers meet, they identify the problems the students are having and they come up with solutions, the meetings are purposeful, unlike what George and Jeff used to do in the past, which was mostly fault finding.
Two further key leadership practices tracked by USLI were Classroom Observations and School Walkthroughs. The USLI team observed increases in the use of these practices by School Leaders who participated in the program. Teachers also reported a 13% increase in those being observed weekly, with 52% of teachers benefitting from weekly classroom observations by the end of the program. As per Figure 3 below, a significant increase in practice is observed in May, which is when training content on these practices had been delivered and supported with coaching.

![Figure 3](image)

A crucial element of any classroom observation is the offering of feedback that is constructive, and will support improvement in classroom practice. Our data shows that providing feedback after lesson observations was more common earlier in Laikipia than Nairobi, and the uptake increased in both locations with the full delivery of related training and coaching support.

![Figure 4](image)
Key to the success of USLI was the ability of the program to shift School Leader mindset. For many School Leaders, their focus is administrative, and not instructional. Their professional training, and even government systems of accountability and supervision do not encourage school management practices that affect teaching and learning.

**Figure 5**

Figure 5 demonstrates positive shifts in School Leader mindsets, and shows a marked improvement with respect to their interactions with teachers. The School Leaders, through participation in USLI, reported increased openness to feedback from teachers, and an increasingly constructive approach to addressing weaknesses in teacher practice. School Leaders are still hesitant to establish training plans for teachers consistently, and may feel restrained by capacity or resource to do so. This may be an area for further support in future iterations of USLI.

**Ustadi Story of Change:** Head Teacher Maureen from St Antony Happy Day School shares that, “Mindset change was the beginning of all the positive changes that took place in our school.” Within two months of Ustadi Maureen said, “I like the way I currently relate with my teachers; I see them as my colleagues, and we work as a team. We give each other feedback and our school is improving day by day.”
USLI gathered intriguing data sets around the status of Strategic Planning within partner schools. At baseline, 59% of partner schools in Laikipia North (Figure 6 below), and 52% of partner schools in Nairobi (Figure 7 below), produced evidence of a strategic plan. However, by endline, a number of schools seem to be revising their plans, and therefore report them as ‘partially complete’. This may be due to the fact that USLI training and coaching expanded the School Leaders’ understanding of what a strategic plan should include, and how it should influence teaching and learning within a school. USLI content was designed to build the capacity of School Leaders to have a strategic plan that went beyond the typical elements of infrastructure, assets, and finances, and encouraged an additional focus on student learning goals, and of course of an accompanying implementation plan. It is important to note that the program covered strategic planning toward the end, and so observable impact of the training would be limited at this time. Further, there are differences between Nairobi and Laikipia North, as government schools have a statutory obligation to develop a strategic plan, whereas APBET schools do not.

Similar assertions may be true of School Culture Plans, which 85% of Laikipia North partner schools presented at baseline, and 100% at endline. In Nairobi, the prevalence of partner schools with Culture Plans was 41% at baseline, and had increased to 70% at endline, indicating an increased understanding.
of the importance of the Culture Plan, and its potential impact on teaching and learning. Data shows that 30% of School Leaders in Laikipia and Nairobi updated their Culture Plan post USLI training.

In summary, a number of key findings can be observed in relation to the second outcome. First, the USLI program demonstrated an ability to increase leadership competencies across all indicators. Interestingly, there does not seem to be any direct correlation between professional qualification and competency ratings. Critically, increase in practices such as school walkthroughs, and teacher observations, point to important shifts in the School Leaders’ understanding of their management role, with increased appreciation for their role as instructional leaders. This is also reflected in the perception and mindset shifts documented in the School Leader surveys.

Outcome 3 - Impact on Teaching Processes

It was important for USLI to be able to observe demonstrable shifts in teacher practices, whilst acknowledging that with such a short program cycle, our expectations were limited. Reviewing certain elements of lesson planning that were directly supported with USLI training and coaching, USLI realized gains in the Nairobi partner schools, as per Figure 8. Interestingly, the data showed a decline in lesson planning practices in partner schools in Laikipia North. On consultation with the program coaches, the USLI team have attributed this to a more accurate understanding of the required practices on the part of the coaches observing the endline.

