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I. Executive Summary

**Background.** The READ TA project is a five-year (October 2012- October 2017) intervention which works to improve reading and writing in seven mother tongue languages in collaboration with the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Regional State Education Bureaus (RSEB), City Administration Education Bureaus (CAEB), Colleges of Teacher Education (CTE) and Woreda Education Offices (WEO).

**Mentoring.** Past research has shown that conventional in-service teacher training alone is not enough to sustain changes in teaching and learning in classrooms. The READ-TA Mentoring Framework and Manual (developed in year 3 of the READ-TA project) and corresponding activities slated for 2017—including training of master trainers, training of mentors, and mentoring teachers--are designed to support Ethiopian teachers continually and long after READ-TA to focus on their own professional development and help their students to better learn to read and write.

**Purpose.** The purpose of this study is to gather initial data on school based MTL teacher support and beliefs and practices about mentoring in five regions (Amhara, Tigray, SNNPR, Oromia and Eth Somalia). The overarching research questions related to mentorship for improved reading practices/ methodologies and implementation of the curriculum are:

1. What are the perceptions (principals, mentors and mentees) of the benefits/ importance of mentorship?
2. What are the beliefs (according to principals, mentors and mentees) regarding understanding practices/ methodologies for teaching mother tongue?
3. What are the beliefs (according to principals, mentors and mentees) regarding understanding the mother tongue curriculum?

This baseline assessment was conducted in March, 2017. The next endline analysis will be conducted end of May 2017. The mentoring activities will be implemented in March, April and May. Therefore, the purpose is also to provide useful recommendations based on the analysis findings and conclusions to improve mentoring practices and to measure changes in the endline assessment. Therefore, the specific elements of the mentoring framework evaluated include:

1. Is a 1:5 (mentor: mentees) adequate?
2. Are the criteria for mentor selection applicable in all schools?
3. Does mentoring work in self-contained classrooms?
4. Is it possible to do mentoring at the cluster level when there are small schools?
5. Should the teaching load be reduced for mentors?
6. Is it possible to use 40 hours for CPD and link 20 hours of mother tongue mentoring?

**Methods.** Data was collected using both qualitative and quantitative methods. In particular, interviews were conducted with principals and/or deputy principals, mentees (mother tongue teachers), and mentors. In addition, focus group discussions were conducted. Thirty-nine schools were included in the sample. Data was collected by education professionals from READ TA/SCI, and Regional Education Bureaus. The analysis of the findings and reporting will also be done by READ TA/SCI and SCI MEAL team.
Beliefs/Practices. FGD responses were coded into understanding practices/methodologies, understanding new curriculum content, and improved attitudes. Fifty percent of the FGDs mentioned the perceived benefit of mentoring is to support learning and understanding teaching practices and methods for teaching the mother tongue language.

**Mentoring will improve the ability of the newly graduated teachers, especially those who do not understand teaching methodology and teaching methods. [FGD 010]**

Related to practices, 30 percent of the FGDs mentioned the perceived benefit of mentoring is to support gaining knowledge and understanding the content of the new mother tongue curriculum.

The practice of mentoring in our school is relevant, it helps the mentees understand the newly introduced mother tongue language curriculum. [FGD011]

Lastly, an additional benefit of mentoring mentioned by 13% of the FGDs was that it could create a colleague atmosphere and positive attitude towards each other as professionals.

Mentoring encourages us to support the professional development of one another. [FGD 022]

Findings suggest that the majority of mentors do not participate in experience sharing (92.86%). This finding is confirmed in principal reports, of whom 94.87% report no experience sharing. Fifty-seven percent of mentor teachers reported that they have not

However, it is important to note, as will be seen in the body of the report, that Mentors reflected that mentorship is additional burden (60%) and also it is useful for continuous development of teachers (95%). Furthermore, 53.8 principals responded that there is not mentoring service in their school, therefore only half responded.
mentee-mentor plan. This finding is also supported by principal reports, of whom a slightly larger percentage (66.67%) report that their mentors and mentees have no plans.

Current data suggest that 61.43 percent of mentees and mentors have discussions. In addition, 64.1 percent of principals’ report that their mentees do not have mentee portfolios and 71.79 percent report that they do not receive reports.

**Element - ratio.** One of the elements of interest to be research was the mentor to mentee ratio. Specifically, the research question asks: Is a ratio of 1:5 (mentor: mentees) adequate? Many of the activities conducted with mentees can be done in groups, however, other activities, for example, the classroom observation, requires one on one attention. Therefore, a smaller ratio may be ideal. Furthermore, it is possible that the ratio will need to be determined by contextual factors. For example, schools with smaller number of teachers will only allow for a smaller mentor-mentee ratio. FGD data was coded for ratio, using the sub codes adequate and inadequate. Most FGDs did not discuss the ratio. However, one reflected on the ratio in relation to the challenges. They stated:

*A challenge is the number of mentees assigned per mentor.* [FGD 021]

**Element - criteria.** Principal and mentee interviews ask participants if mentors were selected based on predetermined criteria from the framework including expertise and outstanding experience. As can be seen in the figure below principals and mentees strongly agreed/ agreed that selection was based on criteria (total 84.61% principals, 54.47% mentees). More principals reported strongly agree/ agree than mentees, a 30 percentage point difference. The difference is due to the fact that mentees were unaware of how mentors were selected as indicated in the FGD and 22.39% reported they did not know.

![Figure 3. Mentor selection](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor selection, %</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly A</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>22.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals were also asked if they had teachers who fit the mentor selection criteria. As seen in the figure and table 4, the majority indicated strong agree/ agree that they had teachers at their school who fit the mentor selection criteria (strongly agree 28.02 %, agree 15.38%). However, 47.71% reported that they disagreed or did not know.
Element- self-contained. FGD participants reflected on mentoring in self-contained classrooms, their reflections largely focused on how to better implement mentoring in the context of self contained settings. For example, they stated:

**Self-contained classroom teachers are working in the same shift. This makes it difficult to conduct the classroom observation and to provide feedback.** [FGD 025]

Element- cluster. While the framework defines the role of cluster supervisors it only specifically states once the role of “cluster mentors.” It states: “Cluster supervisors are expected to provide some instructional leadership and support for cluster schools.” P. 8, Framework. It goes on to state “mentors will get support from … cluster supervisors [who] will… implement the mentoring plan, and monthly discussions with cluster mentors” p. 17, Framework. However, it does not go on to provide guidance on the role of cluster mentors.

