

## **Appendix B**

### **Details and results of the family-engagement intervention**

#### **Description of the family-engagement intervention**

In the third phase of the study (2016-2017) we incorporated a family-engagement component. This component focused on the teachers of the students already in the experiment. In July 2016, teachers were randomly assigned to one of two groups. In the treatment group (Family-engagement intervention), teachers received a report card containing test score information, collected in June 2016, for the students in their class. We provided teachers with information on all students in their class, regardless of whether they had received they had participated in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the study, and regardless of whether the household had received individual information or not. Teachers also received a list of suggestions to promote family-school engagement, with two components. First, a list of suggestions on how to improve their communication with the families. Second, a list of suggestions on how to encourage families to engage with their children's education outside of the school. No information was provided to teachers in the control group.

To implement this intervention, teachers were visited at their schools. A questionnaire was administered to all teachers. Only teachers assigned to the treatment group received the report card mentioned above. In December 2016 and June 2017, we administered new rounds of EGRA and EGMA tests to all students in our sample.

#### **Results of the family-engagement intervention**

We test two specifications to examine the impact of the teacher intervention. In the first specification, we examine the differences in students' results based on whether they were in a classroom with a treated or control teacher. In the second specification, we test the interaction between teacher group (treatment/control) and students group (treatment/control). The effects of the intervention of teachers are null.

It may be the case that the intervention did not provide new information to teachers; teachers had knowledge of their students' abilities but were unable to act upon it. Alternatively, the intervention may have provided new information to teachers, but the receipt of this new information did not change teacher behaviors. did in fact provide new information to teachers, but teachers were unable to act on it. We can not rule out any of these (plausible) hypotheses.

Table B1. Impact of the family-engagement intervention

	Dec. 2016	Dec. 2016	June 2017	June 2017
<i>Math and reading composite</i>				
Teacher treatment	-0.073 (0.129)	-0.035 (0.176)	-0.174 (0.162)	0.022 (0.225)
Teacher treatment*				
Individual treatment		-0.038 (0.157)		-0.290 (0.222)
Observations	2049	2049	965	965
Control mean	2.260		2.286	

Teacher treatment = Teacher was assigned to the treatment condition of the family-engagement intervention in Phase 3. Individual treatment = Student was assigned to the treatment condition of the household information intervention in Phase 1 or Phase 2. Composite math and reading score calculated by the following: Reading and math (subtractions) scores were standardized within grade with respect to the control group. The sum of the standardized reading and math scores were calculated for baseline and each wave. Composite scores for each follow-up wave were standardized again with respect to the composite score for the control group at baseline. All models include controls for age, gender, grade, and baseline math and reading scores. Standard errors in parentheses clustered at the teacher level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .