1. **Classroom Assessment**
   In Uganda, formal system-level documents, such as teaching syllabuses produced by the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC), provide guidelines for classroom assessment. These documents—as well as other system-wide resources, such as textbooks, which provide self-testing exercises at the end of each curricular topic—are available for teachers to engage in classroom assessment activities. Mechanisms are also in place to systematically ensure that teachers develop skills and expertise in classroom assessment. For example, pre-service teacher training for all teachers includes the development of skills and expertise in classroom assessment. However, classroom assessment practices are perceived to be weak.

2. **Examinations**
   The Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education (UACE) examination has been administered every year since 1980 to grade 13 students. UACE results are used for certifying grade completion and determining admission to higher education institutions, as well as for monitoring education quality levels, planning education policy reforms, and for school and educator accountability. There are varied and systematic mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination. For example, the Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB) conducts a pilot and translation verification before the final examination is set. However, inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is high, and includes candidates using unauthorized materials, such as prepared answers and notes.

3. **National Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)**
   The National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE) has been administered in Uganda at the primary level since 1996 and at the secondary level since 2008. NAPE is administered annually to students in grades 3 and 6 in Literacy and Numeracy, and every three years in Oral Skills in English. NAPE is also administered every year to students in Senior grade 2 in English, Mathematics, and Biology. Regular funding for NAPE is provided by the government and external sources, such as the World Bank. Although the group in charge of NAPE is a permanent unit within the Uganda National Examinations Board, there are too few staff members to adequately carry out assessment activities.

4. **International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)**
   Uganda has participated in two international large-scale assessments, SACMEQ II (1999-2004) and SACMEQ III (2005-2009). Uganda has taken concrete steps to participate in SACMEQ IV (2010-2015). Funding for SACMEQ III was earmarked partly from the regular government budget, allocated at discretion, as well as from external sources. Although Uganda met all technical standards required to have its data from the SACMEQ exercises presented in the main displays of the international report, the results have not been covered in the media.
Introduction

Uganda has focused on increasing student learning outcomes by improving the quality of education in the country. An effective student assessment system is an important input to improving education quality and learning outcomes because it provides the necessary information to meet stakeholders’ decision-making needs. In order to gain a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of its existing assessment system, Uganda decided to benchmark this system using standardized tools developed under The World Bank’s Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) program. SABER is an evidence-based program to help countries systematically examine and strengthen the performance of different aspects of their education systems.

What is SABER-Student Assessment?

SABER-Student Assessment is a component of the SABER program that focuses specifically on benchmarking student assessment policies and systems. The goal of SABER-Student Assessment is to promote stronger assessment systems that contribute to improved education quality and learning for all.

National governments and international agencies are increasingly recognizing the key role that assessment of student learning plays in an effective education system. The importance of assessment is linked to its role in:

(i) providing information on levels of student learning and achievement in the system;
(ii) monitoring trends in education quality over time;
(iii) supporting educators and students with real-time information to improve teaching and learning; and
(iv) holding stakeholders accountable for results.

SABER-Student Assessment methodology

The SABER-Student Assessment framework is built on the available evidence base for what an effective assessment system looks like. The framework provides guidance on how countries can build more effective student assessment systems. The framework is structured around two main dimensions of assessment systems: the types/purposes of assessment activities and the quality of those activities.

Assessment types and purposes

Assessment systems tend to be comprised of three main types of assessment activities, each of which serves a different purpose and addresses different information needs. These three main types are: classroom assessment, examinations, and large-scale, system level assessments.

Classroom assessment provides real-time information to support ongoing teaching and learning in individual classrooms. Classroom assessments use a variety of formats, including observation, questioning, and paper-and-pencil tests, to evaluate student learning, generally on a daily basis.

Examinations provide a basis for selecting or certifying students as they move from one level of the education system to the next (or into the workforce). All eligible students are tested on an annual basis (or more often if the system allows for repeat testing). Examinations cover the main subject areas in the curriculum and usually involve essays and multiple-choice questions.

Large-scale, system-level assessments provide feedback on the overall performance of the education system at particular grades or age levels. These assessments typically cover a few subjects on a regular basis (such as every 3 to 5 years), are often sample based, and use multiple-choice and short-answer formats. They may be national or international in scope.

Appendix 1 summarizes the key features of these main types of assessment activities.
Quality drivers of an assessment system
The key considerations when evaluating a student assessment system are the individual and combined quality of assessment activities in terms of the adequacy of the information generated to support decision making. There are three main drivers of information quality in an assessment system: enabling context, system alignment, and assessment quality.

Enabling context refers to the broader context in which the assessment activity takes place and the extent to which that context is conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment. It covers such issues as the legislative or policy framework for assessment activities; institutional and organizational structures for designing, carrying out, or using results from the assessment; the availability of sufficient and stable sources of funding; and the presence of trained assessment staff.

System alignment refers to the extent to which the assessment is aligned with the rest of the education system. This includes the degree of congruence between assessment activities and system learning goals, standards, curriculum, and pre- and in-service teacher training.

Assessment quality refers to the psychometric quality of the instruments, processes, and procedures for the assessment activity. It covers such issues as design and implementation of assessment activities, analysis and interpretation of student responses to those activities, and the appropriateness of how assessment results are reported and used.

Crossing the quality drivers with the different assessment types/purposes provides the framework and broad indicator areas shown in Table 1. This framework is a starting point for identifying indicators that can be used to review assessment systems and plan for their improvement.

Table 1: Framework for building an effective assessment system, with indicator areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Types/Purposes</th>
<th>Classroom Assessment</th>
<th>Examinations</th>
<th>Large-Scale, System-Level Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Context</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Leadership and public engagement</td>
<td>Funding institutional arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Alignment</td>
<td>Learning/quality goals</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Pre- and in-service teacher training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Quality</td>
<td>Ensuring quality (design, administration, analysis)</td>
<td>Ensuring effective uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicators are identified based on a combination of criteria, including:
- professional standards for assessment;
- empirical research on the characteristics of effective assessment systems, including analysis of the characteristics that differentiate between the assessment systems of low- versus high-performing nations; and
- theory—that is, general consensus among experts that it contributes to effective assessment.

Levels of development
The World Bank has developed a set of standardized questionnaires and rubrics for collecting and evaluating data on the three assessment types and related quality drivers.

The questionnaires are used to collect data on the characteristics of the assessment system in a particular country. The information from the questionnaires is then applied to the rubrics in order to judge the development level of the country’s assessment system in different areas.

The basic structure of the rubrics for evaluating data collected using the standardized questionnaires is summarized in Appendix 2. The goal of the rubrics is to provide a country with some sense of the development level of its assessment activities compared to best or recommended practice in each area. For each indicator, the rubric displays four development levels—Latent, Emerging, Established, and Advanced. These levels are...
artificially constructed categories chosen to represent key stages on the underlying continuum for each indicator. Each level is accompanied by a description of what performance on the indicator looks like at that level.

- **Latent** is the lowest level of performance; it represents absence of, or deviation from, the desired attribute.
- **Emerging** is the next level; it represents partial presence of the attribute.
- **Established** represents the acceptable minimum standard.
- **Advanced** represents the ideal or current best practice.

A summary of the development levels for each assessment type is presented in Appendix 3.

In reality, assessment systems are likely to be at different levels of development in different areas. For example, a system may be **Established** in the area of examinations, but **Emerging** in the area of large-scale, system-level assessment, and vice versa. While intuition suggests that it is probably better to be further along in as many areas as possible, the evidence is unclear as to whether it is necessary to be functioning at **Advanced** levels in all areas. Therefore, one might view the **Established** level as a desirable minimum outcome to achieve in all areas, but only aspire beyond that in those areas that most contribute to the national vision or priorities for education. In line with these considerations, the ratings generated by the rubrics are not meant to be additive across assessment types (that is, they are not meant to be added to create an overall rating for an assessment system; they are only meant to produce an overall rating for each assessment type). The methodology for assigning development levels is summarized in Appendix 4.

**Education in Uganda**

Uganda is a low income country in Sub-Saharan Africa. In 2012, GDP per capita (current US$) was $547, with annual growth of 3.4 percent.

In Uganda, the first seven years of education are free and compulsory for all children. As of 2011 (latest data available), net enrollment at the primary level was 94 percent; as of 2002 (latest data available), it was 16 percent at the secondary level. Net enrollment of girls is higher than boys at the primary level (95 percent for girls and 92 percent for boys in 2011); however, it is higher for boys at the secondary level (15 percent for girls and 17 percent for boys in 2002).

The Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) in Uganda has identified a number of priorities to further develop its education system, including improving the quality of primary education through the introduction of local language instruction, increasing the attractiveness of the teaching profession through the introduction of a scheme of service that creates a career ladder for teachers and school administrators, and ensuring that all pupils successfully completing the first primary seven years of education have access to either academic secondary education or Business, Technical, and Vocational Education and Training (BTVP).

Detailed information was collected on Uganda’s student assessment system using the SABER-Student Assessment questionnaires and rubrics. It is important to remember that these tools primarily focus on benchmarking a country’s policies and arrangements for assessment activities at the system or macro level. Additional data would need to be collected to determine actual, on-the-ground practices in Uganda, particularly by teachers and students in schools. The following sections discuss the findings by each assessment type, accompanied by suggested policy options. The suggested policy options were determined in collaboration with key local stakeholders based on Uganda’s immediate interests and needs. Detailed, completed rubrics for each assessment type are provided in Appendix 5.
Classroom Assessment

Level of development: EMERGING

In Uganda, several formal, system-level documents provide guidelines for classroom assessment at the primary and secondary level. Additionally, there are some system-wide resources available for teachers to engage in classroom assessment activities. For example, textbooks provide self-testing exercises at the end of each topic.