Furthermore, baseline data from mentor interviews suggests that only 3% of mentors to date are working with other schools. Specifically, mentors were asked: Do you have mentees from other schools?, or at the cluster level. When asked: “What are the challenges of mother tongue mentoring?” one FGD mentioned clusters.

**…”Cluster mentoring is hard to implement.” FGD 021**

Element- load. The element most frequently mentioned in FGDs was teaching load. It emerged when participants discussed the challenges and the recommendations. Usually mentor teachers have a workload of 30 sessions per week. This makes it difficult if not impossible for them to also fulfill their mentorship responsibilities, especially one on one classroom observation and feedback. The full report presents statistics on teaching load.
Element- CPD. Continuous Professional Development in Ethiopia includes 60 hours of in-service teacher training, of which 20 are dedicated to mentoring. There are two related questions of interest with regard to CPD and mentoring, the first asked of FGD participants is (1) Should mother tongue mentoring be linked with CPD? And the second asked FGD participants (2) Is CPD active in your school? For these questions codes were applied, they included: linked, not linked, active, not active and somewhat active.

CPD Twenty-four FGDs or 61.5 percent of FGDs discussed that mother tongue mentoring should be linked with CPD. There reflections are below.

We believe it will be easy to implement mother tongue language mentoring by integrating it with CPD activities at our school [FGD023]

Challenges. Participants in FGDs were asked: What are the challenges in mother tongue language mentoring? Responses were coded into the following sub categories:

- Budget and financial incentives- Thirty-one percent of FGDs indicated that lack of budget/ financial incentives was a challenge with the mother tongue language mentoring program.
- Lack of capacity or interest- Twenty-eight percent of FGDs indicated that lack of mentor capacity and lack of mentor and mentee interest is a challenge with the mother tongue language mentoring program.
- Lack of support- Thirty percent of FGDs indicated that lack of support in the form of stationary materials and human resources, for example the principal or supervisor, is a challenge.
- Workload or time- Eighty-seven percent of the FGDs indicated that the workload of mentors was a challenge in order to be able to implement their mentoring responsibilities.

Recommendations. Participants in FGDs were asked: What are your recommendations? Responses were coded into the following sub categories: workload, support, and training.

- Minimize workload- Forty-one percent of FGD recommended minimizing the workload.
- Additional support- Forty-six percent of FGDs recommended providing additional support such as support from the principal and cluster supervisor, in addition they recommended providing stationary materials. Furthermore, transportation on meals or tea were recommended.
- Additional training- Twenty-three percent of FGDs recommended providing additional training. This implied training should have been provided earlier in the year. Also, this implied ongoing training during implementation.

2 Challenges will be more complete at endline.
3 Recommendations will be more complete at endline.
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II. Project Background

The READ TA project is a five-year (October 2012- October 2017) project implemented in five target regions to improve reading and writing in seven mother tongue and English languages in collaboration with the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Regional State Education Bureaus (RSEB), City Administration Education Bureaus (CAEB), Colleges of Teacher Education (CTE) and Woreda Education Offices (WEO) and other implementing partners Save the Children International, Florida State University, Whiz Kids Workshop, Inveneo and SIL LEAD.

READ TA supports the development and implementation of mother tongue curricula for grades 1-8 in seven targeted mother tongue languages (Amharic, Afan Oromo, Af-Somali, Hadyissa, Sidamu Afoo, Tigrina and Wolaytattoo) and English as a Second Language. READ TA theory of change assumes that the revision of mother tongue curriculum and development of student books, teacher guides and supplementary reading materials will lead to improved reading scores. READ TA provides in-service and pre-service continuous professional development of teachers, school principals, supervisors and teacher educators through the training of teacher trainers. The project is expected to reach 15 million children in all schools and five regions of Ethiopia.

USAID provides funding for the project and the Research Triangle Institute International implements READ TA with Save the Children, Florida State University (FSU), SIL LEAD, Inveneo, and Whiz Kids Workshop. READ TA’s main activities are concentrated around four Intermediate Results (IRs):

- **IR1**: Reading and writing materials appropriate for primary classrooms and pre-service and in-service teacher training developed
- **IR2**: Language-specific teaching and learning methodologies and strategies that focus on helping students learn to read and write effectively are applied
- **IR3**: Language teaching and learning supported by appropriate technology and teacher aids
- **IR4**: Technical support to RSEBs and MoE for the READ institutional improvement

Mentoring

Past research has shown that conventional in-service teacher training alone is not sufficient to sustain changes in teaching and learning in classrooms. The READ-TA Mentoring Framework and Manual (developed in year 3 of the READ-TA project) and corresponding activities slated for 2017—including training of master trainers, training of mentors, and mentoring teachers—are designed to support Ethiopian teachers continually and long after READ-TA to focus on their own professional development and help their students to better learn to read and write.
Mentoring activities fall under IR2, to improve methodologies and strategies, recent year 4 achievements under IR2 include:

- Developed mother tongue teacher’s mentoring framework in English and adapted the framework into seven mother tongue languages
- Developed mother tongue teachers’ mentoring manual in English and validated it with mother tongue teachers
- Adapted the validated English version mother tongue mentoring manual into seven mother tongues with teachers and validated the adapted mother tongue version
- Solicited RSEB reflections on the mother tongue teacher mentoring framework during regional validation of mother tongue version mentoring manuals and shared reflections with the MoE

This year (year 5) will include training master trainers for training of mentor trainers of grades 1-8 mother tongue mentors, train mentor trainers of grades 1-8 mother tongue mentors, and provide technical support for training remaining mentors.

