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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Introduction and Background**

The Quality Learning Initiative (Kalikayatna) program in Uttar Pradesh state was launched by Prajayatna in 2016 as a pilot funded by Christoffel Blinden Mission (CBM) an international organization. The QLI Pilot was to be implemented in all the primary schools in four clusters; two each from Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts in the state of Uttar Pradesh.

Prajayatna works towards providing inclusive quality education in government schools across four states in India. Over the past decade or more the organization has been facilitating systemic reform towards inclusive quality education through the adoption of a dual approach:

- Reshaping learning perspectives and methodology (Impacting what schools and classrooms deliver-learning quality)
- Decentralized education governance – by facilitating community ownership (Impacting how schools are run and managed)

The Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) aims at building a learner centric environment for Primary school children in government schools. This is to be planned and realized through a number of innovative pedagogic strategies and processes. The programme attempts to promote children’s learning through a natural organic manner. In such a learning environment, children with disabilities naturally form a part of the classroom learning groups in which the active participation of every student is encouraged in all learning processes without any discrimination. The ultimate goal visualized is the creation of an ecosystem which is sensitive to the needs of all students including those with disabilities and that which will ensure that their needs are addressed in a manner which nurtures and enhances their capabilities, through self-directed learning.

### The QLI Approach: Major Components

- Organization of Teacher Collectives (Monthly Meetings).
- Integrated curriculum and going beyond textbooks.
- Organizing whole group and mixed age group activities along with Individual Practice Time.
- Observation and documentation of each student’s work by teachers.
- Continuous and comprehensive assessment of each student through tools developed by Prajayatna: Teacher Observation Book, Ongoing Portfolio and Progress Card
- Analyzing and interpreting the assessment data and recordings and providing feedback to the student by teachers.
- Sharing students’ learning and progress with parents.

**Sources:**

i.) Proposal submitted by Prajayatna to CBM
ii.) Prajayatna Key Implementation Guidelines
iii). Interactions with the Chief Functionary of Prajayatna
**Evaluation Questions**

Keeping in focus the scope and objectives of the QLI pilot program, four evaluation questions were framed in collaboration with Prajayatna and Christoffel Blinden Mission for the study, which are presented below:

1. To what extent has the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) program been implemented by trained teachers in selected government primary schools as intended?
2. To what extent have children with disabilities been included and provided quality inclusive education in selected government schools as intended?
3. To what extent and in which ways has the Prajayatna program strengthened and promoted the ownership of primary school education by decentralized education governance structures?
4. To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?

**Methods**

The research design adopted a mixed methods approach to elicit both quantitative and qualitative information from different primary and secondary data sources. The sample included different stakeholders who were involved directly or indirectly in the QLI or were recipients of the program.

From the 75 QLI pilot schools, one teacher from implementing the QLI program in each of the schools was in the sample. A sub sample of 26 schools was randomly selected out of the 75.

A set of ten instruments were developed for data collection and some of the tools were translated into Hindi. The teacher questionnaire was administered to one teacher form each of the 75 QLI schools and interviews conducted with four teachers Classrooms were observed in three schools. Qualitative data were collected from the sub-sample of 26 schools. FGDs were conducted with parents, students and SMC members from 8 out of the 26 school sites and Gram Panchayat (GP) Pradhans who participated out of the 36 Gram Panchayats. Interviews were conducted with

---

**Respondents**

- Teachers
- Students
- Gram Panchayat Pradhans
- School Management Committees
- Parents of students with and without disabilities.
- Government Officials.
- Prajayatna Staff

**Tools used in the Study**

- Teacher Questionnaire
- Interview Schedule for Teachers
- Classroom Observation Schedule.
- Interview Schedule for Prajayatna Staff.
- Interview Schedule for Government Officials.
- FGD for Students.
- FGD for Gram Panchayat Presidents
- FGD for Parents of Students without Disabilities.
- FGD for Parents of Students with Disabilities.
- FGD for School Management Committees.
all the Prajayatna staff and government functionaries working at the district, block and cluster levels.

**Major Findings and Recommendations**

The major findings for each of the four evaluation questions along with the recommendations are presented in the table below. It needs to be noted that the recommendations proposed are based on two major assumptions:

1. The QLI pilot will continue for a minimum period of two years more in the four clusters where it is presently being implemented for purposes of consolidation and strengthening the processes undertaken. This is important as Prajayatna visualizes that in 2019-20 consolidation of ongoing work in classes I, II, III and IV will be undertaken and Class V will be included in the program.
2. The QLI pilot will be up scaled to other blocks/districts in Uttar Pradesh.

All the recommendations though made separately for each of the four evaluation questions are all integral to and support the overall QLI pilot programme in strengthening, consolidation and upscaling in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Q. No:1 To what extent has the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) program been implemented by trained teachers in selected government primary schools as expected?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QLI implementation was reported by most teachers to be undertaken as expected which is no use of textbooks and an integrated curriculum. As reported, 82% teachers were still using the state textbook but not on a daily basis and 68% were teaching English, Hindi and Mathematics separately a few times a week. Two positive changes reported by most teachers was use of a daily lesson plan based on the monthly plan and concept map developed in the collectives. Secondly, the three main QLI teaching strategies - whole group, smaller mixed age groups and Individual Practice Time were reportedly used by 50% teachers and observed too. The weakest component that emerged was making adaptations/ accommodations for students with disabilities, with 17% reporting they never did this and 23.4% doing it once a week.  
Nearly all teachers perceived the Teacher Collective Meetings to be a most useful platform to jointly develop a monthly teaching plan, share their experiences, ideas and problems and find solutions together. This was totally endorsed by NPRCCs and BEOs.  
Provision of regular onsite support and time spent by PY facilitators was another QLI component appreciated as it enabled effective transaction of the QLI in classrooms. One third teachers found support by facilitators useful to a large extent in most of the aspects of the QLI program. |  
- The QLI pilot is attempting to institute an alternate culture of learning and within the context of mainstream government schooling. Thus, it is important that the philosophy and approach (integration of subjects, learning in mixed groups, continuous assessments and going beyond the textbook), of the program is validated, legitimated and accepted by the education department. This will lead to teachers adopting the processes as part of their regular routine.  
- Organizing visits for the government functionaries to the project sites to share the on ground experiences,  
- Constituting a Core Advisory Group by the SCERT- SSA and Prajayatna.  
- Collaborating with state and district officials on planning use of teacher collective processes in SSA cluster monthly meetings based on the QLI pilot. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ In assessment related aspects (maintaining a portfolio for each student, assessing and providing feedback to students on a continuous basis and teaching students in mixed groups) 38% to 46.5% teachers found the support totally useful.</td>
<td>• Strengthening onsite support by PY through capacity building of PY facilitators in assessment and handling inclusion of children with different types of disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 41% to 54% found it largely useful in ensuring participation and learning of each child, developing activities, use of concept map and integrated teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 50% teachers did not perceive the support useful in all processes related to children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classroom environment as reported by teachers and observed in the three schools was enabling, child friendly, encouraging and participative. Teacher's behavior towards children was friendly, positive and encouraging. Students were not scared or hesitant to ask or answer questions. Most of the students were observed to be happy, busy and engaged in their tasks, spoke confidently asked questions freely and made presentations. A few were seen to help their peers when necessary, from time to time even those children with disabilities. Children were busy and enjoying group work. During individual work time, there were some children who sat around waiting to be given their assignment, three to four students just did what they wanted to, a few were coloring because they wanted to do this and not because they were told to. Students in Class 4 required more attention and support as reported by teachers.

TLMs provided by PY was were used optimally by all students. It was appreciated and reported to promote student learning. Teachers, parents, students and government functionaries appreciated the benefits of materials.

Teachers reported undertaking continuous student assessment through observation and using the Teacher Observation Book, Student Portfolio and Progress Card. However, classroom observations revealed that though teachers were observing and interacting with students they did not note down or record students’ progress either during or after the class was over. Files were reported to be maintained by all teachers and seen in the three schools. Portfolios was a feature appreciated by all major stakeholders, as a useful way of getting to know students’ progress and also a proof of each student’s learning.

Post assessment feedback to students was reported by most teachers and 76.9% reported doing this on a continuous basis which was corroborated by the classroom observations.

Documentation and recording on a daily basis was reported by one third of the teachers whereas the same number were doing it on a weekly basis, with 13.5% and 16.2% once in two to four months and biannually respectively. During classroom observation, none of the three teachers undertook this. Teachers shared it was time-consuming and problematic to undertake while handling so many students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancing student participation and learning through more inputs and support by PY facilitators for promoting the transaction of quality IPT activities for all students in general and those with disabilities in particular.</td>
<td>✓ Strengthening and consolidating the QLI approach as part of mainstream education and improving students’ learning levels through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning teaching-learning activities for the inclusion of students in Classes 4 and those to be a part of the QLI, students in Classes 5.</td>
<td>✓ Jointly delineating the roles and responsibilities of functionaries representing key institutions (Prajayatna and Government District-Block-Cluster-School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Establishing a system of joint monitoring of QLI project schools by Prajayatna staff, Education department, GP and SMC members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Ensuring that district-block officials from the education department visit schools at least twice a year to motivate the QLI teachers, community and project staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Identifying with district and sub-district government staff effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Major Findings

58.5% teachers dealing with children with disabilities reported that it was not easy to assess them, with more teachers (70.8%) in Chitrakoot reporting having difficulties as compared to 48.3% from Bahraich.

Secondary data on students’ learning levels for 2016-2018, indicates no student at the highest “self-directed” learning level. At the “independent” level there were a minimum number in all abilities across the three years. However, students progressed from one level to the next, indicative of improvement with an appreciable increase in “need support” for abilities and “interested” for subjects.

## Recommendations

Teachers from those participating in the QLI pilot as future Resource Persons.

- Developing a video on ‘A day in the QLI Classroom’ to illustrate the processes, materials and activities being followed.

### Evaluation Q. No: 2 To what extent have children with disabilities been included and provided quality inclusive education in selected government schools as expected?

Prajaytna has successfully enrolled 37.14% children with disabilities out of the 175 who were identified by them between 2016-2018. Data and interviews with teachers, parents, government officials and SMCs indicate that attendance rates have also improved between 2016-2018 from 4% to 50% in Chitrakoot and 15% to 25% in Bahraich, respectively.

This is attributed to the regular home visits made by PY facilitators to convince parents to send their children to schools. They also motivated and convinced teachers to change their negative attitudes and beliefs about children with disabilities. However, children requiring a high level of support though identified were not seen or reported to come to schools, largely due to lack of aids and transportation.

Stakeholders and PY staff perceived capacity building of all those involved as a critical and necessary component in working for children with disabilities. A total number of 21 programs were conducted by PY in Bahraich and Chitrakoot districts respectively by the PY staff, outside experts and SSA Iterant teachers. There is a demand for more trainings by teachers, staff and parents.

Support has been provided in multiple ways by Prajayatna through organization of camps and parental meetings, ensuring certification, medical check-ups and measurement camps for provision of aids and appliances and experts visiting the homes of children with disabilities. These strategies were viewed as critical by one and all in the rehabilitation of children with severe disabilities and improving the overall quality of children’s lives.

### A good beginning has been initiated by Prajaytna for providing inclusive quality education to children with disabilities.

- Strengthening the new initiative further by developing plans for providing services to all disabled children is a priority area to be jointly addressed by PY and the state government.
- Networking with other departments specially education and health for providing a holistic package of services/rehabilitation children with all types of disabilities.
- Organizing transportation for those children whom need the same to come to and go back from school.

- Drawing up a comprehensive capacity building training plan jointly by the district authorities and PY for all functionaries working in the programme.
- Preparing a feasible and practical action plan collaboratively with key institutions (DIETs-SCERT-SPO etc.) working for primary school education.
- Developing a strategy plan for provision of a holistic package of services with parents, SMCs and Gram Panchayats.
- Developing a plan for optimal involvement of government Iterant teachers to be jointly drawn up by PY and the state-district government.
- Documentation of ‘Case Studies’ on children with disabilities for advocacy and sharing experiences and the QLI approach with teachers and parents.
### Major Findings

Social inclusion of students with disabilities and their acceptance has been realized which was not the situation before the QLI pilot. The IEP format developed by PY, forms the basis of all planning which is jointly undertaken by the teacher, PY facilitator and parents. However, though revised once it still does not address all the aspects in the PY Progress Card.

Teachers reported use of PY tools in assessing students but faced difficulties for this target group. It was perceived to be time-consuming, subjective and difficult to place children at different levels despite explanations of each level being given. The progress of these children is shared by teachers verbally and through the child’s ongoing portfolios which is highly appreciated by the parents.

The process of achieving inclusion appears to be continuously evolving based on the needs and demands of the students and their teachers. An evidence of this is the modification of the IEP format and progress card.

