

Pre-Analysis Plan: An Evaluation of a Remedial Summer Camp in the Dominican
Republic

Amendment 1

Carolina Concha-Arriagada, Guthrie Gray-Lobe, and Michael Kremer

This amendment describes the analysis plan for a follow-up randomized evaluation conducted in July 2025, building on the study described in the January 19, 2025 pre-analysis plan. The amendment documents changes to program implementation, sample size, data collection, and compliance while maintaining the original empirical strategy.

4. Follow-Up Evaluation: July 2025

a. Motivation

The July 2025 evaluation was motivated by findings from the July 2024 study. The 2024 evaluation found modest improvements in Spanish language skills, no statistically detectable gains in mathematics, and substantial attenuation of intent-to-treat effects, potentially due to low attendance. Only 9 percent of students invited to the 2024 camp attended all 15 days.

Attendance patterns in 2024 were heterogeneous. In particular, students who attended the school where the camp was hosted—who therefore faced the lowest transportation costs—were substantially more likely to attend consistently. Among these students, 16 percent attended all 15 days. These findings suggested that transportation costs and program engagement were key constraints on program take-up and dosage.

The July 2025 program was therefore implemented with design modifications intended to increase attendance, reduce classroom disruptions, improve compliance with randomized assignment, and strengthen follow-up data collection.

b. Sampling and Assignment

The July 2025 evaluation includes 11,311 students drawn from 320 public primary schools. Students were randomly assigned to receive an invitation to attend one of 52 remedial summer camps.

The targeted population was similar across the two rounds, comprising students in schools identified as being at high risk of grade repetition. However, in contrast to 2024, when students were nominated for the study by teachers, enrollment in the study was based on administrative records indicating past grade retention. Specifically, in 2025, students were enrolled in the study only if they were at least one year behind their age-appropriate grade. In 2024, 65 percent of the students nominated to participate in the camps were at least one year behind their age-appropriate grade.

Relative to the 2024 round, the 2025 evaluation includes a larger number of students, a larger number of camps, and greater geographic coverage.

c. Program Description

i. Duration

The remedial summer camp was extended from 15 days in 2024 to 19 total instructional days in July 2025. Daily instructional hours remained unchanged.

ii. Instructional Content

The instructional content in Spanish and mathematics was unchanged between 2024 and 2025. Teacher lesson guides for both subjects were identical across years. As a result, differences in outcomes across rounds should be interpreted as arising from changes in implementation and student assignment rather than changes in curriculum or instructional materials.

iii. Assignment to Instructional Levels

In 2024, students were grouped into classrooms based on their enrolled grade level. In 2025, students were instead assigned to instructional groups based on their performance on the baseline assessment, with the goal of improving instructional targeting for students with heterogeneous learning levels *within grades*.

iv. Transportation and Socio-Emotional Programming

In response to evidence that transportation costs reduced attendance in 2024, the government introduced school busing in 2025 to reduce commuting barriers.

In addition, in response to reports of bullying, classroom disruptions, and disengagement during the 2024 camps, the government introduced socio-emotional and behavior-management programming in 2025. These components were intended to improve the classroom environment and student engagement.

v. Compliance with Random Assignment

To strengthen the first stage of the randomized design, the government was more restrictive in limiting enrollment in 2025. Participation in the camp was limited to students who received a randomized invitation, reducing the two-sided noncompliance observed in 2024.

vi. Socio-emotional survey

The 2025 survey included a short module asking students about socio-emotional skills, attitudes toward education, self-image, their belief in their ability to acquire academic skills through effort, and experience of bullying. The survey was intended to measure whether the program, especially the additional socio-emotional modules, affected self-reported socio-emotional skills. The items are described below.

d. Data Collection and Attrition

In the 2024 evaluation, follow-up rates were lower than anticipated and exhibited evidence of differential attrition. Forty-seven percent of students in the study had a valid Spanish test score at endline. Students randomly assigned to receive an invitation to the camp were 3 percentage points more likely to have a Spanish test score observed. Follow-up rates were higher among students who had completed a baseline assessment: 55 percent of students with a baseline Spanish test score were observed at endline, and within this subsample, the treatment group was 5 percentage points more likely to have a Spanish test score recorded.