Purpose of the assessment

The purpose of this study is to gather initial data on school based MTL teacher support and beliefs and practices about mentoring in five regions (Amhara, Tigray, SNNPR, Oromia and Eth Somalia). The overarching research questions related to mentorship for improved reading practices/ methodologies and implementation of the curriculum are:

1. What are the perceptions (principals, mentors and mentees) of the benefits/ importance of mentorship?
2. What are the beliefs (according to principals, mentors and mentees) regarding understanding practices/ methodologies for teaching mother tongue?
3. What are the beliefs (according to principals, mentors and mentees) regarding mastery and understanding the mother tongue curriculum?

And following the endline…

4. How have teaching practices (methodologies) and understanding of the mother tongue curriculum changed in schools benefitting from mentoring as opposed to those without mentoring?

This baseline assessment was conducted in March 2017. The next endline assessment will be conducted end of May 2017. The mentoring activities will be implemented in March, April and May. Therefore, the purpose is also to provide useful recommendations based on the analysis findings and conclusions to improve mentoring practices and to measure changes in the endline assessment. Therefore, the specific elements of the mentoring framework evaluated include:
1. Is a ratio of 1:5 (mentor: mentees) adequate?
2. Are the criteria for mentor selection applicable in all schools?
3. Does the mentoring relationship work in self-contained classrooms?
4. Is it possible to do mentoring at the cluster level when there are small schools?
5. Should the teaching load be reduced for mentors?
6. Is it possible to use 40 hours for CPD and link 20 hours of mother tongue mentoring?

A workshop was held on December 30, 2016 with the RSEBs from the five regions to discuss the elements and in turn questions above. Conclusions and recommendations from the event can be found in the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mentoring ratio 1:5</td>
<td>Mentoring has to be school based, transit mentoring has a cost, it is not practical [this also relates to clusters]- ratio has to modified from 1:1 to 1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Selection criteria</td>
<td>The criteria is not applicable in all school settings, criteria needs to be modified and contextualized for teaching settings w less training and turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self contained classrooms</td>
<td>There are no self [few] contained classrooms in the region, mentors should mentor mother tongue language teachers [this is interesting considering the data shows otherwise, i.e. there are]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cluster</td>
<td>School based mentoring is preferred, assigning by Woreda/ cluster is impractical, possibly pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Teaching load</td>
<td>Difficult to reduce load, cost implications, employing more teachers, at the same time mentoring has to be considered regular work and recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Link CPD and mentoring</td>
<td>Integrate with the CPD system and allocate time for mentoring, but also have specific CPD by subject area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audience

Therefore, the intended audience of this report is the Ministry of Education, Regional State Education Bureaus and USAID and other development partners implementing education reform projects.

III. Methods

Data was collected using both qualitative and quantitative methods. In particular, interviews were conducted with principals and/or deputy principals, mentees (mother tongue teachers), and mentors. In addition, focus group discussions were conducted.
Sample selection

The baseline study was conducted in 30% of schools selected for piloting mentoring in the five regions with support from READ TA/ Save the Children International. The schools were selected purposefully considering their accessibility to regional capitals as well as to ascertain equal proportions of urban and rural schools. Thirty-nine schools were sampled.

From the target schools two mentors and two mentees under each mentor (mentored by different mentors) were purposefully selected for the FGD; a total of seven people per school.

Table 2: Schools selected for mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Sampled schools (30%)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>This is increased to six to give equal chance to all three languages (2 each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCI Mentoring Baseline Study

Data collection and analysis

Data was collected by education professionals from READ TA/SCI, and Regional Education Bureaus. The analysis of the findings and reporting will also be done by READ TA/SCI in collaboration with READ TA/RTI and MOE.

Quantitative data was entered into an open source software, Kobobox. Data was collected on paper instruments and then entered electronically with tablets. Then, the data was cleaned by the MEAL lead and excel was used for analysis.

Qualitative data was entered into word. Qualitative data was collected on paper instruments and then typed electronically. Then, the word documents were uploaded into Dedoose, an open source software. A codebook was developed using an iterative process. First, codes were created based on a review of the mentoring framework, handbook and research questions/ elements. Then, the data was examined to determine if the codes were applicable. After practicing with three FGDs, codes were checked and ultimately applied to all 39 FGDs.
Tools

Tools include: the principal interview, the mentor interview, the mentee interview and the focus group discussion protocol. Instruments can be found in the annexes.

Limitations

Time allotment. There was limited time to conduct the baseline study. In addition, the other aspect of limited time is the amount of time provided for implementation of mentoring practices. Three months is a very short period of time to change the behaviors of teachers, mentors and mentees in schools. Furthermore, this work is being done at the end of the academic year. This is a busy time of year making implementation and endline data collection difficult.

Language. Ideally, if there had been more time then the instruments would have been translated into mother tongue languages. Data collectors are expected to work with the instruments in English and translate them simultaneously as they collect data. This influences the validity and reliability of the data since data collectors may ask questions differently when translating simultaneously. Furthermore, they have to then translate mother tongue languages back to English when writing down responses.

Focus Groups. Focus groups were conducted with one principal, two mentors and two (or more) mentees. The responses of the group members could be influenced by more senior staff, for example the principal. Therefore, in the next data collection focus groups will be separated by type such that mentees will be in a focus group by themselves. Interviews will be conducted with principals and mentors.

In addition, because of the small number of mentees at a given school it is not possible to separate groups by gender. However, future research could benefit by disaggregating groups by gender at the cluster level in order to allow for men and women’s voices to be heard equally. Since the majority of principals are men and more teachers are women, separating by type will inherently lead to somewhat more gender segregated FGDs.

Extrapolating. The roll out of the program was based on regional bureau decisions. This lead to a desire to be able to access schools. Therefore, the population of schools in the pilot is more urban and similarly the sample is more urban. Therefore, findings should be very cautiously generalized (if at all) to the rural context school which has different characteristics— for example teachers tend to be less experienced, there is higher turn over and there are more self contained classrooms, among others.
IV. Sample characteristics

This section presents relevant background characteristics of the participants in the study.