Some progress is indicated in the learning levels for children with disabilities is seen between 2016 to 2018 across all the skills/abilities. Students have moved from the lowest level to the next one. In the five attitudinal aspects nearly 50% had progressed towards the interested levels of learning by 2018. There were hardly any children at the self-directed level of learning. Development of all the required abilities appears to be challenging especially to analyse and evaluate, as almost a negligible number of students are seen in the independent category across all three years of the pilot.

### Recommendations

- Relooking at the IEP format jointly by PY and teachers to identify inclusion of critical aspects (abilities/skills) that are focused on in the progress card but do not find a place in the present IEP. This will promote facilitation of action oriented transaction of classroom practices.
- Planning a systematic capacity building program for teachers on critical aspects such as use of IEP and assessment tools amongst others. Post training follow up and specific onsite support by PY facilitators is equally important.
- Organizing trainings for all stakeholders operating across different operational levels including parents.

The progress reported for students with disabilities is appreciable considering the short duration of the QLI pilot and the target group in question.

- A specific focus on improving classroom transaction in relation to the identified abilities and attitudes is necessary.
- A plan involving the government functionaries and teachers for regular monitoring and follow–up is necessary.

### Evaluation Q. No: 3 To what extent and in which ways has the Prajayatna program strengthened and promoted the ownership of primary school education by decentralized education governance structures?

A multi-pronged planned approach was adopted by PY wherein eight major strategies were to be undertaken namely:

1. Collection of Local Education Governance Data (LEGD)
2. Organizing Shiksha Samitis.
3. Creating Gram Panchayat Networks
4. Organizing Block and Nyaya Panchayat Level Workshops:
5. Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats:
6. Advocacy with the Department
7. Documentation Activities
8. Strengthening and activating SMCs

Out of the eight, five were completely realized, with more activities

- Strengthening the DEG initiative requires further through networking of PY with Zilla PR structures to operationalize and involve them in ensuring the delivery of inclusive quality school education.
- Moving beyond discussing and resolving the basic issues of infrastructure, enrolment and retention that have been addressed in most of the QLI schools to actual monitoring by SMC members of students’ learning and progress, teaching-learning in classrooms, teachers dealing with children with disabilities amongst other concerns.
- Developing a joint action plan by SMC members, teachers and the PY staff for
### Major Findings

undertaken than planned in two namely Creating Gram Panchayat Networks and documentation. SMCs were activated and strengthened to a large extent whereas organizing Block and Nyaya Panchayat level workshops was achieved to some extent. One activity that was not achieved at all was Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats.

### Recommendations

monitoring schools by assigning roles and responsibilities.
- Networking with the block and zilla panchayat structures and functionaries
- Strengthening the relationship between SMCs and Gram Panchayats and developing a joint work culture
- Sharing School development plans at the GP /Block levels between schools in different GPs as a cross learning exercise.
- Preparing an action based plan for strengthening the involvement of parents in the process of their children’s schooling.

### Evaluation Q. No: 4- To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?

The impact of the QLI pilot as reported by major stakeholder groups were mainly the increased student enrolment and regular attendance including those with disabilities and the improved and enabling school environment. Improvement of the school environment as reported was in:

- Improved relationships between some teachers-parents and SMC members and more between teachers and students.
- Students happier and more confident, more active participation and better learning.
- Development of leadership qualities in students and being more sensitive and caring towards each other.
- Greater awareness about education in SMCs. Their being active and interested in students’ learning.
- SMC meetings being conducted more regularly and education related issues discussed and resolved.
- Improvement in the availability of school infrastructure facilities.
- Student portfolios being maintained and progress shared with parents, SMC members and government officials.

In the QLI pilot different stakeholders faced a number of challenges which by implication would have affected the realization of the QLI objectives. These challenges are highlighted in figure 1 presented after the Table.

The study also revealed a number of positive aspects appreciated and viewed as critical by stakeholders in the successful implementation of the QLI pilot. These components were: teachers’ collectives as an empowering platform, regular onsite support by PY facilitators, group work by students across mixed age groups and provision of materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Q. No: 4- To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the QLI pilot as reported by major stakeholder groups were mainly the increased student enrolment and regular attendance including those with disabilities and the improved and enabling school environment. Improvement of the school environment as reported was in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improved relationships between some teachers-parents and SMC members and more between teachers and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Students happier and more confident, more active participation and better learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Development of leadership qualities in students and being more sensitive and caring towards each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Greater awareness about education in SMCs. Their being active and interested in students’ learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ SMC meetings being conducted more regularly and education related issues discussed and resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improvement in the availability of school infrastructure facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Student portfolios being maintained and progress shared with parents, SMC members and government officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the QLI pilot different stakeholders faced a number of challenges which by implication would have affected the realization of the QLI objectives. These challenges are highlighted in figure 1 presented after the Table.

The study also revealed a number of positive aspects appreciated and viewed as critical by stakeholders in the successful implementation of the QLI pilot. These components were: teachers’ collectives as an empowering platform, regular onsite support by PY facilitators, group work by students across mixed age groups and provision of materials.
Major Findings

- Maintenance of student portfolios and alignment of the QLI approach to the vision and philosophy in the NCF 2005 which is inherent in the Government of India’s Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (EFA) and now Samagrah Shiksha programme.

Recommendations

- Lack of collaboration with GPs and Pradhans
- SMC members capacities not completely developed
- Unequal involvement of SMC members

Figure 1: Challenges faced in QLI Pilot by Major Stakeholders

- Non functional Panchayat structures
- Lack of Priority and Funds for Education
- Weak connect between GPs and SMCs
- Lack of Collective Action

- Lack of Awareness about Imp. & Need for Education
- No Rehabilitation Services/facilities for CWD

- Changing traditional teaching methods
- Handling large classes
- QLI time consuming
- Documentation work
- Continuous Assessment

DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

- Low priority accorded to school education
- Delay in Approvals
- Insufficient funds for education

PRAJAYATNA

- Bridging teacher-student socio-cultural divide
- Lack of Rehabilitation Services for children requiring a high level of support.
- Insufficient knowledge and skills, for providing support to children.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(DIET- SSA-DPO/BEO-BRC/NPRC)

- Official Government orders required
- Less DIET faculty
- Less number of DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES
Upscaling & Replication of the QLI pilot

The QLI pilot has demonstrated that the approach implemented in classrooms has the potential for upscaling to other areas in the two districts and/or other districts in the state. This was suggested by nearly all the teachers involved in the pilot and also other major stakeholders such as government officials (DIET faculty, BEOs, NPRCCs), SMCs and GP Pradhans.

The positive aspects highlighted earlier hold the power for replication while the program is being up scaled. A set of recommendations are proposed below with the objective of providing direction for taking the pilot forward in the future that is presented in Figure 2 -Integrated model for Upscaling the QLI pilot below and outlined in The Way Forward that follows.

**Figure 2: Upscaling the QLI Pilot: An Integrated Model**

- **Other Deptts.**
  - Health
  - Social Welfare
  - Labor
  - Rural Dev.
  - Panchayati Raj *Focus on: Networking with departments*

- **SCERT & SPO**

- **Other DIETS in Uttar Pradesh**
  - DIETs Bahraich & Chitrakoot *Focus on: Preparing Master Trainers in: QLI & Disability*

- **PRAJAYATNA & DISTRICT STRUCTURES (Resource Centre for QLI approach in Primary and Pre-school Education)**

- **Decentralized Education Governance Processes**
  - Continue programme across the two entire districts
  - Focus on working closely with Block and Zilla Panchayat structures.
  - Strengthen linkages between GPs & SMCs

- **Quality Learning Initiative**
  - Consolidation of Pilot
  - Continuance of ongoing work in classes I, 2, 3 and 4 & including children from classes IV in QLI pilot schools.

- **Children with Disabilities**
  - Continuance in all pilot schools
  - Exploring home based education option with all Govt. Departments.
• Developing a holistic ‘Plan of Action’ focusing on strategies and mechanisms for upscaling the programme and forging linkages with key government education institutions at the district and state levels.

• Developing a long term strategy by Prajayatna to incorporate and integrate all the positive aspects/components in the QLI project into ongoing State-district level programmes and initiatives.

• Constituting an Advisory Group comprising Prajayatna senior staff, Uttar Pradesh state government officials (SCERT and SPO), the two DIETs in Chitrakoot and Bahraich, four block and cluster level representatives (BEOs and NPRCCs), Gram Panchayat Pradhans, members from four SMCs NGO, one representative each from other government departments (and innovative teachers.

• Establishing a baseline for the next phase and including programme evaluation as a periodic an integral component of the future QLI program.

• Ensuring academic rigor by planning for the use of a ‘randomized control design’ as part of the future Action Plan in order to provide systematic, empirically valid data/evidences.

• Networking with key government departments especially for provision of a package of rehabilitation services for children with disabilities.

• Strengthening DIET functionaries by preparing Master Trainers for promoting the QLI approach.

• Constituting a Core Group of potential Master Trainers from teachers who participated in the project from 2016 to 2018 to train, support and monitor the quality of the project once it is up scaled; and prepare future teacher collectives.

• Developing two schools in each cluster in the QLI pilot as demonstration sites for upscaling.

• Developing a variety of materials (pamphlets, brochures) to promote advocacy and provide information on the QLI approach along with inclusion of children with disabilities.

• Preparing an appropriate plan for providing onsite support and guidance to teachers.

• Developing a joint monitoring mechanism with the government education department and Panchayati Raj structures for upscaling decentralized education governance processes.

Initiate a QLI Pilot in Anganwadi Centres in the 4 QLI pilot clusters

(Focus on Early Identification & Stimulation)
• Developing an exit plan as part of the sustainability plan.
Chapter 1: Background and Introduction

This chapter comprises two sections. Section 1 provides an overview of the Prajayatna programme and approach adopted in providing inclusive child centred education to students at the primary level in different states in India. This is followed by a brief exposure to the program context of the two districts in the state of Uttar Pradesh where the Quality Learning Initiative Pilot has been implemented and evaluation study undertaken. This is followed by Section 2 in which a brief Introduction to the evaluation study is presented focussing on the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation.

Section 1: Background

1.1. About the Organizations

1.1.1. Christoffel Blinden Mission

Christoffel Blinden Mission (CBM) is an international development organisation, committed to improving the quality of life of persons with disabilities in the poorest countries of the world. Their vision is - an inclusive world in which all persons with disabilities enjoy their human rights and achieve their full potential. CBM addresses poverty as a cause, and a consequence, of disability, and works in partnership to create a society for all.

In India, CBM has been striving to promote access to quality healthcare, education, and livelihood for persons with disabilities and reach out to some of the most marginalized sections of the society. CBM believes in community-based disability inclusive development and is attempting to make the rights in the United Nation Convention on Rights for Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030, a reality for persons with disabilities in India. It believes that an Inclusive world is only possible with partnerships that create equal opportunities and a barrier-free environment. In striving towards building an inclusive society, CBM identified Prajayatna as a potential partner during CBM’s include Vidya Campaign in Karnataka state in 2014, which was to mainstream children with disabilities in schools. During this campaign it was learnt that the partner’s core competency is in education and working with government schools, which is within the key result area two of the CBM Country Implementation Plan(CIP) for India and the target group objectives of CBM. However, they had not included children with disabilities in their programmes. The objective of the partnership was thus, to mainstream children with disabilities through effective decentralized governance and quality learning processes, working in partnership with the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (Education for All) department in the state of Uttar Pradesh. This location was chosen
as per the geographic need identified in CIP. Thus, CBM initiated the QLI pilot project with Prajayatna based on of CBMs belief in the Disability Inclusive Development Approach.

1.1.2. Prajayatna

Prajayatna the partner organization has been working towards improving the quality of education in government schools in India for more than a decade. Their programs are being implemented across three Indian states namely Karnataka, Telangana and Uttar Pradesh. Registered as a society under the Karnataka Societies Registration Act of 1960, the organization has been active as a program initiative for the past 18 years and as an independent organization for the past 10 years. Over the past decade or more various initiatives were taken which culminated in the important realisation that there was a need to relook at learning as viewed by majority of the people. It was realized that learning was a very natural process and that every child was capable of learning. This included children with disability and thus Prajayatna did not look at this target group specifically. The organization believed that if education changed and the way it was looked at changed then every child would be accommodated, be it a ‘girl’ child, a child from the ‘dalit’ community or a child with ‘disability’ etc. It was believed that it was the learning process that marginalized children and hence the way learning took place required to be changed for everyone. A learner -centred approach was required that would enable every child to reach their full potential.