Additionally, there are some system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills and expertise in classroom assessment. For example, pre-service teacher training that is offered to teachers in Primary Teacher’s Colleges and in the undergraduate Bachelor of Education degree program includes a topic on the development of skills and expertise in classroom assessment. Opportunities are also available every year for some teachers and Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB) examiners to participate in workshops and conferences, as well as in item development for, and in scoring of, examinations. School inspection and teacher supervision also includes a component focused on classroom assessment.

Informal and ad-hoc activities to build teachers’ skills and expertise in classroom assessment are also made available in Uganda, including refresher courses on classroom assessment, as well as conferences and workshops organized for practicing teachers.

Varied and systematic mechanisms are in place in Uganda to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices. Specifically, classroom assessment is a required component of a teacher’s performance evaluation and of school inspection. There are also system-wide reviews of the quality of education, which include a focus on classroom assessment.

At the same time, classroom assessment practices are generally considered to be weak. For example, teachers tend to construct their own assessments in a haphazard fashion, creating questions and essay prompts similar to the ones that their teachers used. In addition, it is very common for classroom assessment activities to be mainly about recalling information.

In Uganda, classroom assessment information is required to be disseminated to all key stakeholders. Specifically, teachers are required to report classroom assessment information to the school, parents, students, School Management Committees and the Board of Governors.

Classroom assessment information is also required to be used to support student learning, including diagnosing student learning issues, providing feedback to students on their learning, and as an input to an external examination program. Although teachers use classroom assessment to inform their students’ learning, informing their own teaching is not a main reason why teachers typically carry out classroom assessment activities.

Suggested policy options:

1. Ensure a variety of resources are made available to teachers at the system level to provide support for classroom assessment activities, such as scoring criteria or rubrics for evaluating students’ work.

2. Review existing pre-service and in-service training mechanisms and adjust them to ensure that the training that teachers receive in conducting classroom assessment is sufficient to ensure appropriate student learning. In-service training should also be made mandatory after a specific number of years in the teaching service to refresh those who have taught for long.

3. Ensure that teachers employ a variety of assessments that go beyond knowledge recall and allow students to engage in higher-order thinking skills, with emphasis on the students’ ability to inquire, reason, and apply concepts to real-world situations.

4. Ensure that teachers evaluate their assessment practice and use assessment not only to measure a student’s progress but also to acquire useful data to inform their own instructional practice.
Examinations

Level of development: ESTABLISHED

The Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education (UACE) is an examination that has been administered every year since 1980 to grade 13 students. Examination results are used for certifying grade completion and determining admission to university and other higher education institutions, as well as for monitoring education quality levels, planning education policy reforms, and school or educator accountability.

The Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB), a semi-autonomous body that is accountable to the Ministry of Education and Sports, is responsible for running the UACE. While UNEB has permanent, full-time staff, there are too few staff members to adequately meet the demands of the examination. Specifically, one staff member is required to handle many subject areas outside of his or her area of expertise. UNEB sometimes relies on external specialists, including the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) and university staff, teacher trainers, and secondary school teachers, to assist with examination activities.

There are some opportunities offered in Uganda to prepare for work on the examination. For example, Makerere University’s School of Education offers undergraduate and master’s degree courses on educational measurement and evaluation. Additionally, UNEB sends eight to ten people to attend the Association for Educational Assessment in Africa (AEAA) conference and two people to attend the International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA) conference every year.

UNEB annually selects teachers to participate in developing the examination questions, creating marking guides, administering the examination, acting as a judge in orals, and supervising examination procedures. However, other than a four-week training for the teachers involved in item development and marking of the examination, there are no courses or workshops on the examinations available to teachers.

Some documentation about the technical aspects of the examination is available, but it is not in a formal report format. At the same time, there are varied and systematic mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination. For example, UNEB conducts a pilot or filed testing and translation verification before the examination is finalized. UNEB also sends supervisors who monitor the administration of the examination at UACE examination centers all over the country.

However, inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is high. Inappropriate behavior includes leakage of examination content prior to the examination, and using unauthorized materials such as prepared answers and notes during the examination.

In general, examination results are used by some stakeholder groups in a proper way. However, schools release the examination results to the media, which publish student’s names and grades. This practice is not in line with the guidelines of communicating examination results, and it is something that the schools and the media do without formal authority.

Students who do not perform well on the UACE have the option of retaking the examination, attending remedial courses to prepare for the examination and repeating the grade. Students can also opt to attend less selective schools. In addition, some mechanisms are in place to monitor the consequences of the examination. For example, there is a permanent oversight committee and studies that are updated regularly.

Suggested policy options:

1. Ensure that UNEB has a sufficient number of permanent full-time staff to meet the demands of the examination. In addition, ensure that UNEB has adequate facilities, including computers for all technical staff, in order to carry out the required examination activities.

2. Introduce courses or workshops on the examination, and make them widely available to teachers. For example, conduct workshops on the Report on the Work of Candidates (which analyses in detail the candidates’ performance in the examination papers) to
allow teachers sufficient time to address candidates’ weaknesses.

3. Ensure varied and systematic mechanisms to monitor the consequences of the examination. For example, allocate government funding for independent research on the impact of the examination.

4. Ensure that the technical aspects of the examination are contained in a formal report format that is easily accessible to all stakeholders.

5. Introduce preventive and reactive mechanisms to limit inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination. For example, make available for all key stakeholders a document that clearly defines inappropriate behavior during the examination process and specifies the consequences for engaging in such behavior. Ensure that the consequences are consistently enforced.

6. Ensure that schools and the media comply with the guidelines of communicating examinations results. Measures for non-compliance should be clearly stated and consistently enforced.
National Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)

Level of development: ESTABLISHED

To monitor the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process, the Government of Uganda has carried out the National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE) at the primary level since 1996 and at the secondary level since 2008. At the primary level, assessment is conducted annually in grades 3 and 6 in Literacy and Numeracy, and every three years in Oral Skills in English. At the secondary level, students in the Senior grade 2 are assessed every year in English, Mathematics, and Biology. In addition, a sample of teachers is assessed.

The Government White Paper on Education (Ministry of Education and Sports, 1992) is the formal policy document that authorizes NAPE. In addition to this document, a national large-scale assessment plan for the coming years exists in official communications and minutes of meetings.

Regular funding for NAPE is allocated by the government and by non-government sources, such as the World Bank. Activities covered by the funding include assessment design and administration, and data analysis and reporting. Due to the small resource envelope allocated for the assessment program from both government and non-government sources, some activities, mainly at the level of dissemination of NAPE findings, are suppressed and others are squeezed.

The group in charge of NAPE is a unit within the Uganda National Examinations Board. Although there is permanent full-time staff responsible for NAPE, there are too few staff members to meet the needs of the assessment.

In Uganda, university courses (graduate and undergraduate) on educational measurement and evaluation are available on an annual basis; however, there are no opportunities to prepare individuals to work on NAPE. At the same time, teacher training courses, workshops, and presentations are offered to teachers, head teachers, and District Education Officers.

A number of measures are taken to ensure the quality of NAPE. For example, all administrators are trained according to a protocol, there is a standardized manual for the administrators, and a pilot is conducted before the main data collection takes place.

A comprehensive, high-quality technical report on NAPE is available to the general public. The report broadly covers an introduction to the assessment, survey procedures, and student achievement levels by subject and grade. The report also presents challenges faced by the schools and concludes with recommendations for the future.

NAPE results are disseminated within 12 months after the assessment is administered. In addition, mechanisms are in place to monitor the consequences of NAPE, including a permanent advisory committee, regular focus groups and surveys of key stakeholders, and expert review groups.

Suggested policy options:

1. Using official communications, minutes of meetings, and other resources, develop a formal, written plan for future NAPE activities.

2. Introduce funding for research and development activities specifically for NAPE.

3. Ensure a variety of mechanisms are in place to monitor the consequences of NAPE, such as funding for independent research on the impact of NAPE.

4. Establish and make regularly available opportunities that prepare individuals for work on NAPE.

5. Ensure that sufficient funds from government and non-government sources are earmarked for NAPE activities, including for the dissemination of NAPE findings.

6. Ensure that NAPE has a sufficient number of permanent full-time staff to meet the demands of the assessment.
International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)

Level of development: EMERGING

Uganda has participated in two international large-scale assessments, SACMEQ II (1999-2004) and SACMEQ III (2005-2009). In addition, Uganda has taken concrete steps to participate in SACMEQ IV (2010-2015). A pilot study of SACMEQ IV has been concluded, and the results are being analyzed.

Funding for SACMEQ III was earmarked partly from the regular government budget, allocated at discretion, as well as from external sources. Funding for SACMEQ III covered implementation of the assessment exercise in Uganda, processing and analyzing data collected from the assessment exercise, and reporting and disseminating assessment results. In addition, funding covered attendance at international expert meetings, as well as research and development activities. The Government of Uganda is required to meet the costs of administering SACMEQ IV.

The team responsible for carrying out SACMEQ activities is comprised of the National Coordinator, who is the Minister of Education and Sports, and two National Research Coordinators, all of whom are fluent in the language in which the international-level meetings are conducted. They have attended various international workshops, meetings, and trainings. The team has previous experience working on international assessments and has the necessary training and experience to carry out the required assessment activities effectively.

Individuals working directly on SACMEQ benefit from the opportunities to learn about international assessments. Master’s degree students studying assessment or a related area are also invited to the international training workshops. Workshops that are held in Uganda are only for individuals who are involved in administering the SACMEQ questionnaires, and master’s degree students are not invited to these workshops.

Uganda met all technical standards required to have its data presented in the main displays of the international report. In addition, Uganda has contributed to the global knowledge base on international assessments by generating new knowledge and making it available through publications and presentations, which are available as SACMEQ National Reports, National Policy Briefs, and Research Papers and Theses.

Although SACMEQ results have not been covered in the media, they have been used by policymakers to inform curriculum improvement, teacher-training programs, and resource allocation. For example, SACMEQ findings have been used by the Ministry of Education and Sports to inform the design of continuous assessment guidelines for tutors in Primary Teacher Colleges (PTCs). SACMEQ findings have also been used to inform the content and delivery of pre-service and in-service teacher training programs to ensure that they are more responsive to teachers’ needs.