Another area of teacher practice that USLI intended to impact was learner engagement, seeking to observe specific techniques teachers were using to engage students. Figure 9 shows gains across the partner schools, and increases in good practices.
Ustadi Story of Change: Madam Bernice, Headteacher of Affinity Educational Centre wondered why learners at her school showed a drop in performance after moving to upper primary (grade 4 and above). She could not think of a solution, since she did not know what the problem was.

Conducting classroom walkthrough helped me identify the problem. She realized that teachers stopped engaging learners in Grade 3, as they thought learner engagement was only for lower primary, and so they lectured throughout the lesson.

During one of their weekly debriefs, Madam Bernice shared what they had been learning on student engagement, and active learning strategies. She showed them the ‘Learning Pyramid’, which shows learner retention rates when different teaching methods are used.

The teachers have since embraced active learning strategies, and Madam Bernice is using weekly observation and coaching to support the teachers’ implementation.

USLI was also seeking to realize an increase in the offering of constructive feedback to students, ensuring learning is facilitated well. Figure 10 demonstrates significant increases across the indicators in Laikipia North. USLI notes a slight decline in the use of precise praise in the Nairobi cohort, for which there is no obvious explanation immediately. Finally, it is worth noting that partner schools in Laikipia North had previously benefited from some instructional training and support from AET which may have been complementary to USLI content, and could explain better performance in Laikipia overall compared to Nairobi.
Finally, whilst USLI recognizes the complexities of influencing positive change in behaviour management, when so much of behaviour management is driven by deeply engrained social, cultural and religious norms, the MEL tools were designed to measure certain actions that might indicate changes in teacher practice. Table 6 shows that in Nairobi, there was a low incidence of the presence, or quality of, the discipline plan in the classrooms, although it should be noted that APBET schools have not typically had high standards of documentation which may offer partial explanation. The findings presented here indicate that longer term support for changes in behavior management practices may offer increased impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Behavior Management</th>
<th>Laikipia North</th>
<th>Nairobi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures and routines help to meet high behavioral expectations</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirections are positive and motivating</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline plan is present and visible in the class</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline plan has clear expectations, rewards and consequences</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

In summary, there are several highlights from the findings on the third outcome. There was a clear shift in classroom practices over the course of the pilot with greater learner engagement and improved behavior management. Since the program did not have direct contact with teachers, the data from classroom observations indicates that School Leaders exercised instructional leadership to shift classroom practices.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the USLI team observed strong indications that the theory of change holds water. Evidence shows that, in the course of the pilot, training and on-ground support to School did improve education practices within the school, therefore increasing teacher performance. Within the pilot phase, positive shifts in School Leader and teacher practice were observed, as a result of the increased capacity of Head Teachers and their Deputies to fulfil the role of Instructional Leaders within the school.
In the 2018 World Development Report, the World Bank declared a global learning crisis, and highlighted four factors that hinder student learning, including “School Management that doesn’t affect teaching and learning.” Equipped School Leaders improve the school’s teaching quality by helping teachers solve problems, providing instructional advice, and setting goals that prioritize learning. “Effective headship by head teachers was prerequisite to good performance of schools.” (Chitavi, 2002) Further, Heck, et al (1990) found that the “head teacher’s leadership influenced school governance, instructional organization, and school climate, which in turn directly affected student achievement.”

An external evaluation of Dignitas’ work, conducted by ziziAfrique in 2018 to answer the question of what impacts student achievement, recommended that every head teacher should be elevated to the position of instructional leader, and focus on selected instructional practices, including holding teachers accountable for lesson preparation and delivery. Bambrick-Santayo (2012) recognizes ‘Instructional Levers’ that School Leaders can use as a focus of teacher support. These are data-driven instruction, teacher observation and feedback, instructional planning, and teacher professional development.

Evidence gathered in the course of the Ustadi pilot clearly suggests that School Leaders must be equipped and empowered to ensure improved quality of teaching and learning in schools across Kenya.

Phase Two of Ustadi will be committed to sharing these findings with other education sector stakeholders, including the various government agencies, as we seek to understand further how to integrate these learnings, and the broader Ustadi program into what the government is seeking to achieve through NESSP (National Education Sector Strategic Plan 2018-2022), and of course with the CBC, TSC’s Teacher Professional Development initiatives, and other critical drivers of progress.