Participant by Gender

The figures to the left present the gender composition of the participants in the study. The majority of principals in schools are male (89.74%). Conversely, the majority of the mentors and mentees are female (62.86% and 67.16%). Therefore, there is a slightly higher percentage of female mentees as compared to mentors.

The next page presents a table and associated figures on the field of study of the mentors and mentees. It is not surprising that the majority of mentors (85.71%) and mentees (64.14%) field of study is language. This is to be expected since the mentoring program is designed to support mother tongue language teachers. Furthermore, more mentors report a field of study of language than mentees. This may be because mentees who are in self contained classrooms do not have a field of study of language.

It is important to note that not all mentors report a field of study of language since expertise in language is one criteria for mentor selection; to be discussed further under criteria.
With regard to level of study we see that the majority of mentors and mentees have a diploma (82.86% and 82.84%). In other words, nearly equal percentages of mentors and mentees have diplomas. One of the mentor criteria is to have earned a diploma, to be discussed further below. Having a diploma signifies that a teacher has attended and graduated from one of the Colleges of Teacher Education (CTEs) in Ethiopia.

While the majority of participants reported teaching the new mother tongue curriculum (88.57% mentors, 97.76% mentees), it is interesting to note (1) more mentees report teaching the mother tongue curriculum than mentors, and (2) not all mentors and mentees report teaching the new mother tongue curriculum (see table and figures, next page). This may be due to time lags in learning the new curriculum and implementation (for which mentoring is designed to help) or again that since some teachers are in self contained classrooms they do not report themselves as teaching the new mother tongue curriculum.

The fact that more mentees report teaching the new curriculum may be a function of the mentor criteria such that experience and language (not mother tongue) took precedence over teaching the new mother tongue language in selection. Or mentees may be over reporting.
Data and findings related to self contained classroom teachers and criteria are reported when this element is discussed in detail below.

**Figure 7. Mentor- new MT**

![Mentor- Teach new MT curr. (%)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teach new MT curriculum</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor, n=70</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee, n=133</td>
<td>97.76</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure and table on the below presents the location of the schools in the sample.

As was discussed in the limitations section of this report the majority of schools and in turn participants (principals, mentors and mentees) in this study are in an urban and semi urban setting.

**V. Benefits**

The first question in the FGD protocol asked participants to discuss benefits. Frequently participants in FGDs stated that they could not answer the question since they still had not participated in the mentoring program. The same is true for principals and mentees when interviewed. However, some provided reflections on what they perceived would be the benefits of mentoring. These reflections are presented below.

FGD responses were coded into understanding practices/ methodologies, understanding new curriculum content, and improved attitudes.
Fifty percent of the FGDs mentioned the perceived benefit of mentoring to support learning and understanding teaching practices and methods for teaching the mother tongue language.

*Mentoring will improve the ability of the newly graduated teachers, especially those who do not understand teaching methodology and teaching methods.* [FGD 010]

*Mentoring will help newly deployed teachers have more/sufficient knowledge of active learning approaches.* [FGD 026]

*The mentee] learns new teaching strategies* - Mentee interview

Related to practices, 30 percent of the FGDs mentioned the perceived benefit of mentoring to support gaining knowledge and understanding the content of the new mother tongue curriculum.

*The practice of mentoring in our school is relevant, it helps the mentees understand the newly introduced mother tongue language curriculum.* [FGD011]

*Mentoring enables the mentees to understand the manual, the teacher guide and the student textbooks.* [FGD011]

*Mentoring improves the knowledge of the mentees, it creates a good relationship between the mentor and the mentees, it helps the mentee understand the new curriculum and will have a direct impact on the reading and writing of primary school students.* [FGD039]

*Mentoring improves the [mentee] teacher’s capacity to teach the new curriculum.* Principal interview

Lastly, an additional benefit of mentoring mentioned in 13 percent of the FGDs was that it could create a colleague atmosphere and positive attitude towards each other as professionals.

*Mentoring encourages us to support the professional development of one another.* [FGD 022]

*Mentoring helps [us] to share ideas, develop a sense of transparency, and learn from one another.* [FGD 032]

*Mentoring brings an attitudinal change to the mentor and the mentee.* [FGD 019]

The fact that FGD participants could not state the benefits is important for the project to consider when implementing. Part of the cost/ benefit analysis teachers and mentors in particular may be weighing is the perceived cost of which they are fully aware (i.e. their time without additional compensation) vs. the lack of or unawareness of benefit. Additional
sensitizing and awareness raising about the benefits of mentoring may be beneficial. Reflections from teachers themselves may be the most effective way to convince teachers of the benefits.

It will be interesting to see if in the endline participants reflect more positively on the benefits and importance of mentoring. Specific beliefs and practices to be measured are presented below.

VI. Beliefs and Practices

Mentors and mentees were asked about the others knowledge and understanding of the mother tongue curriculum and mentoring manual. In other words, mentors had to reflect on mentees’ knowledge and conversely mentees had to reflect on mentors’ knowledge. The figures consolidate the data into agree/strongly agree and disagree/strongly disagree for ease in interpretation. The tables present all scale categories from strongly agree to disagree and do not know. Interesting findings emerge.

Forty-seven percent of mentees agreed or strongly agreed that mentors were knowledgeable about the mother tongue curriculum. Sixty percent of mentors agreed or strongly agreed that mentees were knowledgeable about the mother tongue curriculum. Thirty-one percent of mentors agreed or strongly agreed that the mentees were knowledgeable about the mentoring manual. Thirty-eight percent of mentees agreed or strongly agreed that mentors were knowledgeable about the mentoring manual.

---

4 The difference attributable to the fact that more mentees reported not knowing their mentor’s knowledge of the curriculum. Also, it appears that language expertise was criteria for selection of the mentors, not mother tongue.
Mentees were also asked to rate on a scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree whether or not a co-learning environment was created and whether or not there was confidentiality. The majority of mentees agree/ strongly agree that there is a co-learning environment (70%). In addition, a majority of mentees agree/ strongly agree (58%) that there is confidentiality.

Findings suggest that the majority of mentors do not participate in experience sharing (92.86%). This finding is confirmed in principal reports, of whom 94.87% reported that mentors have no experience sharing. Fifty-seven percent of mentor teachers report have no mentor-mentee plan. This finding is also supported by principal reports, of whom a slightly larger percentage (66.67%) report that their mentors and mentees have no plans.

Additional practices to be examined in the endline include holding discussions, have no a mentee portfolio and writing reports to the principal. Current data suggest that 61.43 percent of mentees and mentors have discussions. In addition, 64.1 percent of principals report that their mentees have mentee portfolios and 71.79 percent report that they did not receive reports.

It will be important to ensure in the endline that participants understand the difference between traditional plans, reports, and discussions for example and the specific mentoring plans, reports and discussions in the program.
VI. Specific elements

Ratio

One of the elements of interest to be research was the mentor to mentee ratio. Specifically, the research question asks: Is a ratio of 1:5 (mentor: mentees) adequate? Many of the activities conducted with mentees can be done in groups, however, other activities, for example, the classroom observation, requires one on one attention. Therefore, a smaller ratio may be ideal. Furthermore, it is possible that the ratio will need to be determined by contextual factors. For example, schools with smaller number of teachers will only allow for a smaller ratio. The question of ratio is also related to the manageable workload a mentor teacher can carry (to be discussed further below).

FGD data was coded for ratio, using the sub codes adequate and inadequate. Most FGDs did not discuss the ratio. However, one reflected on the ratio in relation to the challenges. They stated:

**A challenge is the number of mentees assigned per mentor. [FGD 021]**

In the sample mentors were asked: How many mentees do you have? Of those who were engaged in mentoring, the average number of mentees per mentor was 2.35, in other words there were on average two mentees per mentor. It makes sense, therefore, that the most frequently reported number of mentees per mentor was two (49 percent), followed by only one mentee (20 percent) and then three mentees (18 percent), see table below. It is also important to note that in some cases there are five or more mentees per mentor (11 percent). The endline will gather data on ratio via FGDs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria

Another element of interest in this study was the criteria set for mentor selection. The mentoring framework provides clear guidance on the selection criteria of mentors. It states: “selection criteria for mentors shall be the following: (1) Mother Tongue Language teacher with five or more years of teaching experience and relevant career structure level, (2) Teacher recognized as a model teacher, (3) Minimum diploma graduate in mother tongue language studies, (4) Competent interpersonal skills and (5) when comparable, priority shall be given to female teachers and teachers with disabilities.” P. 16, Framework.
As was discovered in a review of the sample characteristics, it appears that not all individuals who attended the mentor training and in turn are deemed mentors in the pilot program teach the new mother tongue curriculum. Since the mentoring is focused on improving mother tongue language teaching-learning, it should be emphasized that mother tongue language curriculum knowledge be criteria for selection. In addition, selection criteria should be transparent and available to all participants, not just cluster supervisors, mentors, and principals. In FGDs participants were not familiar with the selection criteria, this was specifically expressed by mentees who stated:

*We are concerned and request additional clear information on how mentors were selected and sent to the mentor training. [FGD 017]*

Principal and mentee interviews ask participants if mentors were selected based on their expertise and experience. As noted above Mentors are to have expertise in mother tongue language and five years of experience. As can be seen in the figure below principals and mentees strongly agreed/agreed that selection was based on criteria (total 84.61% principals, 54.47% mentees). More principals reported strongly agree/agree than mentees, a 30 percentage point difference. The difference is due to the fact that mentees were unaware of how mentors were selected as indicated in the FGD and 22.39% reported they did not know.

**Figure 15. Mentor selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor selection, %</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly A</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>22.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals were also asked if they had teachers who fit the mentor selection criteria. As seen in the figure and table, the majority indicated strong agree/agree that they had teachers at their school who fit the mentor selection criteria (strongly agree 28.20%, agree 15.38%). However, 47.71% reported that they disagreed or did not know.
Self-contained

This study was also designed to understand the applicability of the mother tongue language mentoring with teachers in self contained classrooms. As mentioned above variations in data and findings might be influenced by the fact that mentees are working in self contained classrooms, this implies that their training may not be exclusively in language since they are teaching additional subjects such as environmental science and mathematics.

The mentoring framework provides specific guidance for mentoring in self contained classroom environments. It states: “In self-contained classroom setups… a mother tongue language professional who fulfills the criteria will be assigned as a mentor for a year (or two) at the cluster level…” p. 17, Framework. Therefore, it appears that self contained teaching is also related to the next criteria, clusters. In other words, teachers who teach in self contained classrooms also tend to be in small rural schools which would require cluster level mentors.

Recall that the December 2016 workshop suggest that there were not a large number of self-contained schools in the regions pilot program, furthermore regional bureaus suggested that mentors should work with mother tongue language teachers exclusively. Findings from the data suggest that there are (1) schools which have self contained classrooms, source: principal interview, and (2) mentees which are teaching in self contained classrooms, source: mentee interview.

There were 24 schools or (62 percent) in the study who had self contained and both types of classes in their schools.
Furthermore, 45.52% of the mentees were teaching in self contained classrooms. Mentors were also asked: Does mentoring help self contained classroom teachers?

FGD participants reflected on mentoring in self-contained classrooms, their reflections largely focused on how to better implement mentoring in the context of self contained settings. For example, they stated:

**Self-contained classroom teachers are working in the same shift. This makes it difficult to conduct the classroom observation and to provide feedback. [FGD 025]**

**For smooth implementation of mother tongue language mentoring the school needs to assign mentors and mentees of self-contained classes to work in different shifts. [FGD 016]**

**In grades 1-4 there are self-contained classes implemented in our school and hence there is no free time for mentoring activities such as classroom observation/modeling/ unless mentees and mentors are in the opposite shifts. [FGD034]**

Lastly, mentors were asked: “Does mentoring help self contained classroom teachers?” The majority of mentors strongly agreed or agreed that mentoring has the potential to help self contained teachers (11.43% strongly agreed, 51.43% agreed). On the other hand, approximately 30 percent disagreed, strongly disagreed or did not know if mentoring had the potential to support self contained classroom teachers. Future endline research will clarify this question.