Prajayatna has been facilitating systemic reform towards quality education through a dual approach:

- Reshaping learning perspectives and methodology (Impacting what schools and classrooms deliver- learning quality)
- Decentralized education governance – by facilitating community ownership (Impacting how schools are run and managed)

1.2. Prajayatna: The Approach

Prajayatna, believes that that for any sustainable change to manifest, communities need to assume ownership for schools and engage with the system through a democratic process evolved and determined by them wherein they articulate their needs and expectations of education and arrive at solutions. Towards this, Prajayatna's strategy involves:

- identifying structures for communities to participate, institutionalize the process of engagement with the structures therefore the process of ownership
- support and work with these structures to build their institutional capabilities

Simultaneously, Prajayatna also developed a pioneering learning initiative called Kalikayatna, with a view of impacting student learning within primary schools. The initiative focusses on the delivery of inclusive quality education which attempts to provide a holistic learning experience
for the children. It has certain aspects which include mixed age groups, integrated curriculum, continuous and comprehensive assessment of the children and group and individual learning activities. In order to facilitate such a process, the teachers are supported to develop their abilities to become facilitators through collectives. Thus, the Prajayatna program operates at two levels:

**Level I- Impacting Education Governance through Community Ownership (decentralization)**

Decentralization of Education Governance (DEG) is to be implemented with the involvement of key elected representatives from the Panchayati Raj at the three levels- the Gram Panchayat, the block and the district level, level along with the school level structure namely, the School Management Committees (SMCs). Key learnings gained from the implementation of the project will be institutionalized by conducting necessary advocacy and trainings. The Departments of Education and Rural Development would be actively engaged in solving issues of schools and education governance through the Prajayatna processes.

**Level II- The Quality Learning Initiative (Kalikayatna): A pilot**

The Quality Learning Initiative (Kalikayatna) looks at building a learner centric environment for children by introducing an integrated curriculum and promoting teaching-learning through learner groups and radically altering the assessment processes, in classes 1-5 in government primary schools. Learning through a natural organic manner will be promoted. The approach looks at teacher empowerment, classroom practices where concepts are introduced in an integrated curriculum and children are encouraged to explore, experiment and learn in mixed age groups. Assessment practices are to be continuous and comprehensive in nature and involve maintenance of individual portfolios by the teachers instead of competitive examinations.

When the question of working with children with disabilities came up in the discussion with CBM, Prajayatna perceived it to be a natural part of the work they were doing. They realized that most of the children who are out of school were children with disabilities and hence this pilot would enhance the quality of their work.

**Focus on Children with Disabilities**

In such a learning environment children with disabilities would naturally form a part of the learning groups and would be actively encouraged to participate in all learning processes without any discrimination. Children with disabilities were to be identified through a baseline survey in four clusters selected from the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich in the state of Uttar Pradesh covering 75 schools. Subsequently all attention would be paid to getting the children enrolled and engaging them actively in the learning process.

Through the pilot programme and different processes the inclusion of children with disabilities was to be promoted, as specified below.
• Shikshana Gram Sabhas and meetings at the Gram Panchayat level with all the stakeholders to bring about a deep awareness about the situation of children with disabilities and their problems in schools.

• School Management Committees (SMCs) to focus on and promote provision of facilities and development of the pedagogical support mechanisms necessary for these children into their school development plans.

• Sensitization of teachers to the needs of children with disabilities, thereby creating a classroom environment which is supportive and enhances the learning of all children.

• Enabling and supporting Gram Panchayats to identify resources necessary for enriching the learning environment of these children and liaising with the Department of Education and other departments to ensure all available government schemes reach the children. Similar action was planned to be taken at the Block level.

Ultimately, it is visualized that an ecosystem would be created which is sensitive to the needs of children with disabilities and will ensure that their needs are addressed in a manner which nurtures and enhances their capabilities. Some apprehensions were there since the team had little knowledge about the technical aspects of disability and government provisions, etc. Also as the team was new building their understanding and capacities was very important. They all needed requisite information and knowledge and training on rights, types of disability, causes, aspects related to the disability agenda. Working and supporting teachers in schools was a major challenge as the staff required to know what needs to be done to support teachers in providing inclusive quality education to children with disabilities. Initially working with parents was an issue due to lack of information on their part. However, the major concern and challenge faced was with regard to those children who required a high level of support and specially in Uttar Pradesh where there is a dearth of even minimum facilities for a child with disability. It was a tremendous challenge to figure out ways of improving the quality of life of children with disabilities.

After implementing the pilot in Uttar Pradesh for the last three years, the PY team is very confident about the work they are doing. They have a deeper understanding of working with children with disabilities. Disability is now an integral part of their conversation and also their vision statement.
1.3. The Program Context

Coverage

It was planned that the project will be implemented in:

- Two districts of Uttar Pradesh Chitrakoot and Bahraich; reaching out to 2500 schools and 700 Gram Panchayats.
- In 4 clusters of the 2 districts of Uttar Pradesh namely Chitrakoot and Bahraich in a total number of 75 schools. The Kalikayatna Learning Initiative Approach will reach out to 5000 children and 200 teachers through 75 schools including children with disabilities in these schools.

1.3.1. The Project Site

The state of Uttar Pradesh is one of the largest states of India with a high degree of educational backwardness and a huge population of school going children. Of the total number of 75 districts in Uttar Pradesh, Chitrakoot and Bahraich are located and form the southern and northern extremes of the state. They are districts with a fairly high degree of social, economic and educational backwardness. Both the districts are category "A" districts i.e. having socio-economic and basic amenities parameters below the national average and receive funds from the Backward Regions Grant Fund Programme (BRGF). Presently the two districts are a part of the Government of India’s “Transformation of aspirational districts programme.

District 1: Chitrakoot

District Chitrakoot is situated in the southern part of Uttar Pradesh bordering the state of Madhya Pradesh and is located 240 kms. from the State headquarters. It falls in the northern Vindhya range of mountains and is comparatively one of the smaller and lesser populated districts of the state. It has five blocks and constitutes the Bundelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh. Chitrakoot has been named one of the country's 250 most backward districts (out of a total of 640). It has a literacy rate of 66% and is one of the 75 districts in Uttar Pradesh. Being located at the border, it has become one of the most remote and cut-off districts in India.

District 2: Bahraich
The second district Bahraich lies in northern part of Uttar Pradesh which borders the country of Nepal. The district being a border area between two countries sees a high degree of migration. It has forest cover towards its northern parts and is prone to serious flooding every year by the river Ghagra. It is a large district with 14 blocks and a population of 35 lakhs. It has a literacy rate of 51.1%. Minority population is about 36% of the total population of the district. Both districts face a number of challenges in school education that are highlighted in the box below:

### Major Issues & Challenges

- Low enrolment and retention of students especially those with disabilities.
- Lack of appropriate facilities in schools.
- High pupil - teacher ratios.
- Lack of a conducive learning environment.
- Limited awareness amongst teachers about children with disabilities.
- Lack of medical facilities for children with disabilities (doctors, camps, etc.).
- Lack of parental awareness about their entitlements.
- Narrow outlook of local communities about education.

With the aim of improving the existing educational scenario at the primary level in government schools in these two districts, the Prajayatna project envisages piloting a unique and inclusive learning approach the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) - Kalikayatna in selected government schools which would focus on building capabilities of children, including children with disabilities in an organic / natural way of learning. In the QLI pilot Prajayatna aims to specifically focus on the needs and requirements of children with disabilities and addressed the same in an inclusive manner. It will also support decentralized education structures to take ownership for ensuring the quality of government schools and high levels of educational outcomes; which would include enrolment of all children, good infrastructure, availability of proper teaching staff and quality classroom learning processes in the two districts. It is visualized that the community processes will be sensitized to the needs of the children with disabilities, thereby enabling identification of children with disabilities, ensuring that they are enrolled and accommodated in schools and have the necessary environment and facilities along with appropriate opportunities to learn with other children.
1.3.2. The Program: Transforming Government Schools- through an inclusive approach to education reform *(The Log Frame for the project is attached in Appendix 1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Number/Project</th>
<th>P3203 Transforming Government Schools- through an inclusive approach to education reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner</strong></td>
<td>Prajayatna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project start and end dates</strong></td>
<td>01/01/2016 – 31/12/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>State of Uttar Pradesh : Chitrakoot and Bahraich Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 2,99,38,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective</strong></td>
<td>To create an ecosystem where the schools are conducive for learning for every child including children with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objective</strong></td>
<td>To complement SSA in inclusive education for children with disabilities in 2500 government schools in 700 gram panchayats of Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts of Uttar Pradesh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Expected Results**   | 1. Decentralized governance structures (Panchayat and School Management Committees) are strengthened for monitoring of 2500 schools for quality inclusive education  
2. Teachers in mainstream schools trained in inclusive education and active learning process (Kalikayatna model) implemented in 4 clusters from 2 districts and 75 primary schools.  
3. Partner strengthened for effective and efficient implementation of project activities |

1.3.3. Target Groups

The Quality Learning Approach (Kalikayatna) was piloted in 4 clusters of the 2 districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich in the state of Uttar Pradesh and PY had projected reaching out to 5000 children with disabilities and 200 teachers in 75 schools. The number of children with disabilities was based on the data got from the department. However, in reality, once the programme started it was seen that many children were not there for various reasons, mis-identification being the main one. Prajayatna was able to reach only 2250 children. This was in the whole district of Chitrakoot and a part of Bahraich (1000 out of 3409 schools). It needs to be noted that Bahraich did not have data when the QLI programme was launched. Data had been collected but was not consolidated nor was it in a useable manner. This was done the next year, after the pilot was initiated.

As the QLI Pilot is focused towards improving the schooling and learning of children, women become very important in initiating a process of change as they have more stake in their child’s future. Further, processes for promoting and strengthening decentralization of education governance structures was to reach out to 700 Gram Panchayats and more than 2500 Government schools impacting well over 2.5 lakh children. The work with the communities
would involve strengthening of community structures such as School Management Committees and Panchayati Raj structures all of which has 50% participation of women and Prajayatna attempts to ensure this.

1.4. Major Outcomes

The major outcomes visualized by Prajayatna are:

- Decentralized governance structure (Panchayat & School Management Committees) strengthened for monitoring of 2500 schools for quality and inclusive education.
- Teacher trained in inclusive education and active learning process (Kalikayatna process) in 75 schools.

1.5. Results

During the project period (2016-2018) there are three results which the pilot aims to achieve as outlined below:

1. Decentralized governance structures (Panchayat and School Management Committees) are strengthened for monitoring of 2500 schools for quality inclusive education.
2. Teachers in mainstream schools are trained in inclusive education and active learning process (Kalikayatna model) which is to be implemented in 4 clusters from 2 districts and 75 primary schools.
3. Partner is strengthened for effective and efficient implementation of project activities.

Section 2: Introduction

2.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be used to assess the progress of the pilot program against the stated objectives which were set at design stage. The purpose of the evaluation is to measure achievements, outcomes and observable trends to determine overall change factors and impact of activities. This evaluation will adopt a participatory approach, identifying and providing examples of strategies, approaches, and activities that have been successful and considering the degree to which these could be replicated.

2.2. Scope

The scope of the evaluation will focus on the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) being piloted in a total number of 75 schools in four clusters within the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich in the state of Uttar Pradesh. This will include all children studying in these schools including those with disabilities. In addition, the evaluation study will also cover the implementation of the decentralized education governance processes being implemented within these four clusters. The study will focus on best practices, achievements and challenges for the entirety of the project period beginning January 01, 2016 to July 31, 2018.
2.3. Evaluation Objectives

- To assess the quality, effectiveness and relevance of project activities against achieving the overall objective and stated outcomes set at design.
- To review the sustainability aspects of the project.
- To assess the relevance of the intervention and if it could be replicated in other locations.
- To uncover relevant learning about the challenges of inclusive approaches to inform other disability projects across regions and partners.

In the following sub section, the evaluation questions that are framed will attempt to address all the objectives stated above, with the exception of the second one related to sustainability. This will not be feasible and therefore challenging since it is perceived that the time period that the QLI project has been operational (2016- mid 2018) is too short and therefore will not do justice to the same. It is however being emphasized that sustainability is important and needs to be definitely addressed in the future.

2.4. Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Questions for the study were formulated by the consultant in collaboration with a CBM representative and Prajayatna staff based on the TORs and Evaluation Study Framework. Discussions with the CBM and Prajayatna led to the team unanimously agreeing that the evaluation questions needed to necessarily focus on the two major interventions (processes) being piloted in 75 school contexts of four clusters in two districts of Uttar Pradesh. Thus, the two major components that had been outlined in the TORs would be evaluated in Quality Learning Initiative Pilot project. Finally, the evaluation questions for the study were framed keeping in focus the scope and objectives of the study and needs as expressed by CBM and Prajayatna in terms of both processes and final outcomes of the intervention which are presented below:

1. To what extent has the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) pilot program been implemented by trained teachers in selected government primary schools as intended?
2. To what extent have children with disabilities been included and provided quality inclusive education in selected government schools as intended?
3. To what extent and in which ways has the Prajayatna program strengthened and promoted the ownership of primary school education by decentralized education governance structures?
4. To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?