Suggested policy options:

1. Introduce a system-level strategy and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that SACMEQ information is communicated effectively to all key stakeholders. For example, include provisions for all schools and educators to receive feedback on SACMEQ results. Additionally, distribute national reports with SACMEQ results to stakeholder groups in electronic and print formats.

2. Collaborate with the media to ensure wide coverage of ILSA results, such as through newspapers, radio, and television.

3. Ensure that financial resources are earmarked from both government and non-government sources to run SACMEQ activities.
## Appendix 1: Assessment Types and Their Key Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Large-scale assessment Surveys</th>
<th>Examinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>To provide immediate feedback to inform classroom instruction</td>
<td>To provide feedback on overall health of the system at particular grade/age level(s), and to monitor trends in learning</td>
<td>To certify students as they move from one level of the education system to the next (or into the workforce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>For individual subjects offered on a regular basis (such as every 3-5 years)</td>
<td>Annually and more often where the system allows for repeats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is tested?</strong></td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Sample or census of students at a particular grade or age level(s)</td>
<td>All eligible students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>Varies from observation to questioning to paper-and-pencil tests to student performances</td>
<td>Usually multiple choice and short answer</td>
<td>Usually essay and multiple choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of curriculum</strong></td>
<td>All subject areas</td>
<td>Generally confined to a few subjects</td>
<td>Covers main subject areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional information collected from students?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, as part of the teaching process</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring</strong></td>
<td>Usually informal and simple</td>
<td>Varies from simple to more statistically sophisticated techniques</td>
<td>Varies from simple to more statistically sophisticated techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Basic Structure of Rubrics for Evaluating Data Collected on a Student Assessment System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Development Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LATENT (Absence of, or deviation from, attribute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1—Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2—Leadership, public engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3—Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4—Institutional arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5—Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1—Learning/quality goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2—Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3—Pre-, in-service teacher training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ1—Ensuring quality (design, administration, analysis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ2—Ensuring effective uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Summary of the Development Levels for Each Assessment Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>There is no system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There is weak system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There is sufficient system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There is strong system-wide institutional capacity to support and ensure the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMINATIONS</td>
<td>There is no standardized examination in place for key decisions.</td>
<td>There is a partially stable standardized examination in place, and a need to develop institutional capacity to run the examination. The examination typically is of poor quality and is perceived as unfair or corrupt.</td>
<td>There is a stable standardized examination in place. There is institutional capacity and some limited mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of acceptable quality and is perceived as fair for most students and free from corruption.</td>
<td>There is a stable standardized examination in place and institutional capacity and strong mechanisms to monitor it. The examination is of high quality and is perceived as fair and free from corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL (OR SYSTEM-LEVEL) LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>There is no NLSA in place.</td>
<td>There is an unstable NLSA in place and a need to develop institutional capacity to run the NLSA. Assessment quality and impact are weak.</td>
<td>There is a stable NLSA in place. There is institutional capacity and some limited mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of moderate quality and its information is disseminated, but not always used in effective ways.</td>
<td>There is a stable NLSA in place and institutional capacity and strong mechanisms to monitor it. The NLSA is of high quality and its information is effectively used to improve education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>There is no history of participation in an ILSA nor plans to participate in one.</td>
<td>Participation in an ILSA has been initiated, but there still is need to develop institutional capacity to carry out the ILSA.</td>
<td>There is more or less stable participation in an ILSA. There is institutional capacity to carry out the ILSA. The information from the ILSA is disseminated, but not always used in effective ways.</td>
<td>There is stable participation in an ILSA and institutional capacity to run the ILSA. The information from the ILSA is effectively used to improve education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Methodology for Assigning Development Levels

1. The country team or consultant collects information about the assessment system in the country.

2. Based on the collected information, a level of development and score is assigned to each dimension in the rubrics:

   - **Latent** = 1 score point
   - **Emerging** = 2 score points
   - **Established** = 3 score points
   - **Advanced** = 4 score points

3. The score for each quality driver is computed by aggregating the scores for each of its constituent dimensions. For example:

   The quality driver, ‘Enabling Context,’ in the case of ILSA, has 3 dimensions on which a hypothetical country receives the following scores: Dimension A = 2 points; Dimension B = 2 points; Dimension C = 3 points. The hypothetical country’s overall score for this quality driver would be: \((2+2+3)/3 = 2.33\)

4. A preliminary level of development is assigned to each quality driver.

5. The preliminary development level is validated using expert judgment in cooperation with the country team and The World Bank Task Team Leader.

   For scores that allow a margin of discretion (i.e., to choose between two levels of development), a final decision has to be made based on expert judgment. For example, the aforementioned hypothetical country has an ‘Enabling Context’ score of 2.33, corresponding to a preliminary level of development of ‘Emerging or Established.’ Based on qualitative information not captured in the rubric, along with expert judgment, the country team chooses ‘Emerging’ as the most appropriate level.

6. Scores for certain key dimensions under ‘Enabling Context’ (in the case of EXAM, NLSA, and ILSA) and under ‘System Alignment’ (in the case of CLASS) were set as ceiling scores, i.e., the overall mean score for the particular assessment type cannot be greater than the score for these key dimensions. These key variables include formal policy, regular funding, having a permanent assessment unit, and the quality of assessment practices.
Appendix 5: SABER-Student Assessment Rubrics for Uganda

This appendix provides the completed SABER-Student Assessment rubrics for each type of assessment activity in Uganda. In each row of the rubric, the relevant selection is indicated by a thick border and an asterisk. The selection may include a superscript number that refers to the justification or explanation for the selection (as indicated by a thick border and an asterisk). The explanation or justification text can be located in the “Development level rating justifications” section at the end of each rubric. If a row includes a superscript, but not a thick border and an asterisk, this means that insufficient information was available to determine the relevant selection in the row.
UGANDA

Classroom Assessment
## Enabling Context and System Alignment

*Overall policy and resource framework within which classroom assessment activity takes place in a country or system, and the degree to which classroom assessment activity is coherent with other components of the education system.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enabling Context and System Alignment 1: Setting clear guidelines for classroom assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>There is an informal system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>There is a formal system-level document that provides guidelines for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>This option does not apply to this dimension.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The availability of the document is restricted.</td>
<td>The document is widely available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enabling Context and System Alignment 2: Aligning classroom assessment with system learning goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are no system-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>There are scarce system-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>There are some system-wide resources for teachers for classroom assessment.</th>
<th>There are a variety of system-wide resources available for teachers for classroom assessment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no official curriculum or standards document.</td>
<td>There is an official curriculum or standards document, but it is not clear what students are expected to learn or to what level of performance.</td>
<td>There is an official curriculum or standards document that specifies what students are expected to learn, but the level of performance required is not clear.</td>
<td>There is an official curriculum or standards document that specifies what students are expected to learn and to what level of performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enabling Context and System Alignment 3: Having effective human resources to carry out classroom assessment activities

| There are no system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills and expertise in classroom assessment. | This option does not apply to this dimension. | There are some system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills and expertise in classroom assessment. | There are a variety of system-level mechanisms to ensure that teachers develop skills and expertise in classroom assessment. |
## ASSESSMENT QUALITY

*Quality of classroom assessment design, administration, analysis, and use.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Latent" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Emerging" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Established" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Advanced" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1:

**Ensuring the quality of classroom assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom assessment practices suffer from widespread weaknesses or there is no information available on classroom assessment practices.</th>
<th>Classroom assessment practices are known to be weak.</th>
<th>Classroom assessment practices are known to be of moderate quality.</th>
<th>Classroom assessment practices are known to be generally of high quality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There are ad hoc mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There are limited systematic mechanisms to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
<td>There are varied and systematic mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of classroom assessment practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Classroom Assessment:** Development level rating justifications

1. At the primary level, two documents provide guidelines for classroom assessment: the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) syllabuses for each year P1 to P7 and the Teacher’s Guides for P1 to P3. Each of these documents contains a section on guidelines for assessment. There are no Teacher’s Guides for P4 to P7.

The curriculum at the Lower Primary level (P1 to P3) is organized in a Thematic Approach, where different themes have been developed and content to be taught is organized in broad learning areas referred to as strands. Emphasis at this level is on literacy, numeracy, and life skills. The curriculum at the Upper Primary level (P4 to P7) is subject based, covering English, Mathematics, Integrated Science, Social Studies, Local Language, Religious Studies, Creative and Performing Arts. With regard to Primary Education, NCDC has produced syllabuses for all the subjects for each year for P1 to P7 and Teacher’s Guides for P1 to P3. Guidelines for classroom assessment are provided at the end of each topic in the syllabuses. Further details on classroom assessment are given in the Teacher’s Guides for P1 to P3. With regard to secondary education, NCDC has produced teaching syllabuses for O-Level (S1 to S4). There is a teaching syllabus for each subject for each year S1 to S4. These syllabuses contain guidance on the mode of assessment but do not provide detailed guidelines for classroom assessment for each topic. There are also no Teacher’s Guides at this level. There are teaching syllabuses for each of the 8 core and 23 elective O-Level subjects. NCDC has recently produced the teaching syllabus for A-Level and it can be accessed from the National Curriculum Development Centre website at http://www.ncdc.go.ug/a-levels.html.

The Ministry of Education and Sports has also developed a Continuous Assessment Handbook and Guidelines for Tutors in Primary Teacher Education in Uganda. This is a guide for individuals (i.e., tutors/teacher trainers) preparing student teachers to engage in continuous assessment in primary schools. Although this Handbook is mainly for tutors in the Primary Teacher’s Colleges (PTCs), it is a valuable resource on assessment mechanisms for teacher educators, teacher trainees and practicing teachers in primary schools. The handbook can be accessed from the Ministry of Education website.

2. The NCDC syllabuses for each year P1 to P7 are available to the public through the National Curriculum Development Centre, teacher-training colleges, in-service courses for teachers and leading bookstores in the country. The syllabuses are provided free of charge to all government-aided schools in the country. Private schools can purchase copies of the syllabuses from NCDC and book stores.

The NCDC Teacher’s Guides for P1 to P3 are provided free of charge to all government-aided schools. Private schools can purchase the Teacher’s Guides from NCDC and book stores.

The NCDC syllabuses for O-Level (S1 to S4) are available from NCDC and are sold at bookstores in the country. These syllabuses can also be accessed from the National Curriculum Development Centre website at http://www.ncdc.go.ug/o-level.html.

3. The NCDC syllabuses for each year P1 to P7 and the NCDC syllabuses for O-Level outline what students are expected to learn in different subject areas at different grade levels.
The recommended textbooks for primary and secondary education provide support for classroom assessment. These textbooks usually provide self-testing exercises at the end of each topic. NCDC has only produced the A-Level Entrepreneurship Learner’s Book as textbooks are mainly produced by private sector publishers such as MacMillan and Heinemann. The Ministry of Education and Sports normally provides a list of the recommended textbooks to each government-aided school. Schools are required to select the textbooks they would need from the list and submit their lists to the Ministry of Education and Sports, which then purchases copies and supplies them free of charge to all government-aided schools. Private schools purchase their own textbooks from book stores.

Schools and teachers make their own scoring criteria for classroom assessment activities, following the UNEB examination formats. Schools and teachers can purchase past UNEB examination papers from UNEB and bookstores and use them for their classroom assessment activities. Schools and teachers also collect past papers from the best-performing schools and use them for classroom assessment activities.

4. The NCDC syllabuses for P1 to P7 outline what students at different grade and age levels are expected to learn in Language and Mathematics. The syllabuses also outline what students are expected to learn for all subjects in the curriculum. The syllabuses list a set of competencies that students are expected to acquire at the end of each curricular topic. The NCDC syllabuses for O-Level outline what students at different grade and age levels are expected to learn in English and Mathematics. They also outline what students are expected to learn for all subjects in the curriculum. The O-Level and A-Level UNEB syllabuses outline what students are expected to learn in Language and Mathematics. They also outline what students are expected to learn for all subjects in the curriculum.

5. System-level mechanisms include pre- and in- service teacher training. Specifically, pre-service teacher training for all teachers includes a topic on the development of skills and expertise in classroom assessment. Secondary school teacher trainees receive training on classroom assessment during their undergraduate Bachelor of Education degree program. Primary school teacher trainees receive training on classroom assessment during their Grade 3 Certificate programs at the Primary Teacher’s Colleges (PTCs). Primary teacher trainees enrolled for the Diploma in Primary Education also receive training on classroom assessment.

The provision for in-service teacher training is mainly available to primary school teachers through the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) program and the initial teacher orientation program conducted by the coordinating tutors. Coordinating tutors are teacher trainers in teacher-training colleges who have been identified by the Ministry of Education and Sports to offer support in implementation of the curriculum. At the secondary school level, the provision for in-service training is available primarily to Mathematics and Science teachers through the Secondary Science and Mathematics Teachers (SESEMAT) program. The purpose of the program is to improve the teaching ability of Science and Mathematics teachers at the secondary level, and the overall goal is to improve student performance in those subjects.

Additionally, all teacher training programs include a required course on classroom assessment. School inspection or teacher supervision also includes a component focused on classroom assessment. Annual opportunities to participate in workshops, conferences, and item development for, or scoring of exams are available for some teachers and UNEB examiners.
Informal or ad-hoc initiatives/activities to build skills and expertise in classroom assessment are also made available in the country, including refresher courses, conferences and workshops organized for practicing teachers.

6. The supply-open ended format is more common at the primary school level, while the multiple-choice format is common at the secondary school level. There is no standard system-level criterion that is provided to teachers to be used during the grading as part of classroom assessment activities. Teachers construct their own classroom assessments in a haphazard fashion, with questions and essay prompts similar to the ones that their teachers used.

It is very common for classroom assessment activities to be mainly about recalling information. It is also common to observe errors in the scoring or grading of students' work, and grade inflation, and uneven application of standards for grading students' work is a serious problem. It is common for classroom assessment to be mainly used as an administrative or control tool rather than as a pedagogical resource. At the same time, classroom assessment is typically aligned with the pedagogical or curricular framework, parents are generally informed of their child's grades, and classroom assessment activities tend to provide useful feedback to students.

7. System-level mechanisms are in place to monitor the quality of classroom assessment activities and include classroom assessment as a required component of a teacher’s performance evaluation and school inspections. There are also system-wide reviews of the quality of education, which include a focus on classroom assessment. Specifically, the Directorate of Education Standards has the responsibility of setting standards, assuring quality and evaluating performance in education. Additionally, there is an external moderation system that reviews the difficulty of classroom assessment activities and the appropriateness of scoring criteria. Some schools have internal and external moderation systems comprised of staff within and outside of the schools.

8. Teachers are required to report classroom assessment information to the school, parents, students, School Management Committees, and Board of Governors. On request, schools should be able to report on individual student’s performance to officials from the Ministry of Education and Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs).

9. The required uses of classroom assessment activities to promote and inform student learning include diagnosing students’ learning issues, providing feedback to students on their learning, informing parents about their child’s learning, grading students for internal classroom uses, providing input to an external examination program, and promoting students from one grade level to the next.

Although teachers in Uganda use classroom assessment to inform students’ learning, informing their own teaching is not a main reason teachers typically carry out classroom assessment activities.
UGANDA
Examinations
### ENABLING CONTEXT

**Overall framework of policies, leadership, organizational structures, fiscal and human resources in which assessment activity takes place in a country or system and the extent to which that framework is conducive to, or supportive of, the assessment activity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Saber Student Assessment" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Saber Student Assessment" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Saber Student Assessment" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Saber Student Assessment" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENABLING CONTEXT 1: Setting clear policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No standardized examination has taken place.</th>
<th>The standardized examination has been operating on an irregular basis.</th>
<th>The examination is a stable program that has been operating regularly.</th>
<th>This option does not apply to this dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no policy document that authorizes the examination.</td>
<td>There is an informal or draft policy document that authorizes the examination.</td>
<td>There is a formal policy document that authorizes the examination.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The policy document is not available to the public.</td>
<td>The policy document is available to the public.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The policy document addresses some key aspects of the examination.</td>
<td>The policy document addresses all key aspects of the examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENABLING CONTEXT 2: Having strong leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All stakeholder groups strongly oppose the examination or are indifferent to it.</th>
<th>Most stakeholder groups oppose the examination.</th>
<th>Most stakeholders groups support the examination.</th>
<th>All stakeholder groups support the examination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no attempts to improve the examination by stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>There are independent attempts to improve the examination by stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>There are coordinated attempts to improve the examination by stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to improve the examination are not welcomed by the leadership in charge of the examination</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Efforts to improve the examination are generally welcomed by the leadership in charge of the examination.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
## Enabling Context 3: Having regular funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no funding allocated for the examination.</td>
<td>There is irregular funding allocated for the examination.</td>
<td>There is regular funding allocated for the examination.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding covers some core examination activities: design, administration, data processing or reporting.</td>
<td>Funding covers all core examination activities: design, administration, data processing and reporting.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding does not cover research and development.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding covers research and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Enabling Context 4: Having strong organizational structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The examination office does not exist or is newly established.</td>
<td>The examination office is newly established.</td>
<td>The examination office is a stable organization.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The examination office is not accountable to an external board or agency.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The examination office is accountable to an external board or agency.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination results are not recognized by any certification or selection system.</td>
<td>Examination results are recognized by certification or selection system in the country.</td>
<td>Examination results are recognized by one certification or selection system in another country.</td>
<td>Examination results are recognized by two or more certification or selection system in another country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The examination office does not have the required facilities to carry out the examination.</td>
<td>The examination office has some of the required facilities to carry out the examination.</td>
<td>The examination office has all of the required facilities to carry out the examination.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enabling Context 5:**

*Having effective human resources*

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no staff to carry out the examination.</td>
<td>The examination office is inadequately staffed to effectively carry out the examination, issues are pervasive.</td>
<td>The examination office is adequately staffed to carry out the examination effectively, with minimal issues.</td>
<td>The examination office is adequately staffed to carry out the assessment effectively, with no issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country does not offer opportunities that prepare for work on the examination.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The country offers some opportunities that prepare for work on the examination.</td>
<td>The country offers a wide range of opportunities that prepare for work on the examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT**

*Degree to which the assessment is coherent with other components of the education system.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1:**

*Aligning examinations with learning goals and opportunities to learn*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear what the examination measures.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>There is a clear understanding of what the examination measures.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the examination measures is questioned by some stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>What is measured by the examination is largely accepted by stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material to prepare for the examination is minimal and it is only accessible to very few students.</td>
<td>There is some material to prepare for the examination that is accessible to some students.</td>
<td>There is comprehensive material to prepare for the examination that is accessible to most students.</td>
<td>There is comprehensive material to prepare for the examination that is accessible to all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 2:**

*Providing teachers with opportunities to learn about the examination*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no courses or workshops on examinations available to teachers.</td>
<td>There are no up-to-date courses or workshops on examinations available to teachers.</td>
<td>There are up-to-date voluntary courses or workshops on examinations available to teachers.</td>
<td>There are up-to-date compulsory courses or workshops on examinations for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are excluded from all examination-related tasks.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in very few examination-related tasks.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in some examination-related tasks.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in most examination-related tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 There is a clear understanding of what the examination measures.
18 What is measured by the examination is largely accepted by stakeholder groups.
19 There is comprehensive material to prepare for the examination that is accessible to most students.
20 There are no courses or workshops on examinations available to teachers.
21 Teachers are involved in most examination-related tasks.
## Assessment Quality

*Degree to which the assessment meets quality standards, is fair, and is used in an effective way.*

### Assessment Quality 1:

**Ensuring quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no technical report or other documentation.  
  - There is some documentation on the examination, but it is not in a formal report format.  
  - There is a comprehensive technical report but with restricted circulation.  
  - There is a comprehensive, high quality technical report available to the general public.

- There are no mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.  
  - This option does not apply to this dimension.  
  - There are limited systematic mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.  
  - There are varied and systematic mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the examination.

### Assessment Quality 2:

**Ensuring fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is high.  
  - Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is moderate.  
  - Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is low.  
  - Inappropriate behavior surrounding the examination process is marginal.

- The examination results lack credibility for all stakeholder groups.  
  - The examination results are credible for some stakeholder groups.  
  - The examination results are credible for all stakeholder groups.  
  - This option does not apply to this dimension.

- The majority of the students (over 50%) may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.  
  - A significant proportion of students (10%-50%) may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.  
  - A small proportion of students (less than 10%) may not take the examination because of language, gender, or other equivalent barriers.  
  - All students can take the examination; there are no language, gender or other equivalent barriers.

(Continued)
## Assessment Quality 3: Using Examination Information in a Fair Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examination results are not used in a proper way by all stakeholder groups.**

- Examination results are used by some stakeholder groups in a proper way. 27
- Students’ results are confidential.
- This option does not apply to this dimension.

**Student names and results are public.** 28

- This option does not apply to this dimension.

## Assessment Quality 4: Ensuring Positive Consequences of the Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**There are no options for students who do not perform well on the examination, or students must leave the education system.**

- There are very limited options for students who do not perform well on the examination.
- There are some mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the examination.
- There is a variety of options for students who do not perform well on the examination. 29
- There is a variety of mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the examination. 30

**There are no mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the examination.**

- This option does not apply to this dimension.
**Examinations**: Development level rating justifications

1. The Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education (UACE) is an examination which is administered to students after they complete two years of upper secondary school (grade 13). The main purposes of the examination are for student certification for grade or school cycle completion, student selection to university or other higher-education institution, monitoring of education quality levels, planning education policy reforms, and for school or educator accountability. The examination was administered for the first time in 1980.

2. There are four documents which contain aspects of the policy on the UACE examination.

The formal policy documents include:

   a. The Uganda National Examinations Board Act, Chapter 137 Laws of Uganda.
   b. The UNEB Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education Regulations and Syllabuses, which are revised every five years. The current UACE Regulations and Syllabuses are for the period 2009-2013.
   c. The UNEB Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of UCE and UACE Examination, which are authorized by UNEB. The current regulations are for the year 2012.

The draft policy document includes:

   a. The National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) draft A-Level syllabus, which provides the policy on the UACE examination. This draft is not available to the public.

3. All of the formal policy documents are available to and easily accessible by the public.

The Uganda National Examinations Board Act can be accessed from UNEB. The Act can also be purchased from bookstores.

A copy of the Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education Regulations and Syllabuses is distributed free of charge to examination centers, which regularly enter candidates for UACE. Additional copies can be obtained from UNEB. Schools, students, and the general public can purchase copies of the regulations and syllabuses from UNEB and bookstores in the country. The examination regulations can also be accessed from the Uganda National Examinations website at http://www.uneb.ac.ug.

A copy of the UNEB Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of UCE and UACE Examinations is distributed free of charge to examination centers, which regularly enter candidates for UACE.
4. The Uganda National Examinations Board is mandated to conduct secondary and other examinations in Uganda. The UNEB Act outlines issues of governance, distribution of power, and responsibilities among key entities. It also states funding sources, as well as procedures for awarding certificates and responding to offenses.

The Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education Regulations and Syllabuses specify who can sit for the examination, the format of the examination questions, and the examination's alignment with curricula and standards. Other issues addressed in the Regulations and Syllabuses include requirements to sit for the examination, award rules, grading, conditions for the award of certificates, center of examinations, examination fees, withdrawals, examination timetables, materials to be provided by candidates, notification of results, disqualification, and remarking of scripts.

The UNEB Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of UCE and UACE Examinations address issues of security breaches, malpractices and irregularities. It also outlines the procedures for special needs and disadvantaged students and identifies rules about preparing the examination rooms and halls. Other issues addressed include categories of examination supervisors, general rules and regulations on the conduct and supervision of the examinations, as well as general arrangements, such as the collection of examination materials, packaging of examination papers, delivery of question papers to storage stations, daily distribution of question papers to centers, and collection of examinations scripts from storage stations.

5. There is strong support for the examination program from policymakers, teacher unions, educators, students, parents, employers, and universities. Although the media supports the examination program, they have pointed to the need to review the existing system of setting and administering national examinations to improve the quality of learning. Newspaper article reviews have pointed to the fact that UNEB has been recycling examination questions at all levels it examines. This practice has had some implications, including encouraging many schools to divert from the teaching syllabus that is intended to promote learning in all its three domains, specifically cognitive (impacting knowledge), affective (positive attitude change) and psychomotor (skills development), to concentrating on the question-and-answer approach of teaching (which orients the learners to reproduce in an exam the points given during the lesson with little room for reasoning).

6. Attempts have been made by the media to acknowledge the need to improve the examination program. The newly appointed chairman of the Uganda National Examinations Board has also expressed intentions to review the entire examination system.

7. Efforts to improve the examination are generally welcomed by the leadership in charge of the examination. The UNEB syllabuses and regulations are revised every five years to cater to the changes in the established curriculum. The rules and regulations are also revised based on emerging needs and reports from the examination exercise.

8. There is regular funding allocated by the government for the examination, and funding is also provided by student fees.

9. Funding has been allocated for examination design and administration, data analysis, and reporting, and the long- or medium-term planning of program milestones. While funding covers staff training, this funding is not adequate.

10. Funding also covers research and development activities.
11. The Uganda National Examinations Board is a semi-autonomous body. It has the primary responsibility for running the examination. Although the Uganda National Examinations Board Act was formally enacted in 1983, the agency has had primary responsibility for running the UACE examination since 1980.

12. The Uganda National Examinations Board is accountable to the Ministry of Education and Sports.

13. The UACE examination results are officially recognized by certification and selection systems in Uganda as well as by more than one certification and selection system abroad. Some countries and universities that admit Ugandan students have only written to UNEB to verify, translate, and clarify the results. For example, some universities in Canada have asked UNEB to send them a copy of the course content. Universities in India have requested UNEB to convert the grades shown on the certificates (i.e., A, B, C, D, E, and F) into percentages.

14. The UNEB headquarters are housed in a secure building located in Ntinda, one of the suburbs of Kampala. Another building which has secure storage facilities is located in Kyambogo, Kampala. Although UNEB has the ability to back up data and has adequate communication tools, it does not have adequate access to computer servers, and not all technical staff has access to computers.

15. UNEB has permanent, full-time staff, but it is not sufficient to meet the demands of the examination. Some staff, especially the technical staff, is overloaded. This year, a total of 111,581 candidates were expected to sit for the UACE examination, in addition to the 565,663 candidates who sat for the PLE examination and the 268,782 students who sat for the UCE examination. The PLE examination and the UCE examination are also overseen by UNEB.

There are approximately 230 staff (technical, general, middle level, and top level staff) working with UNEB. However, there is a limited number of technical staff. For example, the Secondary School Department, which is tasked with the UACE examination, employs 12 test developers, four staff who are tasked with examination management, and seven staff who work in the records section. Staff is overloaded, and one staff member is required to handle many subject areas (even though these subjects were not his or her major at the university). UNEB sometimes relies on subject experts from NCDC, universities, as well as teacher trainers and secondary school teachers.

Issues that have been identified with the performance of the human resources who are responsible for the examination include poor training of test administrators and invigilators, as well as weaknesses in test design. Specifically, the training for invigilators is not adequate. Some invigilators are practicing teachers who are expected to be familiar with administering examinations in general. Other invigilators are teachers who have previously invigilated UNEB examinations. UNEB has therefore not invested significant time in re-training teachers to invigilate the examinations. UNEB conducts a 4-week training for the teachers involved in test-item development and marking of the examinations. However, the teachers involved in supervising and invigilating the examinations are only given a one-day briefing prior to the commencement of the examinations. Some teachers are not able to attend the briefing. Recently, however, UNEB has clarified the duties of invigilators in their Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of UCE and UACE Examinations publication. This document is distributed to test-administrators, supervisors and invigilators at the one-day briefing and also at the commencement of the examinations for those teachers who were not able to attend the briefing. Regarding weaknesses in test-design, certain examination questions are not asked in a clear enough way for all students to understand them correctly.
16. There are university courses on educational measurement and evaluation in Uganda. For instance, Makerere University’s School of Education offers undergraduate and master’s courses on educational measurement and evaluation.

Funding is also available through the UNEB budget for attending international programs, courses, and workshops on educational measurement and evaluation. The funding is available on an annual basis to UNEB staff. For example, UNEB is a member of the Association for Educational Assessment in Africa (AEAA). This association organizes conferences in various countries in Africa to which UNEB usually sends eight to 10 people, such as test developers and research officers, to attend. UNEB is also a member of the International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA). This association also organizes conferences every year, but because of the costs involved, UNEB is only able to send approximately two people to the conference every year.

17. The UACE examination measures the national school curriculum guidelines and standards.

18. What is measured by the examination is largely accepted by various stakeholders such as policymakers, teachers, educators, students, parents, media, think-tanks, universities, and employers.

19. The publically available materials needed to prepare for the examination include examples of the types of questions contained on the UACE examination, which are published in UNEB past paper publications for all subjects. These publications can be purchased from UNEB and from bookstores.

The UACE Regulations and Syllabuses document explains what is measured on the examination. Each examination center, which regularly enters candidates for UACE, receives a free copy of the Regulations directly from UNEB. Additional copies can be purchased from UNEB and in bookstores.

Additionally, UNEB releases an annual report on the strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the UACE, which is made available to the Ministry of Education and Sports. The Minister of Education then officially releases the UACE results to the public.

The materials needed to prepare for the examination are accessible by most students. Schools, students, and the general public can purchase UNEB syllabuses, regulations, and past papers from UNEB and from the leading bookstores in the country. Schools can also hold copies in their libraries. However, certain subgroups, especially candidates in urban schools, have greater access to the materials than their rural counterparts.

20. There are no courses or workshops on the examination available to teachers. The only workshops available are for teachers who are involved in test-item development and marking of the examination.

21. Every year, UNEB selects teachers to participate in creating examination questions, creating marking guides, administering the examination, acting as a judge in orals, and supervising examination procedures.

22. There is some documentation about the technical aspects of the examination, but it is not in a formal report format. This documentation is included in the 2012 UNEB Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of UCE and UACE Examinations document. The broad areas covered by the document include:
categories of examination supervisors, general rules and regulations on the conduct and supervision of examinations, and general arrangements and measures against malpractice.

23. To ensure the quality of the examination, UNEB conducts a pilot or filed testing (where sample examination questions are tested in a sample of UACE schools), and analyzes the results. The sample includes candidates in the top, middle, and low achievement subgroups. UNEB also conducts translation verification before the final examination is set. During the administration of the examination, UNEB sends scouts to UACE examination centers who monitor the running of the examinations. External reviews or observers come from sister institutions such as the National Curriculum Development Centre, Teacher Training Institutions, and the Directorate of Education Standards.

24. There are various inappropriate behaviors surrounding the examination. However, certain mechanisms have been put in place to address each type of inappropriate behavior:

a. Leakage of the content of an examination paper or part of a paper prior to the examination. To address this issue, UNEB has increased examinations scouts. In the event of evidence of cheating, UNEB cancels the results of the cheating students and schools. The police also arrest students involved in cheating.

b. Impersonation (when an individual other than the registered candidate takes the examination). To address this issue, UNEB has instituted the use of photo albums.

c. Copying from other candidates. To address this issue, UNEB has specified a minimum distance that should be permitted between candidates during the examination.

d. Using unauthorized materials such as prepared answers and notes. To address this issue, candidates are checked thoroughly before entering the examination room/hall.

e. Collusion among candidates via mobile phones, passing of paper, or equivalent. To address this issue, mobile phones are strictly prohibited from the examination room. UNEB also deploys external supervisors to check on student conduct during the examination.

f. Issuing forged certificates or altering results. To address this issue, the results certificates have added security features, such as student photographs. Certificates also have a hologram with the UNEB Court of Arms embedded inside. There is an embedded thread that is not visible to the naked eye (an ultra-violet feature) and unique lines on the certificate.

g. Provision of external assistance via the supervisor, mobile phone, etc. To address this issue, UNEB sends out scouts to examination centers to monitor the conduct during the examination. Supervisors and invigilators come from outside the center. Mobile phones are also not allowed into the examination room.
h. There is also an occasional substitution of student’s scripts with others done outside the examination room by someone else. Tamper evident plastic script envelopes are used to address this issue.

25. All stakeholder groups accept the examination results and, as appropriate, use them for selection, placement, and employment purposes.

26. Some students who attend private schools but are unable to pay the examination fees cannot take the examination. Some students in private schools pay the examination registration fees to their schools, yet the school authorities take the money and students cannot sit the examination. UNEB normally appeals to schools to let students sit for the examination and pay later.

27. Some District Education Officers (policymakers) threaten to fire head teachers whose schools do not achieve a certain pass level on the examination. This has encouraged cheating and malpractice. The media has carried out the ranking of candidates and schools inappropriately, which has encouraged unfair competition and malpractice.

28. From UNEB’s side, only the student and persons with a legitimate, professional interest in the test-taker can know the results. Thus, UNEB has instituted an SMS service where students can receive their results immediately after they are released. However, schools make the results public by releasing them to the media which publish students’ names and examination results. This practice is not in line with the guidelines of communicating examinations results and is something that the schools and the media do without formal authority. Some of the results that have been published in the press are not authentic. The media also makes unfair rankings based on the examination results.

29. Students who do not perform well on the examination have the option of retaking the examination, attending remedial courses to prepare for the examination and/or repeating the grade. Students can also opt for less selective schools such as technical, vocational training institutions, farm schools and nursing schools.

30. The mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the examination are mainly a permanent oversight committee and studies that are regularly updated.
UGANDA

National (or System-Level) Large-Scale Assessment (NLSA)
ENABLING CONTEXT

Overall framework of policies, leadership, organizational structures, fiscal and human resources in which NLSA activity takes place in a country or system and the extent to which that framework is conducive to, or supportive of, the NLSA activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⬤ ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENABLING CONTEXT 1: Setting clear policies for NLSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No NLSA exercise has taken place.</th>
<th>The NLSA has been operating on an irregular basis.</th>
<th>The NLSA is a stable program that has been operating regularly.</th>
<th>This option does not apply to this dimension.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no policy document pertaining to NLSA.</td>
<td>There is an informal or draft policy document that authorizes the NLSA.</td>
<td>There is a formal policy document that authorizes the NLSA.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The policy document is not available to the public.</td>
<td>The policy document is available to the public.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no plan for NLSA activity.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>There is a general understanding that the NLSA will take place.</td>
<td>There is a written NLSA plan for the coming years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENABLING CONTEXT 2: Having strong public engagement for NLSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All stakeholder groups strongly oppose the NLSA or are indifferent to it.</th>
<th>Some stakeholder groups oppose the NLSA.</th>
<th>Most stakeholders groups support the NLSA.</th>
<th>All stakeholder groups support the NLSA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CONTINUED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENABLING CONTEXT 3: Having regular funding for NLSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>EMERGING</strong></td>
<td><strong>ESTABLISHED</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADVANCED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no funding allocated to the NLSA.</td>
<td>There is irregular funding allocated to the NLSA.</td>
<td>There is regular funding allocated to the NLSA.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding covers some core NLSA activities: design, administration, analysis and reporting.</td>
<td>Funding covers all core NLSA activities: design, administration, analysis and reporting.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding does not cover research and development activities.</td>
<td>Funding covers research and development activities.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENABLING CONTEXT 4: Having strong organizational structures for NLSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no NLSA office, ad hoc unit or team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CONTINUED)
## Enabling Context 5: Having effective human resources for NLSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🗳️ген</td>
<td>🗳️ген</td>
<td>🗳️ген</td>
<td>🗳️ген</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**There is no staff allocated for running an NLSA.**

- The NLSA office is inadequately staffed to effectively carry out the assessment.  
  - The NLSA office is adequately staffed to carry out the NLSA effectively, with minimal issues.  
  - The NLSA office is adequately staffed to carry out the NLSA effectively, with no issues.

**The country does not offer opportunities that prepare individuals for work on NLSA.**

- This option does not apply to this dimension.

- The country offers some opportunities to prepare individuals for work on the NLSA.

- The country offers a wide range of opportunities to prepare individuals for work on the NLSA.
**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT**

*Degree to which the NLSA is coherent with other components of the education system.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Latent Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Emerging Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Established Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Advanced Icon" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1:**

*Aligning the NLSA with learning goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear if the NLSA is based on curriculum or learning standards.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The NLSA measures performance against curriculum or learning standards.¹⁴</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the NLSA measures is generally questioned by stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>What the NLSA measures is questioned by some stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>What the NLSA measures is largely accepted by stakeholder groups.¹⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no mechanisms in place to ensure that the NLSA accurately measures what it is supposed to measure.</td>
<td>There are ad hoc reviews of the NLSA to ensure that it measures what it is intended to measure.</td>
<td>There are regular internal reviews of the NLSA to ensure that it measures what it is intended to measure.¹⁶</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 2:**

*Providing teachers with opportunities to learn about the NLSA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no courses or workshops on the NLSA.</td>
<td>There are occasional courses or workshops on the NLSA.¹⁷</td>
<td>There are some courses or workshops on the NLSA offered on a regular basis.</td>
<td>There are widely available high quality courses or workshops on the NLSA offered on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ASSESSMENT QUALITY

*Degree to which the NLSA meets technical standards, is fair, and is used in an effective way.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Four dots]</td>
<td>![Three dots]</td>
<td>![Two dots]</td>
<td>![One dot]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: Ensuring the quality of the NLSA

| No options are offered to include all groups of students in the NLSA. | This option does not apply to this dimension. | At least one option is offered to include all groups of students in the NLSA. | Different options are offered to include all groups of students in the NLSA. |

| There are no mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA. | This option does not apply to this dimension. | There are some mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA. | There are a variety of mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of the NLSA. |

| There is no technical report or other documentation about the NLSA. | There is some documentation about the technical aspects of the NLSA, but it is not in a formal report format. | There is a comprehensive technical report but with restricted circulation. | There is a comprehensive, high quality technical report available to the general public. |

### ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: Ensuring effective uses of the NLSA

| NLSA results are not disseminated. | NLSA results are poorly disseminated. | NLSA results are disseminated in an effective way. | This option does not apply to this dimension. |

| NLSA information is not used or is used in ways inconsistent with the purposes or the technical characteristics of the assessment. | This option does not apply to this dimension. | NLSA results are used by some stakeholder groups in a way that is consistent with the purposes and technical characteristics of the assessment. | NLSA information is used by all stakeholder groups in a way that is consistent with the purposes and technical characteristics of the assessment. |

| There are no mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the NLSA. | This option does not apply to this dimension. | There are some mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the NLSA. | There are a variety of mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of the NLSA. |
National (or System-Level) Large Scale Assessment (NLSA): Development level rating justifications

1. To monitor the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process, the Government of Uganda, through the Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB), embarked on carrying out the National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE) at the primary level since 1996 and at the secondary level since 2008. The main objectives of NAPE are to:

- Determine and monitor the level of achievement of pupils over time.
- Generate information on what pupils know and can do in different areas of the curriculum.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of reforms in the education system.
- Provide information on variables that affect learning achievement.
- Suggest measures for the improvement of teaching and learning in schools.