In response to these challenges, the government contracted with a professional survey firm to conduct data collection for the July 2025 evaluation for endline data collection. For baseline data collection, the government used as enumerators district advisors who have worked for MINERD previously as teachers and district managers. The objectives of this change were to improve overall follow-up rates, reduce the scope for selective

attrition correlated with treatment assignment, and standardize data collection procedures across camps and schools. Balance and attrition checks for the 2025 evaluation will follow the same procedures specified in the original pre-analysis plan.

e. First Stage

We have examined the first-stage effects of randomized invitations on attendance in the July 2025 evaluation. These analyses were conducted prior to outcome analysis.

Attendance was substantially higher in 2025 than in 2024. Students invited to the camp attended 8.2 more days on average relative to non-invited students (compared to 3.8 days in 2024). The first-stage effect of invitation on attending at least 15 days of the camp was 41 percentage points, with only 1 percent of non-invited students attending at least 15 days. Students invited to the camp were 29 percentage points more likely to attend all 19 days of the program.

These results indicate a substantially stronger first stage and higher overall program dosage in the 2025 evaluation.

f. Empirical Analysis

The analysis plan for the July 2025 evaluation will mirror that specified in the January 19, 2025 pre-analysis plan, with appropriate adjustments to reflect the extended program duration and additional data available regarding school climate, mindset, and socio-emotional skills.

Specifically:

- The primary estimand remains the intent-to-treat (ITT) effect of being invited to attend the remedial summer camp.
- ITT effects will be estimated using linear regression models for continuous and binary outcomes, controlling for baseline test scores, grade level, and pre-specified covariates.

- The local average treatment effect (LATE) on compliers will be estimated using 2SLS, instrumenting attendance with randomized invitation.
- Outcomes will include endline assessments in Spanish and mathematics, grade repetition, and dropout.
- Heterogeneous effects will be examined along the same dimensions specified in the original plan.
- Balance, attrition, and robustness checks will follow the procedures outlined in the original pre-analysis plan.

The analysis will also examine whether invitation to the summer camp affected self-reported socio-emotional outcomes. The study will examine impacts on indices formed by the following responses:

Construct / Domain	Item #	Exact Question Wording (English)	Response Type	Reverse-coded
Emotional Awareness & Empathy	1	<i>Children who cry because they are happy are silly.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	Yes
	2	<i>Seeing a child cry makes me feel like crying.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
	4	<i>Sometimes, when I get angry, it is actually because I feel sad or hurt.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No

	5	<i>Sometimes people get angry because they feel left out.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
	15	<i>When someone gets angry with me, I try to imagine what they are thinking or feeling.</i>	Almost never / Sometimes / Several times / Almost always	No
Emotion Regulation / Self-Management	3	<i>I find it easy to calm myself down when I feel upset.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
	6	<i>When I get angry with someone, I try to calm myself down even if that person does not apologize to me.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
School Belonging / Institutional Support	7	<i>My school cares about my well-being and about me doing well.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
Academic Self-Concept & Effort	8	<i>I am the kind of student who makes an effort and works hard.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No

	9	<i>When I learn something new, I feel proud of myself.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
Classroom Norms & Discipline	10	<i>It is important to stay quiet while the teacher is speaking.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
Growth Mindset vs. Fixed Mindset	11	<i>If I study a lot, I can improve in reading and math.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	No
	12	<i>Some children are simply good at school and others are not.</i>	Binary (Yes / No)	Yes
Bullying Exposure	13	<i>In the past month have you experienced the following situations? - Classmates laughed at me or insulted me</i>	Almost never / Sometime s / Several times / Almost always	
	14	<i>- They left me out of games or activities</i>		

For headings with more than one item, we will examine the impact on an index. In constructing scores for families of items, we will examine the internal consistency of items using item-rest correlation and IRT analysis. If an item is found to correlate negatively (after pre-specified reverse coding) with other items in the family, we will treat this as *prima facie* evidence that the item was misunderstood by respondents and

an alternative index will be created that drops such items.

For headings with only one item, we will examine impacts using a linear probability model. We will also examine impacts on individual responses with families.

g. Interpretation Across Rounds

Results from the July 2025 evaluation will be interpreted alongside findings from the 2024 evaluation, with explicit attention to differences in attendance and compliance, program duration, eligibility criteria, implementation features, and data collection procedures. We will compare local average treatment effects (LATEs) estimated via 2SLS across the two cohorts to assess the extent to which the 2024 estimates provide a reliable forecast of impacts under the 2025 program, which features higher attendance, a longer duration, and an additional eligibility restriction requiring students to be overage for grade.