2.5 Restrictions
The two major restrictions faced were firstly, insufficiency of time for undertaking tool development, data collection and analysis. Secondly, due to the monsoons and flooding situation in Bahraich district it was impossible to undertake classroom observation in one of the selected schools.
Chapter 2 - Methods

Chapter Two focuses on the methodology used in the study to investigate the evaluation questions. The methodological features include the research design, sampling frame and the sample, instrumentation and data sources, data collection procedure and approaches for data processing and analyses. Methods selected for data collection were also reviewed in the light of the data sources and feasibility of completing the study within the specified time schedule. The limitations of the study are also presented along with these sections in the chapter.

2.1. Evaluation Questions

The four evaluation questions are being reiterated once again in the box below as this provides the necessary framework for planning the research design.

**Evaluation Questions**

1. To what extent has the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) pilot program been implemented by trained teachers in selected government primary schools as intended?

2. To what extent have children with disabilities been included and provided quality inclusive education in selected government schools as intended?

3. To what extent and in which ways has the project strengthened and promoted the ownership of primary school education by decentralized education governance structures?

4. To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?

2.2. Research Design

To address the evaluation questions, a mixed methods research design was adopted for the study. Both primary and secondary sources of data were used to collect information using multiple methodologies. Since the focus of the study was on the pilot being conducted in selected schools within four clusters it was felt that it would be more appropriate to use qualitative methodology to a larger extent which would allow the Consultant and research team to elicit subjective realities and also yield rich data on individual experiences, understandings and perceptions about the two processes being implemented by the major stakeholders and effecting the beneficiaries.
The qualitative methods that were adopted for the study were school visit observations including classroom observations, interviews and focus groups. These methods were used to triangulate data and uncover multiple perspectives from teachers, Prajayatna functionaries and government officials on the implementation and expectations from the Quality Learning Initiative and strengthening of local governance structures for planning, implementation and monitoring of education in primary schools. It was visualized that these visits will provide the scope to observe teachers and also Prajayatna facilitators actually working with teachers in schools-classrooms. This it was hoped would provide deep insights and understanding as to the extent teachers are implementing the program as intended and also how children with disabilities are being provided education in classroom settings.

It was also felt necessary to study one school-classroom context from each of the four clusters. In the school which was the unit of analysis classroom observations, teacher interviews along with FGDs with the SMCs and parents of enrolled students were undertaken. This would help to provide a more holistic picture of project implementation by Prajayatna supported by the perspectives and opinions on different aspects of the program by the key stakeholders.

Given the necessity to focus on understanding the opinions, perceptions and behaviors of the Prajayatna staff working along with teachers and their experiences in classrooms, interviews with the major stakeholders who were key informants was another strategy used for data collection. Interviews were used to elicit the richest possible data regarding district, block and cluster level staff and teachers’ perceptions, opinions and views regarding subjective realities, transaction of teaching-learning in the classroom and problems and challenges faced.

### 2.2.1. Sampling Frame

Given the focus of the study, evaluation questions and research design, a multi-stage sampling approach was used for selecting schools and the different categories of respondents/participants who were either involved directly or indirectly in the implementation of the Prajayatna program in the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The selection process was undertaken jointly with the CBM and Prajayatna staff who helped the consultant.

The sampling frame is presented below in table 1 which includes all the four clusters from the four blocks, two each from the project districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich. The sample for the study was selected from each of the four clusters. Since the Quality Learning Initiative program was being implemented in schools-classrooms the school was taken as the unit of analysis for the study.
### Table 1: The Sampling Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts/Blocks</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>1. Chitrakoot/Karvi</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pahadi</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>1. Kaisarganj</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Jarwal</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total number of teachers working in the QLI project are 87 in both the districts. 1 teacher per school has been taken in the sample. Thus the total number are 75 out of 87 teachers.

The procedure adopted for sampling is outlined below in the two major sub sections with reference to the main and sub sample respectively. In order to study various aspects of the program on the ground and also as perceived by those involved in the Prajayatna program at the classroom level, a variety of respondents formed part of the total sample. The sample included different target groups of respondents namely: teachers, students, SMC members, Gram Panchayat Presidents, Prajayatna staff and Government Education functionaries working at different levels in the district block and cluster.

#### 2.2.2. I. The Main Sample: Primary Stakeholders

**a. Schools**

The two districts in Uttar Pradesh where the QLI was operational were taken in the sample. From each of the two districts all the blocks where the four clusters were located were also taken in the sample. Out of the 75 schools where the QLI was operating, it was decided to represent approximately one third of the total number of schools in each cluster by using the Random Number Table. Thus, a total number of 26 schools were selected. The list of selected schools is presented in Appendix 2. Further, out of the 26 schools, four schools were purposively selected, one each from each of the four clusters that had the maximum number of children with disabilities. It was in these four schools that classroom observations of the QLI pilot was to be conducted.

**b. Teachers**
The focus of the study was on the Quality Learning Initiative which was being piloted in the two districts from selected clusters and schools, thus all the teachers totaling 75 (1 per school) working in the QLI Program constituted the main sample for the study.

c. Classroom Observations

From each of the four clusters out of the selected schools, one school was selected for a visit and classroom observation were to be conducted. However, in order to get an understanding of how students with disabilities are provided quality education in the QLI classroom, in each cluster the school that was selected had the maximum number of children with disabilities enrolled. This provided a rich data source about the teaching-learning based on the QLI approach of Prajayatna.

2.2.3. II. The Sub Sample

a. Primary Stakeholders

i) Teachers: The main sample constituted 75 schools and from each school 1 teacher working in the pilot program was taken. In order to get a better understanding and insight into teachers’ opinions, views and perceptions about the program and providing inclusive education to children with disabilities in the classroom, it was decided with the Prajayatna staff and CBM to select the teacher whose classroom was being observed for interviews. Thus a total number of 4 teachers were to be interviewed.

ii) School- Classroom Sites: Out of the 26 schools selected in the sample one school site from each cluster was selected for in depth study and classroom observations. Thus the sub sample constituted 4 schools, 1 each from the four clusters namely: Kapsethi, Asoha, Bambhaura and Badrauli, for a full day school visit and classroom observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distincts/ Clusters</th>
<th>Schools (1 per Cluster)</th>
<th>Teachers (For Interviews)</th>
<th>Students (For FGDs)</th>
<th>Classroom Observations (1 per school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot/ 1.Kapsethi 2.Asoha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (06+06)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich/ 1.Badrauli 2.Bambahura</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (06+06)</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Secondary Stakeholders

The secondary stakeholders in the program from whom data were collected were the – SMCs, Gram Panchayat Presidents and Parents of children with disabilities and also those without disabilities as presented in Table 3 below. They were selected from the 26 schools out of the total
number of 75 that were randomly selected in the sub sample. These target groups participated in cluster wise FGDs in groups of a minimum 6 to a maximum of 10 respondents. The list of all the respondents from whom data was collected is presented in Appendix 3.

Table 3: Sub Sample of Secondary Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Secondary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Bahraich</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School Management Committee (SMC) Members</td>
<td>6-10 in 2 groups (One per cluster from 2 SMCs in each cluster)</td>
<td>6-10 in 2 groups (One per cluster from 2 SMCs in each cluster)</td>
<td>24-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gram Panchayat (GP) Presidents</td>
<td>All in the two selected QLI clusters</td>
<td>All in the two selected QLI clusters</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Parents of Students without Disabilities</td>
<td>6-8 in two groups (One per school selected in the sub sample)</td>
<td>6-8 in two groups (One per school selected in the sub sample)</td>
<td>24-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Parents of students with disabilities</td>
<td>At least one parent of all the children with disabilities enrolled in the 2 schools selected for classroom observation.</td>
<td>At least one parent of all the children with disabilities enrolled in the 2 schools selected for classroom observation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.    | Prajayatna Staff | Head Office-01  
State-01  
District-01  
Block- Nil  
Cluster-02 | District 01  
Block- Nil  
Cluster-02 | 08 |
| 6.    | Department of Education (Government Officials) | District-02  
Block-02  
Cluster-02 | District-02  
Block-02  
Cluster-02 | 12 |

Other target groups were the Government Education Officials and Prajayatna staff working for the program who were also included in the sample. Interviews were conducted with all of them. The total number of participants in each of the target groups is presented in the table above.

2.3. Instrumentation

Primary and secondary sources of data were used for collecting information for the study. Data were collected from a variety of respondents and school-classroom sites. Strategies such as, school visit observations including classroom observation and conduct of interviews and focus groups were adopted in the study. Secondary data was collected through document review for purposes of triangulation and increasing data validity.
2.3.1. Preparatory Phase: Determining the goals targets, areas and aspects of the study

This initial preparatory stage was viewed as critical for the consultant. A number of calls were conducted, documents/materials referred to. In addition, a planning meeting was organized with the Prajayatna and CBM staff in the CBM office in Delhi to finalise the tools and plan the conduct of the study and other details. The meeting and interaction helped in realizing the following:

- Determining the data sources for collection of information.
- Determining the goals, targets, areas /aspects to be focused upon in the development of different tools, namely classroom observation schedule/ format, interview schedules and focus groups, with both primary and secondary respondents.
- Identifying broad areas that were to be addressed based on a review of literature (specifically Quality Learning Initiative aspects and implementation strategies and strategies for strengthening decentralized education governance structures, LEGD tables and documents).
- Discussing in detail the focus of the study and plan for data collection in Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts.

2.3.2. Tool development

Based on the above information and with a view to collecting the required data from the different data sources /informants constituting the sample of the study a total number of ten draft tools were specifically developed by the consultant in consultation with the Prajayatna and CBM staff. Subsequently, the set of ten draft tools were finalized. All the items were reviewed vis-à-vis each of the four evaluation questions. The instruments were suitably modified by the consultant based on the feedback received from the CBM staff member and Prajayatna members.

It needs to be mentioned that initially FGDs were to be conducted with the Gram Panchayat (GP) members but it was felt that the conducting a discussion with the GP Presidents would yield richer and more detailed information on the processes and work undertaken by the Prajayatna. Thus the target group of this particular FGD was changed. It was also decided that simple
questions would be put together for conducting an informal interaction with students from QLI schools who were studying in classes 2, 3 and 4.

A. Teacher Questionnaire

The teacher questionnaire that was designed was divided into six sections covering the broad areas related to the implementation of the QLI program. Most of the items were close ended items with Likert-type scales of two to four options and the remainder were open ended items. The questionnaires were designed so as to elicit mostly quantitative data with a few qualitative items. It consisted of 28 items so that the average time taken to complete the questionnaire would range from 45 to 60 minutes.

The tool was designed to provide a wide range of data about the various aspects of the QLI program as perceived by teachers. Since the QLI program itself focusses on providing inclusive education all the components inherently contribute to realizing the same. Some of the major components focused on were- teachers’ awareness about the QLI program, provision of training, strategies/pedagogy used in teaching-learning, frequency of activities conducted, assessment, support provided by PY in the programme, usefulness and effectiveness of the QLI and challenges faced. Suggestions for improvement and their views of continuity, replicability and upscaling were also focused on.

B. Classroom Observation Schedule

This tool was designed specifically to observe the classroom environment, resources available and used and how the QLI program was being transacted in the classroom by the teacher. The schedule focused on the implementation of the QLI components by teachers to provide inclusive education to all children including those with disabilities, the classroom environment: physical and social classroom organization and management, availability and use of materials provided to schools, teacher-student interaction, classroom processes and transaction and implementation of teaching-learning strategies.

C. Interview Schedules

Semi-structured interview schedules were constructed for teachers, Prajayatna staff and government officials. These were designed to elicit qualitative responses to substantiate, elaborate/explain and add on to what had been collected through questionnaires that were to be administered to teachers or other tools. The information obtained through interviews was mainly used to gain further insights into different respondents’ perceptions, opinions and views regarding the implementation of the QLI, role of teachers and other key stakeholders in improving the school environment and supporting teachers in the classroom, challenges faced, suggestions for improvement and possibilities of replication and upscaling the program.

i) Teacher Interview Schedule
The teacher interview schedule focused on gathering their perceptions about their roles, training received and QLI implementation strategy including student assessment, providing education to children with disabilities and the type of support provided by the Prajayatna staff in implementation of the QLI approach. The challenges faced by them in implementing the QLI, continuance and replication of the program and suggestions for improving the program were other important areas that were addressed.

**ii) Interview Schedule for Prajayatna Staff**

The Prajayatna staff interview schedule focussed on eliciting information on the effectiveness of the QLI implementation and their role and responsibilities in the same. Orientation and training received and usefulness of the same in dealing with children with disabilities and supporting teachers in classrooms. Role of government officials, SMCs, Gram Panchayats and parents in promoting the work of Prajayatna in the selected schools and teachers in planning, implementation and monitoring the program. In addition, roles and activities to be performed in the classroom and for promoting local governance were dealt with in detail. The challenges faced by them and suggestions for improving the QLI in the future and views regarding replicability of the program were also focussed upon.