The assessment is done annually in grades 3 and 6 in the subject areas of Literacy and Numeracy. Oral Skills in English are assessed every three years. The Senior grade 2 assessment focuses on English, Mathematics, and Biology. A sample of teachers is also assessed.

2. The Government White Paper on Education (Ministry of Education and Sports, 1992) is the formal policy document that authorizes NAPE. The Government White Paper on Education recommended the review and diversification of the assessments used by the Uganda National Examinations Board, which led to the formation of National Assessment of Progress in Education.


4. The national large-scale assessment plan for the coming years exists in official communications and minutes of meetings. Thus, while there is a common understanding that NAPE will take place, there is no formally written plan.

5. There is strong support for the NAPE large-scale assessment program from all stakeholder groups. Many stakeholders are now conscious of the need to obtain information on what children actually learn in school. The use of national assessment results has ranged from reforming the curriculum to improving and reallocating resources.

6. There is regular (continuous and predictable) funding allocated by the government and by non-government sources, such as the World Bank. However, the funding is not sufficient to enable a larger sample size to be used to reduce sampling errors.

7. The activities covered by the funding allocated for NAPE are assessment design and administration, and data analysis and reporting. Due to the small resource envelope allocated for the assessment program from both government and non-government sources, some activities are suppressed and others are squeezed. The activities that are suppressed and squeezed are mainly at the level of dissemination of the NAPE findings. For example, due to limited funding, only the Head Teachers of the sampled schools in each district were invited to the dissemination workshops of the latest NAPE findings for primary school. The
Head Teachers were given copies of the NAPE assessment report at the end of the workshop. All schools, including those that did not participate in the NAPE assessment received copies of the assessment reports.

8. Funding does not cover research and development activities.

9. The group in charge of NAPE is a permanent unit within the Uganda National Examinations Board. There are 11 full-time staff members working on NAPE. Five of these are senior staff, and six are junior staff and clerical officers. However, when the need arises, staff members are called upon to work on other assessment activities as well.

10. Some stakeholders sometimes hold reservations regarding NAPE findings due to political considerations. However, these reservations have never affected the quality of the NAPE assessment, and the NAPE assessment results have never been withheld from publication because of political reasons.

11. The group responsible for carrying out the NAPE assessment is accountable to the Executive Secretary, Uganda National Examinations Board. UNEB is a semi-autonomous body under the Ministry of Education and Sports.

12. There is permanent full-time staff responsible for NAPE. However, there is not enough staff to meet the needs of the assessment. There are only 11 NAPE staff members to run assessments for Primary 3 and 6 in Numeracy, Literacy and Oral Skills in English. The same staff runs the assessments in the subject areas of English, Mathematics and Biology for Senior 2.

13. There are university courses (graduate and undergraduate) on educational measurement and evaluation that are available in the country on an annual basis. For instance, Makerere University’s School of Education offers undergraduate and master’s courses on educational measurement and evaluation. However, there are no opportunities in the country to prepare individuals for work on NAPE. There are also no opportunities offered in the system for NAPE staff per se. All five NAPE senior staff have postgraduate degrees. Of these, one staff member has recently acquired a doctorate (PhD) degree in statistics, three staff members have master’s degrees in statistics and one staff member has a master’s degree in language education. Of the six NAPE junior and clerical staff members, one has a master’s degree in education, two staff members have bachelor’s degrees in education, one staff member completed A-Level, and the two secretaries have qualifications in secretarial studies.

14. NAPE measures performance against national curriculum guidelines and learning standards. At the primary level, the assessment measures pupils’ achievement in Numeracy, Literacy, and, more recently, in Oral Skills in English. At the secondary level, pupils’ achievement is measured in English, Mathematics, and Biology.

15. What is measured by NAPE is largely accepted by various stakeholder groups. These include, among others, policymakers, educators, teachers, district education officials, inspectors, teacher educators, curriculum developers, students, parents, and employers.

16. NAPE is based on the national curriculum which outlines the competencies that learners are expected to acquire at each grade level. Quality assurance measures are applied at every stage of the assessment exercise to ensure validity and reliability. For example, there are regular independent and internal
reviews by qualified experts of the alignment between the assessment instrument and what the assessment is supposed to measure. These experts are from within and outside of UNEB. They usually include officials from NAPE, NCDC, teachers, and teacher trainers.

17. There are teacher-training courses, workshops, and presentations on NAPE, which are offered primarily to teachers, Head Teachers and District Education Officers. All District Education Officers attend the NAPE dissemination workshops as they are responsible for all matters concerning education in the district. For the primary schools, the participants are the teachers of Numeracy and Literacy and all Head Teachers from the sampled schools which participated in the NAPE assessment. For the secondary schools, the participants are teachers of English, Mathematics, and Biology and all Head Teachers from the sampled schools that participated in the survey. While NAPE is conducted in all districts in Uganda, only a sample is selected from each district. NAPE staff has not been able to train a large number of teachers due to limited funding. However, some schools and teachers have organized their own workshops and have invited NAPE staff to disseminate NAPE findings to improve teaching and learning. While NAPE identified the lack of teacher training in basic assessment techniques as a major block to effective teaching, attempts to help the teachers in this area have not taken place due to financial constraints. Although UNEB and NAPE have recognized the need to train teachers in assessment techniques, they are not mandated to give this training, and UNEB and NAPE do not have a budget to offer teachers training in assessment techniques. The government of Uganda, through the Ministry of Education and Sports, has the mandate to train teachers for both primary and secondary schools. This training is offered in Primary Teacher’s Colleges (PTCs) and universities. Although the PTCs and universities offer courses in assessment and evaluation, UNEB and NAPE are of the view that this training needs to be further strengthened.

18. A two-stage stratified sampling design is used. The first stage involves selecting a random sample of schools, stratified by district. Schools in the districts of Uganda are included in the sampling frame. In the second stage, a random sample of pupils present in the school on the day of the survey is selected from each of the Primary 3, Primary 6, and Senior 2 classes. Random selection of schools, and pupils within a school, is done to minimize selection bias. Accommodations are provided for students with disabilities, special plans are made to ensure that the NAPE is administered to students in hard-to-reach areas, and the assessment is offered in English, which is the language of instruction in Uganda.

19. A number of measures are taken to ensure the quality of the NAPE assessment instrument. All administrators are trained according to a protocol, there is a standardized manual for administrators, and a pilot is conducted before the main data collection takes place. In addition, all booklets are numbered, scorers are trained to ensure high inter-rater reliability, and there are internal and external observers during the assessment exercise.

20. There is a comprehensive, high-quality technical report available to the general public. The report broadly covers an introduction to the assessment, survey procedures, the achievement of pupils in numeracy and literacy at different grade levels, and the challenges faced by the schools. The report ends with a conclusion, discussion, and recommendations.

21. NAPE results are disseminated within 12 months after the assessment is administered. The main reports on the results contain information on the overall achievement levels and by subgroups, as well as trends over time and for subgroups. The main reports on the results also contain standard errors. There are workshops and PowerPoint presentations for key stakeholders on the results. Results are featured in the media, and reports with the results are made available for all stakeholder groups. In addition, customized reports are also prepared for specific stakeholders whenever funds are available.

22. Assessment information is used by most stakeholder groups such as policymakers, educators, teachers, student, teacher trainers, curriculum developers,
employers, and parents in a way that is consistent with the stated purposes of the assessment. More recently, teachers have strongly embraced the assessment information to improve their teaching. Other stakeholders are using the information to influence their activities, although at a slow pace.

23. The mechanisms in place to monitor the consequences of NAPE include a permanent advisory committee, regular focus groups and surveys of key stakeholders, and expert review groups.
UGANDA

International Large-Scale Assessment (ILSA)
**ENABLING CONTEXT**

Overall framework of policies, leadership, organizational structures, fiscal and human resources in which ILSA takes place in a country or system and the extent to which that framework is conducive to, or supportive of, ILSA activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>〇〇〇〇</em></td>
<td><em>〇〇〇〇</em></td>
<td><em>〇〇〇〇〇</em></td>
<td><em>〇〇〇〇〇〇</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENABLING CONTEXT 1: Setting clear policies for ILSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The country/system has not participated in an ILSA in the last 10 years.</th>
<th>This option does not apply to this dimension.</th>
<th>The country/system has participated in at least one ILSA in the last 10 years.</th>
<th>The country/system has participated in two or more ILSA in the last 10 years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The country/system has not taken concrete steps to participate in an ILSA in the next 5 years.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The country/system has taken concrete steps to participate in at least one ILSA in the next 5 years.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no policy document that addresses participation in ILSA.</td>
<td>There is an informal or draft policy document that addresses participation in ILSA.</td>
<td>There is a formal policy document that addresses participation in ILSA.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The policy document is not available to the public.</td>
<td>The policy document is available to the public.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENABLING CONTEXT 2: Having regular funding for ILSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is no funding for participation in ILSA.</th>
<th>There is funding from loans or external donors.</th>
<th>There is regular funding allocated at discretion.</th>
<th>There is regular funding approved by law, decree or norm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding covers some core activities of the ILSA.</td>
<td>Funding covers all core activities of the ILSA.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding does not cover research and development activities.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Funding covers research and development activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENABLING CONTEXT 3:**  
 Having effective human resources for ILSA |
| There is no team or national/system coordinator to carry out the ILSA activities. | There is a team or national/system coordinator to carry out the ILSA activities. | There is a team and national/system coordinator to carry out the ILSA activities.  
 This option does not apply to this dimension. | |
| This option does not apply to this dimension. | The national/system coordinator or other designated team member may not be fluent in the language of the assessment. | The national/system coordinator is fluent in the language of the assessment.  
 This option does not apply to this dimension. | |
| This option does not apply to this dimension. | The ILSA office is inadequately staffed or trained to carry out the assessment effectively. | The ILSA office is adequately staffed or trained to carry out the ILSA effectively, with minimal issues.  
 This option does not apply to this dimension. | The ILSA office is adequately staffed and trained to carry out the ILSA effectively, with no issues. |
**SYSTEM ALIGNMENT**