**Figure 19. Self contained- Mentor reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cluster**

Another element proposed to be analyze in the baseline was the idea that small schools be organized by cluster to provide mentoring. In other words, is it possible for a mentor to support multiple mentees from other schools in their cluster?
While the framework defines the role of cluster supervisors it only specifically states once the role of “cluster mentors.” It states: “Cluster supervisors are expected to provide some instructional leadership and support for cluster schools.” P. 8, Framework. It goes on to state “mentors will get support from … cluster supervisors [who] will… implement the mentoring plan, and monthly discussions with cluster mentors” p. 17, Framework. However, it does not go on to provide guidance on the role of cluster mentors.

Furthermore, baseline data from mentor interviews suggests that only 3 percent of mentors to date are working with other schools. Specifically, mentors were asked: Do you have mentees from other schools?, or at the cluster level (see Figure and table below). In addition, the code “cluster” and subcodes “applicable” or “not applicable” was applied to the qualitative data. When asked: “What are the challenges of mother tongue mentoring?” one FGD mentioned clusters.

…”Cluster mentoring is hard to implement.” FGD 021

Since the FGDs were mostly conducted in urban and semi urban areas and rural areas tend to be where small schools are located (where cluster mentors would be needed), it is possible that the concept of cluster mentors was not as relevant. If this is to be considered future research may want to focus on the rural areas and include a specific FGD question. It is also important to note that the workshop wither regional education bureaus concluded that cluster mentorship was not likely due to the associated transportation costs.

Teaching load

The element most frequently mentioned in FGDs was teaching load. It emerged when participants discussed the challenges and the recommendations. Therefore, it is also discussed in the final section. The research question asked: Can the teaching load of assigned mentors be reduced? How can it be reduced? Usually mentor teachers have a workload of 30 sessions per week. This makes it difficult if not impossible for them to also fulfill their mentorship responsibilities, especially one on one classroom observation and feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster/ other schools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>94.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentors in interviews were asked to rate on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree the statement: Mentoring is a burden. Eleven percent of respondents indicated they strongly agreed and 48.57% indicated that they agreed (see figure and table 21). In other words, 60 percent of mentors felt that mentoring was an additional burden. If mentors feel that mentoring is a burden, then, it is unlikely they will be able to fulfill the mentoring responsibilities. This also reflects the fact that they may not be convinced of or aware of the benefits of mentoring, not only for the mentee but also for the mentor, who in a reciprocal relationship also learns.

Reflections on the teaching load as well as other school level responsibilities are captured in the excerpts from FGDs below. They state:

*Mentors have additional responsibilities, like the department head, homeroom teacher and club coordinator. The teaching load of mentors should be reduced to 24 periods per week and assigning a few grade 5-8 teachers in self-contained classrooms as assistant teachers. [FGD 026]*

*The mentor teachers will have a heavy workload since they are teaching their subjects and classes [and mentoring]. [FGD010]*

*We recommend that the mentors’ workload be minimized in order to be able to implement this program. [FGD010]*

*The school should reduce the teaching load of mentors [in this school the school took measures and reduced the mentor workload to 15 periods per week]. [FGD016]*

*Sufficient time is should be provided by reducing the workload of mentors [FGD004]*

**CPD**

Continuous Professional Development in Ethiopia includes 60 hours of in service teacher training, of which 20 are dedicated to mentoring. There are two related questions of interest with regard to CPD and mentoring, the first asked of FGD participants is (1) Should mother tongue mentoring be linked with CPD? And the second asked FGD participants (2) Is CPD
active in your school? For these questions codes were applied, they included: linked, not linked, active, not active and somewhat active.

Linked

CPD Twenty-four FGDs or 61.5 percent of FGDs discussed that mother tongue mentoring should be linked with CPD. There reflections are below.

*We find it very easy to implement mother tongue language mentoring by integrating it with CPD activities at our school* [FGD023]

*MTL mentoring and CPD are linked because their focus is building the capacity of teachers and hence improve the students learning.* [FGD020]

*CPD and mother tongue language mentoring have the same objective and goals. Both are focused on improving teacher subject matter, knowledge and teaching methodologies... there is the possibility to link mentoring with CPD.* [FGD026]

In addition, mentors were asked to rate the following on a scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree: Mentoring is a means for CPD. The majority of mentors indicated that they strongly agree (37.14%) or agree (58.57%).

**Figure 22. Mentoring is a means for CPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring- CPD, Mentor</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active CPD

On the other hand, an important distinction is worth making when it concerns the active implementation of CPD in schools. Forty one percent or 16 FGDs indicated that CPD was not active in their school, furthermore 46 percent or 18 FGDs indicated that CPD was only somewhat active. Their reflections are below. Therefore, it is important to question the value in linking mother tongue mentoring with CPD if it is not or only somewhat implemented, on the other hand, a clear mother tongue content area may be what teachers are looking for in a CPD program and therefore in turn give CPD a lift in schools.
As teachers gain more experience their interest to work on CPD declines. [FGD019]

In our school CPD exists, but in reality we have do not fully practice CPD. [FGD012]

CPD becomes an individual activity, we perform it as a routine activity. It is considered a time wasting activity. [FGD033]

CPD is only partially practiced. [FGD013]

We believe that CPD has some drawbacks... the topics are redundant and boring. [FG018]

VIII. Perceived Challenges

Participants in FGDs were asked: What are the challenges in mother tongue language mentoring? Responses were coded into the following sub categories:

Budget and financial incentives

Thirty-one percent of FGDs indicated that lack of budget/ financial incentives was a challenge with the mother tongue language mentoring program. For example, FGD participants stated:

Lack of budget incentive especially for mentors’ transportation and lunch allowances. [FGD019]

Lack of capacity or interest

Twenty-eight percent of FGDs indicated that lack of mentor capacity and lack of mentor and mentee interest is a challenge with the mother tongue language mentoring program. For example, they stated:

There is poor interest in the mentees for the mentoring approach. [FGD001]

Lack of commitment on the part of a few teachers to implement the mentoring approach. [FGD026]

Trained mentors may not implement the skills and knowledge they obtained from training properly. [FGD001]
Lack of support

Thirty percent of FGDs indicated that lack of support in the form of stationary materials and human resources, for example the principal or supervisor, is a challenge. For example, they stated:

*Proper orientation was not provided.* [FGD018]

*Principals and supervisors may not provide proper assistance from the process and absence of continuous monitoring and evaluation.* [FGD001]

*There is lack of resources such as stationary materials.* [FGD008]

Workload or time

Eight-seven percent of the FGDs indicated that the workload of mentors was a challenge in order to be able to implement their mentoring responsibilities. They simply did not have the time to do both responsibilities; for example:

*We fear the load of teaching hours, every mentor has a load of 26- 28 hours, this makes mentoring difficult, there would be a serious time constraint when mentoring.* [FGD030]

IX. Recommendations

Participants in FGDs were asked: What are your recommendations? Responses were coded into the following sub categories: workload, support, and training.

Minimize workload

Forty-one percent of FGD recommended minimizing the workload.

Additional support

Forty-six percent of FGDs recommended providing additional support such as support from the principal and cluster supervisor, in addition they recommended providing stationary materials. Furthermore, transportation on meals or tea were recommended.

Additional training

Twenty-three percent of FGDs recommended providing additional training. This implied training should have been provided earlier in the year. Also, this implied ongoing training during implementation.

---

5 Lack of support included support in the form of human resources (principals and cluster supervisors) and support in the form of materials such as stationary.

6 In addition, on a systems level it will be important to look at gender differences and why the majority of mentors and mentees are females. Furthermore, challenges and recommendations will be further substantiated after implementation and endline data is collected and analyzed.
The teaching load of mentors should be reduced. Staff need to be trained on topics identified for experience sharing sessions. Budget should be allocated for tea service. [FGD 021]

There should be continuous meeting [training] on mother tongue mentoring to improve the cooperative learning culture and to change the negative attitude of teachers towards mentoring. The school needs to provide the materials and the professional support for mentoring continuously. [FGD023]

We need support from the woreda, education bureau and the federal government. We need additional training to make the process effective. [FGD028]

The support from the supervisors and the woreda should be improved. Additional capacity building and refresher training should be facilitated. [FGD033]

Strong commitment should be shown by school admin to properly implement the mother tongue language mentoring and continuous supervision by all actors to instill the mother tongue mentoring approach. [FGD022]
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Annex B. Instruments

6.1 Principal Interview

A. Overall Consent

Date (D/M/Y): __________________

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___________________________.

May you tell me yours please? ___________________________. Thank you.

(Record sex)   Male ☐   Female ☐

I am here today to assess the current practices of mentoring in the school with your support. The study is aimed at identifying current school based professional support, practices and beliefs towards existing mentoring activity, if any, at the school. The study outcome will be used as a benchmark to assess the mentoring pilot to be rolled out in your school.

For a successful study outcome, I kindly request your consent for interview, mother tongue teachers’ interview and focus group discussion that we will have together.

We will not use your and mother tongue teachers’ names in the study report. Findings will also be kept confidential.

Do you have questions you would like to ask?

Do you agree to participate in this survey and allow us to interview your mother tongue teacher’s (mentees) and mentors?

   YES ☐   NO ☐

Thank you!

B. Basic data

Zone: __________________

Woreda: __________________

Kebele: __________________

School Name: _________________________________

School Cluster name: _______________________________

Mother Tongue Language:


School Level: 1-4 ☐   5-8 ☐   1-8 ☐

What system is being implemented in the school?
a. Self-contained  
   b. Subject matter/non self-contained  
   c. both  
   d. Other

School Location: Urban □  
                Semi Urban □  
                Rural □

C. School based professional support

1. Is there mentoring program in your school? [if “no” go to question #3]
   a. Yes  
   b. No

1.1 If yes, to which grade level?
   a. 1-4  
   b. 5-8  
   c. both

1.1.1 If “a” to question 1.1 above, where are mentors assigned?
   a. To self-contained classes  
   b. To non self-contained classes  
   c. To both

1.2. If yes to question #1 above, what support are mentees’ getting?

2. Is the mentoring program in your school subject (mother tongue) specific?
   a. Yes  
   b. No

3. In your school, are there mentors assigned for another school?
   a. Yes  
   b. No

4. Are there cluster level mentors at your school from another school?
   a. Yes  
   b. No

5. What is/are the selection criteria of mentors?

6. What benefits has your school got from mentoring?

7. Is there a budget allocated for mother tongue language mentoring by Continuous Professional Development (CPD) to support the mentoring?
   a. Yes  
   b. No

8. Has there been experience sharing among the mentors within a cluster in the last one year? [if “no” go to Q. #9]
   a. Yes  
   b. No

8.1 If yes, how many times?
   a. 1  
   b. 2  
   c. 3  
   d. 4

9. How frequent do mentees and mentors meet?
a. Per week   b. Per month   c. per quarter   d. Per semester   e. Per year   f. Do not meet at all

9.1 If, “a” to “c” are selected, how many times? ..........................
9.2 If, “a” to “c” are selected for how many hours? ..............................

10. What is the maximum load (credit hours) of mother tongue teachers per week? ..............................

11. What have you done to reduce the teaching loads of assigned mentors? ..............................

12. Do you have mentee portfolio?
   a. Yes   b. No

13. Do you receive mentor-mentee plan?
   a. Yes   b. No

14. Do you get reports from mentors?
   a. Yes   b. No

15. How many mentees disengaged in the past 3 years? .............................. Males ------- Females -------Total

16. Have you heard about the Mother Tongue Language mentoring manual?
   a. Yes   b. No

D. Principal’s beliefs and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mentees feel happy about the support they get from mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mentoring has improved the teaching practice of mother tongue teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My school has mentoring support needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mentoring has got recognition in our cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No teacher meets mentors selection criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentors are selected based on their experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Mentors interview

A. Consent

Date (D/M/Y): _________________

School name: ____________________________

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___________________________.

May you tell me yours please? ____________________________. Thank you.

I am here today to assess the current practices of mentoring in the school with your support. The study is aimed at identifying current school based professional support, practices and beliefs towards existing mentoring activity, if any, at the school. The study outcome will be used as a benchmark to assess the mentoring pilot to be rolled out in your school.

For a successful study outcome, I kindly request your consent for interview and focus group discussion that we will have with the principal and other mentees too.

We will not use your names in the study report. Findings will also be kept confidential.

Do you have questions you would like to ask?

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

YES □  NO □

Thank you!

B. Basic data

1. Name: -----------------------------------------------

2. Sex: Male □  Female □

3. What was your field of study?
   a. Language  b. Non language

4. What was your level of study?

5. What mother tongue language are you teaching now? ...................................................

6. How long have you been teaching Mother Tongue language?  ----------------------

7. Have you been teaching Mother Tongue Language for Grades 1-4 students using the revised Mother Tongue curriculum materials?
   a. Yes  b. No

C. School based professional support

1. Have you ever served as a mentor?
   a. Yes  b. No
      1.1 If yes, for how long ___________ (years/Months)

2. How many mentees you have under you?
   a. One  b. Two  c. Three  d. Four  e. Five  g. More than five
3. How many of your mentees are trained in the new mother tongue language curriculum? ..............

4. Do you have other mentees from other schools?
   a. Yes      b. No

5. Do you have discussions with the mentees?
   a. Yes      b. No
   4.1 If yes, How often

6. Have you participated in any experience sharing activity on mentoring for the last one year?
   a. Yes      b. No

5.1 If yes, what changes have you brought to the mentoring scheme after the experience sharing? -------

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

7. What support did you get as a mentor? ---------------------------------------------------------------

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

8. Do you develop mentor-mentee plan?
   a. Yes      b. No

9. Have you heard about the Mother Tongue Language mentoring manual?
   a. Yes      b. No

D. Mentors' beliefs and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mentoring is an over burden activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mentoring is a means for continuous development of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The school leadership supports mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is support from the cluster supervisors regarding mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentees are clear about the new curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentees are clear about the mentoring manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mentoring helps self-contained classroom teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Mentee’s interview

A. Consent

Date (D/M/Y): _________________

School name: ____________________________

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___________________________.

May you tell me yours please? ___________________________. Thank you.

I am here today to assess the current practices of mentoring in the school with your support. The study is aimed at identifying current school based professional support, practices and beliefs towards existing mentoring activity, if any, at the school. The study outcome will be used as a benchmark to assess the mentoring pilot to be rolled out in your school.

For a successful study outcome, I kindly request your consent for interview and focus group discussion that we will have with the principal and other mentees and mentor.

We will not use your names in the study report. Findings will also be kept confidential.

Do you have questions you would like to ask?

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

YES □ NO □

Thank you!

B. Basic data:

1. Name: ----------------------------------------------------------
2. Sex:   Male □   Female □
3. What was your field of study?
   a. Language       b. Non language
4. What was your level of study?
5. Are you currently a mother tongue teacher you qualified for?
   a. Yes         b. No
6. How long have you taught mother tongue language? --------------------------
7. Are you trained in the new mother tongue curriculum?
   a. Yes         b. No
8. Have you been teaching Mother Tongue Language for Grades 1-4 students using the revised Mother Tongue curriculum materials?
   a. Yes         b. No
9. Do you teach a self-contained classroom?
   a. Yes         b. No

C. School based professional support
1. Have you got a mentoring support from a mentor? [if “no” go to question #1.4]
   a. Yes   b. No
1.1 If yes, for how long?
   a. Less than one year   b. One year   c. 1-2 years   d. Greater than two years
1.2 If yes, what type of support? (Multiple answers are possible)
   a. New teaching ideas
   b. Demonstration on how students are taught
   c. Feedback from mentors
   d. In class coaching
   e. Emotional support
   f. Induction program to beginners
   g. Others, please specify
1.3 If yes, has the mentoring support helped you improve your mother tongue teaching practice?
   a. Yes   b. No
1.4 If no to question number 1 above, why?
   a. There is no such thing in our school
   b. The mentor has no capacity
   c. I need no mentor
   d. Other please specify
2. Is there a budget allocated by Continuous Professional Development (CPD) to support the mentoring?
   a. Yes   b. No   c. Do not know
3. Have you heard about the Mother Tongue Language mentoring manual?
   a. Yes   b. No

D. Mentees’ beliefs and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The mentoring in my school has a co-learning approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The mentoring results in my school are confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The mentoring in my school has a top-down approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I benefited little from the mentoring activity in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentors are clear about the new curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mentors are clear about the mentoring manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assignment of mentors is based on their expertise/experience/knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Focus Group Discussion
Date (D/M/Y): _________________

School name: ___________________________________

This focus group discussion is to be done with mentees, mentors and principals/deputy principals.

Names of discussion participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

1. What is the practice of mentoring in your school? What are the benefits? Improvements? Give examples, please.
2. Is mother tongue language mentoring linked with Continuous Professional Development (CPD)? How?
3. What is the existing CPD practice in your school?
4. Are you clear about your roles as mentees and mentors? Have you read the mentoring manual and framework? Please give examples.
5. Is there proper documentation of the mentee-mentor relationships? (example: agreement format, planning (setting SMART objectives and activities), reporting, feedback, etc)
6. What worked well in the mentee-mentor relationship? What does not work well?
7. What are the challenges in mother tongue language mentoring?
8. What are your recommendations?
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