**iii) Interview Schedule for Government Officials**

The interview schedule prepared for government education officials working at the district, block and cluster levels, consisted of questions on their awareness about the QLI program in general and the importance of including CWD in particular and future prospects of the program. It also included details on their views regarding the upscaling, replication and suggestions for improvement of the QLI program in the future.

**D. Focus Group Discussions**

FGDs were developed specifically for Gram Panchayat Presidents, School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parents of children enrolled in schools where the Prajayatna QLI program was being implemented.

**i) FGD for Gram Panchayat Presidents**

For Gram Panchayats the FGD focussed on eliciting their views and opinions on Prajayatna’s role and their strategies for involving the GPs in improving school education, by resolving critical issues. Their roles and responsibilities, networking with SMCs and the local communities and views regarding the possibility of replicating and upscaling Prajayatna’s work was tapped through the different questions.

**ii) FGD for School Management Committees**

The interaction with SMC members based on the FGD focussed on awareness about their roles and responsibilities. Other aspects were the number, nature and importance of SMC meetings. Issues identified and discussed in the meetings and whether school improvement plans were being made or not. Their connect with the GP and type of support provided by Prajayatna in
implementing their roles. Views regarding the possibility of replicating and upscaling Prajayatna’s work was also explored.

**iii) FGD for Parents**

The FGD for parents focussed on their perceptions and opinions regarding- school effectiveness, learning levels of their children and changes if any in the school in the past two-three years, Prajayatna’s role in improving the school environment, teaching-learning and conduct of SMC meetings and follow-up were other important aspects Questions related CWD, their schooling and rehabilitation were also specifically focussed on. It also included details on their views regarding the upscaling, replication and suggestions for improvement of the QLI program in the future.

**iv) FGD for Students**

A simple set of six questions were developed for guiding the interaction /FGD with students being exposed to the QLI. It focussed on whether they liked coming to school, what they liked or did not like so much in school, what did their teacher do in class, their feelings regarding CWD and what were the present classes like as compared to those they attended two-three years ago.

**v) FGD for Parents of Children with Disability**

FGD with the parents of children with disability enrolled in the QLI schools basically sought to elicit parent’s views on the role of Prajaytna in enrolling and rehabilitation of their child with disability. The disability their child had and what services had been provided so far, what were their needs and expectations. An important aspect was on changes if at all seen in their children and how had the SMC, GP and Prajayatna supported them and their child.

2.3.3. Translation of Tools

Some of the tools were translated into Hindi by the Prajayatna team in Uttar Pradesh. These were the Teacher Questionnaire, FGDs with Gram Panchayat Presidents, School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parents. The final set of 10 instruments are attached in Appendix 4 a, that has been created especially for easy reference of the ten tools.

2.4. Data Collection

This sub section details out the preparatory activities undertaken prior to data collection, the data sources and steps adopted in collecting quality data from different participants in the study.

**2.4.1. Plan for Data Collection**

A detailed plan for data collection was jointly developed with the CBM and Prajayatna staff located in Bangalore and Uttar Pradesh. A draft plan for two visits one each in Chitrakoot and Bahraich was prepared which was finalized after several interactions on phone and in person.
2.4.2. Data Sources

i. The Consultant with a view to developing her own understanding of the Quality Learning Initiative reviewed and studied all the major documents and materials made available. This formed a major part of the overall methodology. All the basic Prajayatna material generated by the Head Office in Bangalore and Uttar Pradesh state and district offices such as PPTs, Reports, materials formats, records, feedback forms etc. were studied.

ii. A note prepared by the Chief Functionary specifying the roles of different Prajayatna functionaries and the Proposal submitted to CBM by the partner organization were also studied carefully.

2.4.3. Developing a Detailed Action Plan and Travel Schedule

To facilitate timely and systematic collection of data from various data sources, the Consultant developed a detailed plan of action focusing on the major activities, timelines, roles and responsibilities of the Prajayatna staff in consultation with the CBM staff. Since the process of data collection was time consuming the Consultant and Prajayatna team worked in close collaboration to clearly delineate the activities during the two field visits to Chitrakoot and Bahraich.

2.4.4. Negotiating Entry and Ethical Considerations

Prior to the conduct of the study an important first step was taken by the Prajayatna team to obtain informed consent from the district offices, schools and participants/respondents selected in the study for administration of all tools, conduct of interviews, observations and interactions.

Building a relationship of mutual trust and respect and maintaining this throughout the study was viewed as critical. With this in view, the Prajayatna staff was requested to communicate to and inform the schools and other respondents about the study and more importantly elicit maximum cooperation in the smooth conduct of the study. Further, it was recognized that participant consent is a process that must constantly be negotiated throughout the study. Consent forms were signed by all the respondents a copy of which is attached in Appendices 4 b and c, for reference. In addition, the Consultant respected any participant’s decision to withdraw from the study at any point of time.

In the field, rapport building was a common entry point. The research team (Consultant and Prajayatna staff member) introduced themselves and the purpose of their visit to all those involved in the study and established rapport, across all levels. All the respondents were informed about the focus and purpose of the study, given clear instructions and assured that confidentiality would be maintained. Care was taken to structure and conduct school - classroom observations, interviews and focus groups without disturbing the regular school schedule of teachers or students.

2.4.5. Data Collection Procedure
Collection and desk analysis of documentary evidence from the Prajayatna team at all levels. Reports, proformas, records, teaching-learning and training materials formed a major part of documentary evidence. This was an extremely important part of the methodology in order to assess the extent to which Prajayatna worked towards and achieved the targets stated in the design stage.

**Primary data collection**

Two visits were organized by Prajayatna, to Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts from July 24 to 26, 2018 and August 03 to 06, 2018 respectively. The Final Agenda for the two visits is attached in Appendices 5 a and b for Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts respectively. The data were collected through:

- Visits to schools, villages, district offices and government offices in the two districts,
- Meetings with functionaries involved either directly or indirectly with the QLI namely teachers, government officials working at the district and local Prajayatna staff.
- Conduct of interviews of teachers, Prajayatna staff and government officials at the district, block and cluster levels.
- Conduct of FGDs with, parents of children with disabilities and children without disabilities, Gram Panchayat Presidents, School Management Committee members and students in the four schools selected for classroom observation.

**a. School Visit - Classroom Observation**

This was an important strategy used to triangulate data obtained through questionnaires, interviews and focus groups. In the 4 selected school sites, a full day classroom observation was undertaken by two evaluation team members i.e. consultant and a senior Prajayatna staff member, while the selected QLI teacher was teaching. Each school visit –classroom observation was conducted for one full day.

School visit observations included before classroom, during classroom and after classroom observations, which allowed the evaluation team (consultant and Prajayatna staff member) to witness and observe how the teachers worked for one full day.

These visits also exposed the consultant to other factors that might impact the teacher’s work and effectiveness. It helped to identify contextual factors that impact teacher effectiveness, even if these factors had not been identified by the participants of the study. It also made it clearer what are the evident divergences and gaps between stated goals, objectives and teacher’s role expectations and actual classroom transaction.

**b. Conducting Focus Group Discussions**

The conduct of FGDs allowed the consultant to determine perceptions of different groups/categories of respondents about the Quality Learning Initiative as also the role of SMCs
and GPs in supporting the school and the effectiveness of implementing QLI in the selected schools-classrooms in the pilot. In both the districts, in the two clusters separate FGD’s were conducted with members from the four target groups. A total number of 16 FGDs, eight per district were conducted in the two districts.

Focus groups generally lasted between 45 minutes to an hour and were facilitated by the consultant in Hindi, with a Prajayatna staff member documenting/recording the discussion in detail. This was then shared with the consultant for purpose of analysis.

c. **Conduct of Interviews**

The consultant conducted semi-structured interviews with four teachers (1 from each cluster). These interviews were used to elicit a deeper understanding of respondents’ perceptions, views, opinions and their experiences, thereby enriching the data being collected. It also provided an insight into the problems, barriers and challenges faced by them. The interviews were conducted in Hindi by the consultant and lasted for a period of one to two hours with teachers and Prajayatna staff. With two of the Prajayatna staff members a second round was conducted. Detailed notes were taken by the consultant during the interviews.

Interviews with the government officials were conducted at a time convenient to them, thus ensuring no interference in their daily routine and work schedule. The interviews lasted 30-40 minutes. Notes were taken by the consultant wherever required. In one of the blocks the Block Education Officer (BEO) had recently been transferred and thus he was interviewed and not the BEO in position. This was also done in the case of one of the DIET Principals where the Principal had been recently transferred. This was necessary to get the views and perceptions of the officials who were there in the district between 2016-2018 and knew about the QLI program. Interviews with the Prajayatna staff were conducted in the late evenings and in two to three sessions of 60-80 minutes each for the State Coordinator and Chief Functionary respectively.

### 2.5. Data Processing and Analysis

The preceding sections have provided a description of data sources, instruments, and data collection procedure. The steps undertaken for data processing is described below, concluding with a summary of all the data that was collected during the study in Table 4 (in section 2.8).

#### 2.5.1. Preparatory Steps for Data Processing

In order to ensure systematic data organization and analysis an item wise matrix of different tools for each of the evaluation questions was prepared by the consultant. In addition, prior to data processing and analysis being undertaken the consultant and Prajayatna staff involved in the teacher questionnaire administration checked the data on completion of the questionnaire by the teachers to ensure that no item was left out.

#### 2.5.2. Quantitative Data Processing
Responses from questionnaires were verified and then analysed. It needs to be mentioned that though the majority of the items/questions in the questionnaires were drawn directly from the research questions, at the time of data analysis it was found that a little of the information collected though interesting, was not of much use in addressing the evaluation questions. Hence such data was not further analysed or reported in this document.

2.5.3. Qualitative Data Processing

In order to process the qualitative data that was collected the consultant read and re-read the detailed notes taken during the interviews with all the respondents. The consultant then proceeded to categorize the qualitative responses collected through the interview schedules, focus groups and open ended items in the questionnaires into a large number of common categories, for each of the items in the tools.

The following steps were followed during the process of analysis:

- identifying major themes for analysis
- identifying major categories emerging from the recorded interviews and field notes.
- merging of and reducing the overall number of common categories;
- identifying verbatim quotes, examples and unusual terms used by respondents;
- translation of verbatim quotes and terms from Hindi into English.

The qualitative data in the form of common categories and verbatim quotes was used along with quantitative data (tables) as evidence in addressing each of the evaluation questions. Major patterns emerging from qualitative responses were used along with selected verbatim quotes in the report.

2.6. Data Quality Assurance

In the present study at all stages, every effort was undertaken by the consultant along with the Prajayatna support team to ensure that data of high quality was collected for investigating the evaluation questions. The major aspects focused upon are presented below:

2.6.1. Involvement of Stakeholders

The consultant involved the major stakeholders from the CBM country office and Prajayatna staff, at all stages of the study except data entry, analysis and report writing which was the responsibility of the consultant. During the planning stage, as discussed earlier on in the chapter, meetings were held with Chief Functionary, state and district functionaries. This helped the consultant to gain a better understanding of the program and thus develop a need based, relevant
and feasible plan for data collection and other requirements in a more objective and effective manner.

2.6.2. Use of Multiple methods and Coverage of a Variety of Respondents

The study used multiple methods and data were collected from various types of respondents. Triangulation of information from different sources further enhanced the quality of analysis and interpretation. The respondents as stated earlier in the chapter included teachers, students, GP Presidents, SMC members, Prajayatna staff and government functionaries.

2.6.3. Quality Instrumentation

It was visualized that a wide range of instruments would help elicit richer data thereby making the evaluation study more comprehensive and holistic. Thus, a variety of instruments that facilitated collection of important qualitative information were developed. All the instruments were reviewed at least twice by the Prajayatna team and CBM staff member, as highlighted earlier in this section. Initially, the instruments were developed in English and then a few were translated into Hindi.

2.6.4. Plan for Data Collection

The phase of data collection had a clear plan developed jointly by the Consultant and Prajayatna staff. The main purpose was to ensure that, tools were ready, could be read easily, available in the required numbers (particularly the Teacher Questionnaire). During the visits it was ensured that tools were being administered in the proper way. Equally important was that the data were being entered correctly and that the observations were recorded in the tool itself or if required on separate sheets of paper, for further reference and use. During FGDs a Prajayatna staff member was recording the interaction in detail.

2.6.5. Data Checking and Cleaning

Data checking was carried out carefully as this is an important step to ensure data quality. The data was further cleaned using SPSS and MS-Excel. Despite all efforts to ensure data quality as detailed out above, there were certain limitations faced. These limitations have been briefly highlighted in the following sub section.

2.7. Limitations of the Study

The most significant limitation of the study was the time constraint in undertaking an evaluation study in two districts and submitting the report in a short period of two months. Meeting the time deadlines and lack of a preparatory phase impacted other important aspects of the study such as ten tools had to be developed and translated in approximately 10 days which was challenging, the piloting of the tools could not be undertaken, interaction with teachers on children with
disabilities to understand critical aspects such as assessment and IEP usage could not be undertaken due to less time.

More importantly, the QLI being a process driven initiative necessarily calls for classroom observations to be ideally observed three to four times over a period of six months. This had to be limited to four schools and conducted only once in each of the schools. Observations conducted three-four times in the same classroom would have led to better validation and consistency of classroom processes and exposed the variety of strategies used by teachers within the QLI framework thereby enriching the findings.

Observations of the teachers’ monthly collective which should have been a part of the data collection process could not be undertaken as the time period was short i.e. two weeks for data collection. The monthly meeting had just been conducted in all the four clusters before the field visits were undertaken. Since the collectives are a monthly feature in the programme, the Consultant could not schedule this as part of the study. However, attempts were made to address this important component and related issues through specific items in the teacher questionnaire and interview schedules for teachers, Prajayatna staff and government functionaries. Inspite of the challenges highlighted above the study was conducted and completed in time.

The present evaluation study was conducted by the consultant keeping under consideration the programme evaluation standards of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. These are discussed in the following paragraphs.

According to the utility standards in programme evaluation purposes of the evaluation need to be identified and continuously negotiated based on the needs of different groups of stakeholders. The basic approach for the programme evaluation was participatory in nature. However, all stakeholders could not be associated at all stages of framing, designing and execution of the evaluation study. Different stakeholders were involved at different stages of the study wherever their contributions were felt to be necessary and appropriate. Maximum engagement was that of the Prajayatna staff in both the planning and execution of the study and district and block level government education officials for seeking permission and completing necessary formalities for undertaking the study. However, this engagement with other groups of stakeholders like teachers and community was not undertaken to the extent desired.

As per propriety standards agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations and cultural context of clients and other stakeholders. In the context of the present evaluation study the question of a formal agreement did not arise. The district and block level authorities had given permission for the conduct of the evaluation study. It would have helped Prajayatna in undertaking their future work and exploring possibilities of upscaling if government personnel from two key organizations i.e. SCERT and DIET, had been part of the evaluation team.

Protection of human rights and respect of respondents are essential to meet the propriety standards. In this regard utmost care was taken to meet requirements of the standard during the
process of data collection. Although respondents were asked to write their names on questionnaires and interview schedules they were assured that their identities and responses would be kept strictly confidential. This was communicated through the guidelines given at the beginning of the questionnaire and also verbally at the start of the interviews. They were also asked to sign a consent form before data collection started.

2.8. Summary of Data Collected

A summary of the primary data elements which were finally collected for the study is presented in the Table 4 below. The consultant with support from Prajayatna staff was able to obtain extensive data from different groups of functionaries involved in the implementation of the QLI approach and local education governance programs from the two districts in the sample, through administration of teacher questionnaire, conduct of interviews, 16 Focus Groups (4 SMCs, 4 Parents, 4 GP Presidents, and 4 with Students). It was planned to undertake 4 school-classroom observations but due to one school being flooded in Bahraich district 3 full day school visits and 3 classroom observations were possible to gain a deeper insight and understanding about the QLI program and teacher effectiveness in implementation of the same. In addition, it also facilitated assessing to what extent SMC members, Gram Panchayat Presidents and government functionaries supported in creating a conducive learning environment for all children including those with disabilities.

Table 4: Summary of Data Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Teacher Ques.</th>
<th>Interview Teacher</th>
<th>Interview Prajayatna</th>
<th>Interview Govt. Officials.</th>
<th>FGD Parents</th>
<th>FGD with parents of children with disabilities</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>FGD GP Pradhan</th>
<th>FGD SMCs</th>
<th>Student FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02 (09)</td>
<td>02 (16)</td>
<td>02 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: In Bahraich district, one classroom observation could not be conducted as the selected school was flooded due to heavy rains

2.8.1 Profile of the Primary Informants

As stated earlier on in the section for the study there was one group of primary informants namely teachers. Their profile is presented in the table below

Table 5: Profile of Teachers in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under graduate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate and above</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Ed./J.B.T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were a total number of 75 teachers in the sample out of which 53.3% were from Chitrakoot and 46.7% from Bahraich districts respectively. 51.1% were working as point teachers in Grade 1 and 48.9% as Grade 2 teachers. The number of female teachers (58.7%) were slightly more as compared to the male teachers (41.3%). There were no undergraduates with 62.1% who were post graduates and above, with 37.9% graduate teachers. It is interesting to note that all the teachers were professionally qualified with the maximum number 85.7% holding a B.Ed. degree, and 14.3% who possessed a D. Ed or J.B.T.

The following Chapter 3 will present the major findings with reference to each of the four evaluation questions in the study.
Chapter 3: Evaluation Findings and Analysis

Chapter Three presents the primary quantitative and qualitative evidentiary elements and inferences drawn for each of the evaluation questions in the study in four subsections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. Each subsection will address one of the evaluation questions framed for the study. The scope of the present evaluation study is on the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) pilot undertaken by Prajayatna (PY) in 75 project schools in four clusters two each from the Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts respectively.

Section I

Evaluation Question No: 1 To what extent has the Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) program been implemented by trained teachers in selected government primary schools as intended?

With a view to assessing the impact of the Quality Learning Initiative in the selected schools in two clusters each of Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts respectively, in an objective and systematic manner it was necessary to have a frame of reference. To arrive at this, as a first step a document review of all materials provided by the Prajayatna and CBM was undertaken. Secondly, the Consultant conducted an in depth interview and a number of informal interactions with the Chief Functionary of Prajayatna under whose guidance the pilot project had been initiated in the two districts of Uttar Pradesh state. The interactions provided a clear understanding of the vision, ideology and major components/ strategies that had been planned for and used to promote the initiative.

Frame of Reference for Evaluation: Vision and Ideology of the Quality Learning Initiative

The perspective of the Quality Learning Initiative was delineated by the Chief Functionary of Prajayatna who had initiated the project. The vision as specified by her was to - enable every child to have access to an education that will develop the capabilities that is inherent in them and to enable them to thrive and live with dignity. A brief genesis of the project was also provided. The Quality Learning Initiative (QLI) project in Uttar Pradesh was an attempt to pilot a unique and inclusive learning approach in two districts Chitrakoot and Baharaich within two clusters, in a total number of 75 government primary schools. The project in these selected government schools would focus on building capabilities of children, including children with disabilities in an organic / natural way of learning. It was emphasized that the project aimed at promoting child centered, participatory, experiential processes that would lead to self-directed
learning in children in the early primary years and also clearly stated that the project attempts to generate independent thinking, decision making and greater communication in children.

Further she went on to emphasize that the QLI looks at providing a holistic learning experience for the children studying at the primary level (classes 1-5) and has certain aspects which are critical to the effective implementation and success of the project in classrooms namely: using an integrated curriculum designed around concepts rather than subjects, no textbooks, continuous and comprehensive assessment of children and undertaking group work along with individual learning activities. In order to facilitate such a process, teacher collective meetings are organized and onsite support provided by the PY staff to develop teachers’ abilities. The key features of the project and critical aspects that teachers need to focus on in the implementation of the QLI approach at the classroom level are highlighted in the box below. It is within his framework that the subsequent subsections will provide evidences and discussion on specific aspects as highlighted in the TORs.

### KEY FEATURES OF THE QLI INITIATIVE

- Organization of Teacher Collectives (Monthly Meetings).
- Developing a monthly plan jointly by teachers of each cluster.
- Development of daily lesson plans by each individual teacher.
- Integrated curriculum and going beyond textbooks.
- Organizing whole group and mixed age group activities along with Individual Practice Time.
- Documentation of what each child does by teachers.
- Observation of students by teachers.
- Maintaining Teacher Observation Book, Ongoing Portfolio for each student and Progress Card.
- Analyzing and interpreting the student assessment data and recordings by teachers.
- Using the available data for more effective planning of future classroom strategies and practices.

**Sources:**

i.) Proposal submitted by Prajayatna to CBM  
ii.) Prajayatna Key Implementation Guidelines  
iii). Interactions with the Chief Functionary of Prajayatna

With a view to implementing the QLI programme in a qualitatively sound manner, capacity building of the Prajayatna staff and teachers in the pilot clusters was critical to the programme being implemented successfully.

### 3.1. Capacity building of Prajayatna Staff and Teachers

A number of trainings were planned by the organization to prepare their own staff who would be working in the two districts and also subsequently teachers in the selected QLI schools in understanding, planning and implementing the new QLI approach in their classrooms. The
different types of trainings that were organized for the two districts between 2016-2018 are presented in the Table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trainings</th>
<th>District Chitrakoot</th>
<th>District Bahraich</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Monthly Teacher Collectives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusive Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity Building Programs for Prajayatna staff</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Trainings Organized by Prajayatna (2016-2018)**

Source: Prajayatna Data from Records

A total number of 18 trainings/orientations have been conducted for the Prajayatna staff in different areas/aspects. The staff during the interviews stated that they considered this an important and necessary input, which was critical for the successful implementation of the QLI program. The maximum number of trainings were conducted in 2017 when the project had been implemented for more than a year in both the districts. Further, they reported that they were satisfied with the training inputs given at the beginning and later on too as the approach was new for them and more importantly what helped a lot was the methodology used which was - essentially through exposure, discussion and hands on experience.

A special focus was given to imparting training in inclusive education as this was a new area in which the PY team was working. All the staff members expressed the desire for more training and exposure to dealing with children with different types of disabilities.

The maximum number of trainings were the teacher collectives which are viewed by Prajayatna as trainings and these were organized and conducted by the Prajayatna learning facilitators in the four NPRCs on a monthly basis. Discussion on this component which is viewed as both important and central to the effective implementation of the QLI in its true spirit is presented in the next sub section.

**3.1.1. Organization of Teacher Collectives**

Prajayatna’s Quality Learning Initiative approach to ‘teacher training’ differs significantly from what is generally conducted in the education system in some key aspects. The alternative to the traditional way of training that is used in the QLI is the teacher’s collective, which is one of the key features of this approach. In contrast to the traditional approach to trainings where the teacher is entirely dependent on the trainer for information, activities and plans, teachers participating in the monthly collectives in the QLI project build their own capacities to manage and facilitate classroom practices and processes in their own classroom learning environments.
In the collectives as teachers engage with the initiative, they form into small cluster level peer groups in which they support one another in developing concept maps- monthly learning plans, share their problems and find solutions together based on their school-specific circumstances, sharpen their own facilitation skills to ensure that all their students are participating and learning in an inclusive enabling environment. This formation of Cluster level teachers’ collectives enables teachers to develop a sense of ownership of their teaching-learning. They serve as a platform for learning groups to interact, in which teachers collaborate to evolve and understand newer meanings of learning, curricular objectives, outcomes, and content. Also based on teacher-identified needs which determine materials required to further develop the approach in their classrooms. A review of what the teachers have done in the classrooms is also undertaken where the teachers share innovative practices along with challenges faced by them. Some new concept/theories etc. are discussed with the teachers to enhance their understanding of the approach. Then the plan for the following month is discussed.

The teachers who were interviewed shared that collectives are a place where- it is expected that they will collaboratively engage in a process towards understanding how their students learn and plan the work to be undertaken in the next month. Based on their own experiences, teachers are expected to share their ideas, experiences and address the challenges they face in their specific learning environments, review and adapt learning plans, and generate feedback.

**Main Sessions in the Teacher Collective Meetings**

- Session One- Sharing and reflection
- Session Two- Planning for next month
- Session Three- Preparation of learning resources
- Session Four- New learning /exposure activities

*Source: Key Implementation Guide- Prajayatna*

The consultant was informed during the interviews with both teachers and PY staff that a number of activities took place in the monthly collective meetings held at the NPRCs which were generally conducted on one Saturday every month. These meetings were attended by all the project teachers in that cluster and PY cluster facilitators and at times other PY staff and the concerned NPRCC. The main topic of discussion was the monthly plan (Refer to Appendix 6 which focusses on the July 2018 Concept Plan) which was the *basis of all classroom teaching-learning processes in the next month*. This plan provided the framework for teachers to further develop their own individual daily lesson plans for classroom transaction. In addition, activities to be used for whole group and smaller mixed group work, integration of concepts across subjects and materials to be used were also discussed. In all the classes a uniform sequence of activities was to be followed with required breaks for toilet, lunch etc., across the project schools for the students.
Teachers unanimously reported that the three main sessions that took place in the Teacher Collective monthly meetings were useful either to some extent, large extent or totally. 50% teachers as presented below in table 7, reported that it was totally useful, thus indicating that these meetings looked upon as trainings could possibly be the single most important component that helped teachers significantly in implementing the QLI approach.

**Table 7: Perception of teachers on usefulness of Teacher Collectives in QLI planning and implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions in the Collectives</th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a Large extent</th>
<th>Totally Useful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1: Sharing and Reflection</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session II: Planning for the next month</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session III: Preparation of Learning Resources</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session IV: New Learning/ Exposure Activities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for inclusion of children with disabilities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, only one third of the teachers who responded found the inputs provided on planning for inclusion of children with disabilities useful to a large extent with another 15.7% to some extent and 13.7% not at all useful.