*Degree to which the ILSA meets technical quality standards, is fair, and is used in an effective way.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATENT</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM ALIGNMENT 1:</strong> Providing opportunities to learn about ILSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ILSA team has not attended international workshops or meetings.</td>
<td>The ILSA team attended some international workshops or meetings.</td>
<td>The ILSA team attended all international workshops or meetings.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country/system offers no opportunities to learn about ILSA.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>The country/system offers some opportunities to learn about ILSA.</td>
<td>The country/system offers a wide range of opportunities to learn about ILSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>This option does not apply to this dimension.</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn about ILSA are available to the country's/system's ILSA team members only.</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn about ILSA are available to a wide audience, in addition to the country's/system's ILSA team members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASSESSMENT QUALITY

*Degree to which the ILSA meets technical quality standards, is fair, and is used in an effective way.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE: SABER STUDENT</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: Ensuring the quality of ILSA</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: Ensuring effective uses of ILSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td><strong>SABER STUDENT COUNTRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>SABER STUDENT COUNTRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ASSESSMENT QUALITY 1: Ensuring the quality of ILSA

Data from the ILSA has not been published.

- The country/system met sufficient standards to have its data presented beneath the main display of the international report or in an annex.
- The country/system met all technical standards required to have its data presented in the main displays of the international report.
- The country/system has contributed new knowledge on ILSA.

The country/system has not contributed new knowledge on ILSA.

- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- The country/system has contributed new knowledge on ILSA.

#### ASSESSMENT QUALITY 2: Ensuring effective uses of ILSA

If any, country/system-specific results and information are not disseminated in the country/system.

- Country/system-specific results and information are disseminated irregularly in the country/system.
- Products to provide feedback to schools and educators about the ILSA results are not made available.
- There is no media coverage of the ILSA results.

- Products to provide feedback to schools and educators about the ILSA results are sometimes made available.
- There is limited media coverage of the ILSA results.
- There is no media coverage of the ILSA results.

Results from the ILSA are used in a limited way to inform decision making in the country/system.

- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- This option does not apply to this dimension.

- Results from the ILSA are used in some ways to inform decision making in the country/system.
- There is some media coverage of the ILSA results.
- There is wide media coverage of the ILSA results.

If any, country/system-specific results and information from the ILSA are not used to inform decision making in the country/system.

- Results from the ILSA are used in some ways to inform decision making in the country/system.
- There is some media coverage of the ILSA results.
- There is wide media coverage of the ILSA results.

It is not clear that decisions based on ILSA results have had a positive impact on students' achievement levels.

- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- This option does not apply to this dimension.
- Decisions based on the ILSA results have had a positive impact on students' achievement levels.
International Large Scale Assessment (ILSA): Development level rating justifications

1. Uganda has participated in two international large-scale assessments:
   - SACMEQ II (1999-2004)
   - SACMEQ III (2005-2009)

2. Uganda has taken concrete steps to participate in SACMEQ IV (2010-2015). A pilot study has been concluded and the results are being analyzed.

3. The Education Policy Review Commission (1989), on which the Government White Paper on Education (1992) is based, reported a lack of reliable and up-to-date data on educational indicators. The Government White Paper on Education recommended the review and diversification of the assessments used by the Uganda National Examinations Board. The decision to incorporate Uganda into SACMEQ was made in 1998 when the Minister of Education and Sports entered into an agreement committing Uganda’s participation.

4. The Government White Paper on Education is available in the Ministry of Education Resource Center and university libraries, and copies can be purchased from the government bookshop and other leading bookstores.

5. Funding for SACMEQ III was earmarked partly from the regular government budget, allocated at discretion. The Government of the Netherlands was the largest funder for SACMEQ III. Other funding was received from UNICEF. However, the Government of the Netherlands will not fund SACMEQ IV, and the Government of Uganda is expected to meet the costs of administering SACMEQ IV.

6. Funding for SACMEQ III covered implementation of the assessment exercise in Uganda, the processing and analysis of the data collected from the assessment exercise, and reporting and disseminating the results. Funding was also allocated for attendance at international expert meetings for the assessment exercise.

7. Funding for SACMEQ III covered research and development activities.

8. The team responsible for carrying out SACMEQ is comprised of the National Coordinator, who is the Minister of Education and Sports, and two National Research Coordinators, who are the operational managers that work with a team in the Department of Education Planning, Ministry of Education and Sports.

9. The National Coordinator and the two National Research Coordinators are fluent in the language in which the international-level meetings are conducted. They have attended various international workshops, meetings, and trainings. The team has previous experience working on international assessments and has the necessary training and experience to carry out the required assessment activities effectively.

10. Only minimal issues have been identified with the carrying out of the international assessment. For example, the uploaded software from SACMEQ is usually in a higher version, which causes errors or delays in the printing and layout of the test booklets. These errors are minimal and mainly arise because of format control. For example, the uploaded Microsoft Word and Excel documents from SACMEQ may be in an updated format (2007), yet the computers in the Statistics unit run a previous version of Microsoft Word and Excel (2003). These errors are minimal and are usually corrected.
11. The National Coordinator and the two National Research Coordinators have attended all of the international meetings to which they were invited.

12. Opportunities to learn about international assessments include funding to attend workshops or meetings on using international assessment databases. Funding has also been offered for attending international workshops or training on international assessments. Such opportunities are offered every year and they are available to the National Coordinator, the National Research Coordinators, and master’s degree students studying assessment or a related area.

13. The individuals working directly on SACMEQ benefit from the opportunities to learn about international assessments. For example, the National Coordinator, the two National Research Coordinators, and master’s degree students studying assessment or a related area are invited to the international training workshops. The only local workshops held are for individuals who are involved in administering the SACMEQ questionnaires. These workshops are usually held prior to the commence ment of the data collection exercise. Master’s degree students studying assessment or a related area are not invited to these workshops.

14. Uganda met all technical standards required to have its data presented in the main displays of the international report.

15. Uganda has contributed to the global knowledge base on international assessments by generating new knowledge and making it available through publications and presentations, including through:
   a. SACMEQ National Report
   b. National Policy Briefs
   c. Research Papers and Theses

16. The results from SACMEQ III were disseminated in Uganda. PowerPoint presentations with the country’s results were made available to key stakeholders, including officials from the Ministry of Education and Sports, the National Curriculum Development Centre, the Uganda National Examinations Board, the Directorate of Education Standards, Head Teachers, teachers, and teacher trainers. However, the SACMEQ III national report has not been printed yet.

17. The results of SACMEQ III have been fed back to schools and educators by PowerPoint presentations. No brochures with the country’s results were distributed to key stakeholders. Dissemination of the findings to a larger audience of schools and educators has been limited by funding.

18. SACMEQ III results have not been covered in the Ugandan media.

19. The results of the international assessment exercise have brought the attention of policymakers, teachers, and educators to the strengths and weaknesses in student achievement in reading and mathematics. The findings have been used by the Ministry of Education and Sports to address the issue of low levels of mastery of reading and mathematics subjects. The results of the international assessment exercise have been used by policymakers to inform curriculum improvement. The National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) has used the findings to inform its education reforms under the lower secondary education, examination, and assessment project. In part due to the findings of the international assessment exercise, a new O-Level curriculum for lower secondary will be launched in 2017 (see [http://www.independent.co.ug/ugandatalks/2013/06/new-o-level-curriculum-pushed-to-2017/](http://www.independent.co.ug/ugandatalks/2013/06/new-o-level-curriculum-pushed-to-2017/)). Additionally, the findings of the international assessment exercise have been used to inform teacher-training programs. For instance, the findings have been used by the Ministry of Education
and Sports to inform the design of continuous assessment guidelines for tutors in Primary Teacher Colleges (PTCs). The findings have also been used to inform the content and delivery of pre- and in-service teacher training programs to ensure that they are more responsive to the needs of the teachers.

The results of the international assessment exercise have been used to inform resource allocation. For example, the findings have been used by the Ministry of Education and Sports to inform the supply of teachers, classrooms, essential classroom resources, textbooks, and teaching aids to schools and regions with inadequate supply of these resources.

20. There is no evidence of a positive impact on student achievement levels from the uses of SACMEQ III. Evidence on student achievement levels between the SACMEQ II and SACMEQ III administrations is largely mixed. For example, comparison of SACMEQ II results (from 2000) and SACMEQ III results (from 2010) in reading for Primary 6 students show that there was an increase in the percentage of grade 6 pupils reaching competency levels 3 to 6. However, there was a decline in the percentage of grade 6 pupils reaching competency levels 1, 7 and 8. Overall, the national mean score for reading was 478.7 on SACMEQ III, down from 482.4 on SACMEQ II. Additionally, comparison of SACMEQ II results (from 2000) and SACMEQ III results (from 2010) for Primary 6 student in mathematics show that the percentage of grade 6 pupils reaching mathematics competency increased for levels 2 to 4. For competency levels 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8, the percentage of pupils reaching mathematics competency declined. Overall, the national mean score for mathematics declined from 506.3 on SACMEQ II to 481.9 on SACMEQ III.
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The **Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER)** initiative produces comparative data and knowledge on education policies and institutions, with the aim of helping countries systematically strengthen their education systems. SABER evaluates the quality of education policies against evidence-based global standards, using new diagnostic tools and detailed policy data. The SABER country reports give all parties with a stake in educational results—from administrators, teachers, and parents to policymakers and business people—an accessible, objective snapshot showing how well the policies of their country’s education system are oriented toward ensuring that all children and youth learn.

This report focuses specifically on policies in the area of student assessment.