The four teachers who were interviewed shared that - collectives had helped them tremendously in many ways as detailed out below:

- **Sharing and reviewing the previous months’ work and what difficulties were faced.**
- **Clarifying our doubts and discussing ways of teaching difficult concepts and how to transact different activities in a participatory manner.**
- **Taking decisions together on what concepts are to be taught the next month and a broad map is then developed. The desired learning outcomes and related activities along with assessment tools for the month are also considered carefully and identified by us.**
- **Developing a monthly plan for classroom transaction.**
- **Discussing and getting to know new ways of learning, assessment and facilitation etc.**

One of the teachers from Chitrakoot, highlighted that - all of us discuss what we did in the past month and what methods were used what was found difficult to do and how each one of us dealt with our problems. This should continue and be spread to other blocks and districts too.
The second teacher from the same district pointed out that the meetings are the best part of the QLI project as I find these meetings very useful since we teachers together focus on identifying the concepts to be dealt with in the next month then prepare the concept map together, along with what kinds of activities will be done. Discussion on the kind of daily plans we would prepare is also looked at. The best thing is that at the end we all have a copy of the final plan that is to be followed.

Out of the two teachers interviewed in Bahraich, was very happy because they got materials to teach as well. He explained that based on the concepts that had to be taught we also decide the kind of TLMs that can be used and clarified that at times we also prepare materials. Further, the facilitator also comes and gives us the print out of the concept map, activities etc. This really helps me when I am teaching.

His colleague working in the other cluster expressed his feelings very simply by saying ever since this project started, I look forward to the monthly meeting eagerly, we have never had this kind of an opportunity to get together, plan, discuss and find solutions to our problems, which are very similar. It really helps a lot.

It is to be noted, that the NPRCCs and BEOs were very vocal about the positive impact and usefulness of the collectives and even suggested that this was one way of conducting their monthly cluster level meetings which had been initiated under the SSA which was presently unfortunately only a platform for collecting and dispersing data and information.

**Section Summary**

Most of the teachers reported that the different sessions in the monthly collective meetings conducted in the NPRCs were the most useful component of the Prajayatna program. The meetings provided an apt platform for teachers in a cluster to essentially plan for the next month’s teaching. A number of benefits were pointed out such as sharing of experiences, ideas and problems with their peers, planning and finding solutions together and the meeting being facilitated and guided by the PY facilitators on a regular basis. Another advantage was the PY facilitators coming to the schools with a print out of all that had been discussed and planned. The benefits and usefulness of these collectives was fully endorsed by the NPRCCs and BEOs in the interviews with them.

### 3.2. Provision of Support to Teachers

On specifically questioning teachers as to whether they were provided any support in planning and implementation of the QLI program 95.6% teachers reported in the affirmative (table 8). Further, they were also questioned as to who provided them support either directly or indirectly in the work they were doing in schools. Out of all the functionaries listed out like SMCs, GP, HTs and the community including parents; 27.5% teachers reported that the Prajayatna staff provided the maximum support to them, with the 11.3% teachers highlighting government functionaries.
Table 8: Provision of support as perceived by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Support provided</th>
<th>SMC Members</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Gram Panchayat Members</th>
<th>Head Teacher</th>
<th>Prjayatna Staff</th>
<th>Government Functionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N 36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N 29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N 65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Perception of teachers on effectiveness of support provided by Prajayatna staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Onsite Classroom Support by Prajayatna Learning Facilitator

With specific reference to the effectiveness of support provided by the Prajayatna cluster learning facilitators, 25.3% teachers felt they were effective with 58.7% considering them somewhat effective as is presented in Table 9 below.

Typically, in the facilitator’s visits to the project schools they observed the class for the whole day followed by a discussion with teachers wherein feedback was given to them, along with this their problems were addressed, and solutions provided. As pointed out by one of the teachers, “The facilitator generally sits throughout our class and observes how we are conducting it. Sometimes we are corrected then and there if we make any mistakes and at times we are told how something can be done in a better way. Generally, he discusses and provides feedback on how activities and group work etc. can be done in a better way in the meeting that we have afterwards.” Another teacher expressed his desire, “I wish he could come more often as I find his inputs and advice very useful.”
Two critical variables that affect the effectiveness of support provided by facilitators are the frequency of their visits and time spent in the classroom by them. In their role as a facilitator the Prajayatna staff is expected to visit each QLI school in their cluster twice a month. A little more than one third of the teachers stated that the facilitators visited their schools-classrooms either once a month or twice a month as is presented in the table 10 below. A few also reported that they came more than thrice a month. Thus, it is interesting to note that more than two third of teachers reported visits more than once a month and those who were interviewed were- satisfied, happy and felt comfortable and supported when the facilitators came to their classrooms.

**Table 10: Frequency of classroom visits by facilitators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Twice a month</th>
<th>Thrice in a month</th>
<th>More than thrice a month</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding teachers’ perception about the sufficiency of time spent by the facilitators for providing them the necessary amount of onsite support and guidance they required in implementing the QLI, 70.7% teachers felt it was sufficient, with 25.3% viewing it as somewhat sufficient.

**Table 11: Perception of teachers on time spent by facilitators in schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Somewhat sufficient</th>
<th>Not sufficient</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assess the usefulness of support provided by the PY facilitators on different aspects of the QLI approach, a list was provided in the questionnaire to the teachers who were then asked to rate the various aspects on a 4-point scale. Table 12 which is presented below indicates the perception of those teachers who responded to the question.

**Table 12: Usefulness of support provided by facilitators as perceived by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Aspects in QLI Implementation</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that each child participates and learns</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing activities to ensure each student learns by herself/himself</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching all subjects together</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students in mixed groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching without a textbook</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using concept mapping as a way of teaching</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including students with disabilities in the class</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Individual Education Plan for students with disability</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a portfolio for each student</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing and Providing feedback to students on a continuous basis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing capabilities of each student</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping for each student and tracking each child’s learning</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents in their child’s learning</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the following important findings:

- Nearly one third of the total number of teachers who responded found the support provided by facilitators useful to a large extent in most of the aspects critical to proper implementation of the QLI.
- The basic aspects of the QLI in which 40% to 54% teachers found the support provided by facilitators useful to a large extent were in:
  - ensuring that each child participates and learns (54.1%)
  - developing activities to ensure each student learns by herself/himself (50.7%)
  - using the concept map (41.7%) and
  - teaching all subjects together (41.1%)
- Three aspects in which support was perceived to be totally useful by 38% to 46.5% teachers were: maintaining a portfolio for each student, assessing and providing feedback to students on a continuous basis and teaching students in mixed groups.
- In those schools where there were children with disabilities enrolled 25% to 30% teachers reported finding the support provided useful to a large extent and 20% to 36% to some extent. It is to be noted that 11 and 7 teachers out of 43 reported that they did not find the support given at all useful in developing an IEP and also in including students with disabilities in the class.

What has been reported by teachers in the questionnaire is supported by the views and opinions of those teachers who were interviewed who categorically asserted that “we could do what all we are doing because of the continuous support and guidance provided by the facilitators. This has helped me a lot in implementing the different strategies and also using the IEP for children with disabilities. One teacher further specified that “the support was given to them not only in school but also in the monthly collective meetings held at the cluster level.”

All the four teachers who were interviewed appreciated the manner in which their respective facilitators had been supporting them particularly when the QLI was initiated and then mentored them providing onsite practical guidance in a simple experiential manner that was easily understood. They felt this had ‘helped them’, ‘improved their daily lesson plans and what they did in classes’. They could understand and see the mistakes made and ways to improve,’ and ‘how to engage students in a better way’ and “slowly understood the importance of understanding the needs of every child, thus one felt he had also “become sensitive to the needs of every child”.

### Section Summary

Teachers considered support and guidance provided by the Prajayatna learning facilitator as an important factor in translating the QLI vision and approach into effective classroom practice. In their role as a facilitator the Prajayatna staff is expected to visit each QLI school in their cluster twice a month. More than two third teachers reported that facilitators visited them more than once a month. During their visits, 70.7% teachers opined that the time they spent in their classrooms was sufficient, with 25.3% viewing it as somewhat sufficient. Those teachers who were interviewed were satisfied, happy and felt comfortable and supported when the facilitators came to their classrooms.

In most of the aspects critical to proper implementation of the QLI nearly one third of teachers reported their support to be useful to a large extent. Support was perceived to be totally useful by 38% to 46.5% teachers in maintaining a portfolio for each student, assessing and providing feedback to students on a continuous basis and teaching students in mixed groups. In the basic aspects that were new to teachers, three aspects were perceived to be totally useful by 38% to 46.5% teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintaining records and providing feedback to parents on their child’s progress</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>9.6</th>
<th>34.2</th>
<th>37.0</th>
<th>19.2</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| N  | 06 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 73 |%
| %  | 8.2 | 30.1 | 31.5 | 30.1 | 100 |
3.3. Teachers Understanding of QLI and Capabilities

In order to implement the QLI approach as intended it is important that teachers understand and are knowledgeable about the same for translating the approach into actual classroom practice. To assess teachers’ level of understanding about the QLI approach which would influence the way they implemented the processes in their classrooms, teachers were asked - to what extent do you agree that the QLI approach of learning promotes the aspects that are listed out below and a list of aspects were provided, which had to be rated on a 3-point scale.

**Table 13: Aspects promoted by the QLI approach as perceived by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Aspects of the QLI approach</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Learning through mixed age groups</td>
<td>N 03</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 4.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Integration of subjects</td>
<td>N 02</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 2.8</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Assessment of students through tests</td>
<td>N 13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 18.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Student learning and assessment as a unified process</td>
<td>N 04</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 5.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Integration of cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains</td>
<td>N 01</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 1.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Children learning through drill and repetition</td>
<td>N 02</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 2.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Children learn through different ways/learning styles</td>
<td>N 02</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 2.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Developing an Individual Education Plan for students with disabilities</td>
<td>N 02</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 3.4</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Student Learning based on textbooks only</td>
<td>N 21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 30.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing the progress of students</td>
<td>N 03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A list of 10 aspects were presented in the Teacher Questionnaire out of which three items (3, 6 and 9) were intentionally not in alignment with the QLI vision and approach. It was expected that teachers would tick mark the option “not to agree” for these items, whereas all the other 7 items were processes/aspects advocated in the QLI approach. The responses of teachers indicated that:

- The maximum number of teachers 63.5% and 58.6% totally agreed that the QLI approach promotes assessing the progress of students continuously and children’s learning through different ways and styles.
- A little more than 40% teachers opined that the approach facilitated processes of teaching subjects in an integrated manner and student learning through mixed age groups.
- It is interesting to note that some teachers 22% to 28% felt that it promoted student learning through textbooks and assessment of students through tests and also 43% perceived that it helped student learning through repetition and drill. This is unusual as the QLI approach does not focus on these aspects nor does it try to promote the same.
- 30% teachers have also reported that the approach does not facilitate student learning only through textbooks. Possibly these are those teachers who have understood the vision and strategies well.

The data indicates that all teachers do not appear to have a thorough understanding of the QLI approach and are thus at different levels of understanding which would affect their implementation in the classroom. Examining data related to teachers’ capabilities from the time the program was initiated to date (2016-2018), becomes important, as this has implications for future planning and success of the pilot. Thus, secondary data from PY of teacher’s capabilities in different areas of functioning which was viewed as important by PY was reviewed and analysed and is presented in the following sub section.
The six aspects highlighted in the bar graphs above are viewed by the Prajayatna organization as important and necessary for all teachers to possess and develop throughout the project period-2016-18, which shows an encouraging trend. On all six aspects there are a greater percentage of teachers who have moved from the lowest level i.e. evolving to the next level interested to the highest level.
involved. Out of the various aspects teachers’ capabilities have shown some increase from evolving to involved with the maximum percentage being in the interested category, in facilitation and improving the learning environment followed by planning.

The least progress is seen in their skills for evaluation of students and promoting community participation. This provides a base for planning training inputs and providing support and guidance by Prajayatna to teachers.

3.4. The Quality Learning Initiative: Classroom Implementation

This sub section focuses on assessing to what extent the QLI was implemented by the teachers as intended (refer to key features) through the delivery of inclusive, participatory educational practices and processes. Thus, important aspects such as classroom climate, classroom organization and management, teaching-learning practices and processes and assessment will be looked at in detail.

In the Questionnaire all the teachers were asked whether they had implemented the QLI exactly as was told to them by the Prajayatna. 81.8% stated that they were implementing the approach as intended (table 14) given below.

Table 14: Teachers implementation of QLI as intended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the QLI framework highlighted at the beginning of this section and observations of three classrooms for the full day a number of critical aspects are discussed below.

3.4.1 Classroom Environment

Classroom environment is being discussed in terms of physical and social environment keeping in view the needs and requirements of students enrolled at the primary level and the QLI creating an enabling conducive learning environment (safe, secure and comfortable). This is the basic prerequisite for providing quality education to all children. Classroom observations indicated that in all the three classes the classroom environment was comfortable and stimulating for realizing student’s learning. Nearly all the students were happy, busy and engaged in what they were doing throughout the day.

3.4.1.1. Physical and Social Environment
All the classrooms were spacious, fairly well lit and ventilated with adequate space for 5-6 groups of 6-7 children to be accommodated along with their teacher. There was sufficient space for both the teacher and students to move around and also to sit comfortably during the conduct of whole and smaller mixed group activities. There were hardly any displays, charts or children’s work visible in the classrooms. The teacher pupil ratio ranged between 1: 30/35 on the day of the visit, in the three classrooms. There was a provision of stationary to children and a variety of reading materials, which the consultant was informed had been provided by Prajayatna. This was perceived to by most of the teachers and students to be a factor that greatly promoted and facilitated greater student participation and involvement in different learning activities.

3.4.1.2. Teacher –student relationship

To a large extent the teachers’ behavior determines the kind of psycho-social environment provided to the child, thus the role of the teacher is particularly important at this stage of education. In the QLI programme developing and maintaining a strong, friendly, respectful and sensitive relationship between the teacher and students, is the most basic and important aspect for implementing the QLI approach.

Classroom observations indicated that teachers were friendly, sensitive and considerate to students. They listened patiently to what students had to say, motivating and encouraging every child to participate in different activities, including those with disabilities. It was interesting to note that children with disabilities were given more attention and a little more time in explaining things than other students. A positive feature being that all teachers attended to and answered questions asked by their students immediately as far as possible.

Teachers were also seen to call each child by his/her name throughout the day but this was more evident during the whole group activity. They were seen to generally welcome the students with a smile, praised their work if it was done well or correctly and even if the student/s had made mistakes they did not scold/yell/shout/make fun or ridicule them; rather they motivated the student/s to do better or redo the work. In all the three classrooms that were observed there was a child friendly, positive environment.

3.4.1.3. Student behavior

All the classroom observations revealed clearly that most of the students were happy, busy and actively participating in the tasks assigned to them both in groups and individually, by the teacher. Most of them were interacting with their teachers confidently, asking questions and were seen to be interested and involved in completing their tasks. A few had to be motivated and encouraged by the teacher to participate, ask and answer questions. Children with disabilities who were in the class were observed to be sitting quietly, looking at their peers working and trying to do what the teacher had asked them to. Other children were helping them wherever they could.

During the smaller mixed group activity a few children took on the lead role in their groups and after the task was completed made a presentation in front of the other groups. It was during the
IPT in two out of the three classrooms that some children sat around waiting to be given their assignment, three to four students just did what they wanted to, a few were coloring because they wanted to do this and not because they were told to. Generally, throughout the day students were engaged and did not make a noise or fight and disrupt the class. In two schools a few children tried to help children with disabilities to complete their work or wipe a child’s mouth as he was drooling. When they completed their work they took it to show it to the teacher and then handed their work to the teacher.

**Section Summary**

The classroom learning environment and climate in all three schools was seen to be enabling, child friendly and one that encouraged students to participate. Classes were well lit, ventilated, safe and secure though the flooring was uneven and dirty and ceiling was leaking, as it was raining during the visits.

All three teacher's behavior towards their children was friendly, positive and encouraging. There was a strong bond seen between the teacher and most of the students. Students were not scared or hesitant to ask or answer questions. Most of the students were observed to be happy, busy and engaged in their tasks, spoke confidently asked questions freely, made presentations and were seen to help their peers when necessary, from time to time even children who had disabilities.

More students were engaged in the whole and smaller mixed group work as compared to IPT. During individual work time, there were some children who sat around waiting to be given their assignment, three to four students just did what they wanted to, a few were coloring because they wanted to do this and not because they were told to.

### 3.4.2. Classroom Organization and Management

Every classroom that was visited had adequate sitting space available for all children. Mats had been provided for children to sit on with huge spaces available for whole group activities to be conducted inside the classrooms. However, the flooring was in a very poor condition and water was leaking from the ceiling and walls, as it was the monsoon season.

Materials largely stationary and books had been provided by the Prajayatna, which all the stakeholders (teachers, parents, students and government functionaries) perceived had helped students learn better and participate in writing, drawing, coloring and reading much more than before. The walls were bare, with no charts nor was any TLM despite the SSA being active for more than a decade. Teachers were happy that all the materials required for doing the tasks assigned to students were easily accessible to children for use during their activities/tasks.

The classrooms were also seen to be physically organized and arranged in such a way which promoted small group work and children engaging in various types of activities. Teachers shared that after the project had started a sustained and conscious effort was made by them to organize and conduct whole and smaller mixed group activities along with sufficient time for individual practice through child need and age specific tasks/activities. This was corroborated by the classroom observations across four schools. Children were seen to be engaged in whole, small
group and individual activities. Children were generally organized into large groups or whole class during the first part of the day, then into smaller mixed groups followed by individual work. A positive aspect observed was the smooth shifting of children from one activity to another without disrupting or creating unnecessary noise or confusion.

A variety of materials had also been developed by PY for teachers to use during their work which is appended in Appendix 7.

**Section Summary**

Teachers organized and arranged the classrooms in ways that promoted the use of whole group and smaller mixed group activities as was advocated in the QLI approach. The materials supplied by Prajayatna were reported to and observed to promote learning by students. The TLM was seen to be used optimally by students. Teachers, parents, students and government functionaries all appreciated the benefits of materials given by Prajayatna. Students were organized by teachers into whole, smaller mixed groups and then worked on their own.

### 3.4.3. Classroom Teaching- Learning Practices-Processes

The QLI approach places greater emphasis as one teacher put it - *on 'how' children learn rather than on 'what' they learn, although due importance is given to the learning of concepts, across all the subjects.* All the subjects namely- Hindi, English, EVS and Mathematics are expected to be taught in an integrated manner through pre-decided concepts and activities put together in a monthly plan developed by teachers, working in one cluster. To assess how often teachers were implementing these critical QLI aspects in their classrooms a list of 15 aspects were presented in the Teacher Questionnaire which each teacher had to fill. Each teacher was asked to respond as to *how often they conducted each of the aspects* that were listed out. Teachers’ responses are presented in four tables from Tables 15 a to d below. The first table 15 a. highlights that the concept map prepared in the collective meeting was used by 18.7% and 44% teachers on a daily basis and three to four times in a week respectively, which is encouraging. Teaching students through group work (whole/smaller) was being done by nearly half the number of teachers three to four times and 20% daily. Providing time to each student for individual work was also practiced by nearly half the number of teachers daily with 27.8% practiced these three to four times a week.

The findings thus indicate that the basic aspects that were expected to be implemented by teachers in the QLI were being transacted as reported by nearly half the number of teachers in the pilot program. This was corroborated by the classroom observations and in the interviews too.

**Table 15 a: Frequency of basic QLI aspects conducted by teachers**
Using a Concept Map to teach students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Three to four times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching through Group Work (Whole / Smaller groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Three to four times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>030.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing time to each student to do individual work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Three to four times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aspects to be followed for ensuring that all students are included in classroom teaching-learning are presented in Table 15 b. below. Ensuring participation of all students while they were working in groups including those with disabilities and paying attention to each student and encouraging each child to participate was reported to be practiced by 47% and 62% teachers on a daily basis, with 20% to 30% doing it practically the whole week. To promote student participation materials were used by majority of the teachers too. The weakest component that emerged was making adaptations / accommodations for students with disabilities, with 17% reporting they never did this and 23.4% doing it once a week.

Table 15 b: Frequency of aspects conducted by teachers for including all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Including All Aspects</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Three to four times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring participation of all students while working in groups including those with disabilities</td>
<td>N 05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 9.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making adaptations / accommodations for students with disabilities</td>
<td>N 08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 17.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to each student and encouraging them to participate</td>
<td>N 02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>047</td>
<td>075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 2.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using different materials to teach students</td>
<td>N 10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 13.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment related practices integral and critical to the pedagogy of the QLI as highlighted in the table 15c below were being practiced on a daily basis by one third of the number of teachers, with more than half observing what students were doing and providing feedback to them. Documentation was practiced by 31% teachers on a weekly basis.

Table 15 c: Frequency of aspects related to student assessment conducted by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment related Aspects</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Three to four times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment related Aspects</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Three to four times a week</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observing each child to see how she/he is learning and then providing feedback | N | 8 | 24 | 40 | 72 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sharing and reviewing the progress of each student | N | 18 | 31 | 24 | 73 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintaining each student’s portfolio | N | 3 | 29 | 19 | 19 | 70 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documenting the progress of each student | N | 3 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 71 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Giving feedback to each student on the work she/he has done | N | 12 | 21 | 42 | 75 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were three aspects included intentionally to explore to what extent teachers were if at all still practicing them. These aspects were not in alignment with the QLI approach and are presented in table 15 d below. Teachers’ responses, however, indicated that firstly, majority of teachers (68%) reported that they were still teaching English Hindi and Mathematics separately either on a daily basis or three to four times a week, whereas the QLI was promoting an integrated concept based approach. A possible reason for this might be that though the concepts are taught in an integrated manner, language and math concepts are reiterated during the IPT where the teachers might have the understanding that they are teaching separately. Secondly, 82% teachers reported that they were using the state textbook either daily or three to four times a week. Thirdly, a slightly lower percentage of teachers (47%) were assessing students’ progress through tests. This is corroborated through the interviews with four teachers who revealed that they and other teachers were still occasionally practicing the traditional ways of teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15 d: Frequency of teachers using aspects not in alignment with the QLI approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspects not in QLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English, Hindi and Maths separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the students’ progress 3-4 times in a year through tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the state text book to teach students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the classroom observations it was noted that all the three teachers were seen to adopt a child centered, participatory, activity based methodology in classroom transaction. Two of the teachers were seen to interact much more with their students as compared to the other two. The more active teachers were also seen to encourage children to participate much more, conversing...
with and motivating them to choose different activities. The excerpts below highlight teacher’s views about the new QLI approach.

- “We were used to teach by using the textbook and blackboard most of the time after the QLI started we are using group work a lot and also TLM to teach students through activities which is very effective.” *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

- “At times I still teach in the old way you know what I mean but I like teaching all the subjects together through the QLI strategy as with activities and play way methods children enjoy and learn quickly. Since English is new it helps a lot.” *(Teacher from Chitrakoot)*

- “I never knew it was so important to give attention to every child and that even CWD could learn. Also how continuous assessment helps in planning for each student’s learning. The children also like putting the work they have done into Files”. *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

The four teachers who were interviewed highlighted that the project had promoted *much better lesson planning than before* besides developing a broad monthly plan jointly in the monthly collectives, a daily lesson plan was also being developed by them individually. The consultant was informed that a lesson plan format has been provided by Prajayatna to help teachers put their daily plan into an ‘*easy to follow framework*’. Documentary evidence corroborates this. They also shared that- *subjects are not taught separately, concepts are used though the syllabus, state textbooks and desired learning outcomes are all focused on and referred to during the monthly collective meetings*. Depending on the creativity of the teacher, various applications of the concept were seen to be made to different subjects in different ways. Teachers shared their experiences regarding the new QLI way of teaching as presented below:

- “I am more confident now while speaking with students and have started planning better and much more in detail so that I can keep my students engaged meaningfully throughout the day.” *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

- “I have learnt how important it is to use many activities to help children learn one concept, as I have seen that this reinforces the learning of that concept better. This along with letting them do things themselves and showing them so they experience it is very important.” *(Teacher from Chitrakoot)*

- “I was surprised to see that both whole group and small group work really kept students busy and involved and at times they also helped each other. I find they are learning faster and are more confident. Imagine my children actually present the work that they have done. I did not think children could do this.” *(Teacher from Chitrakoot)*

- “We have stopped using textbooks as it is already in our plan but at times we do use it. Also in this way of teaching we are supposed to assess continuously but it takes time. We do give tests to our children.” *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

What was reported and shared by teachers was also corroborated during the classroom observations in three schools. The strategies seen to be used and practiced were found to be broadly following a similar pattern which has been highlighted in the box below. As detailed out in the box below a number of teaching-learning strategies were seen to be adopted by the
teachers within an activity based, child centered participatory approach such as whole group and smaller mixed group work, questioning, student presentations, story-telling. An important aspect being promoted was that of self-learning. Children were seen to acquire knowledge and skills through their own efforts and that of their groups, with a lot of discussion and team work in the smaller mixed age groups being facilitated by the teachers. What was observed in all the three classrooms was that children were actively participating in different types of activities. They were learning by doing things themselves and thereby experiencing. More importantly, every activity that was being done had a purpose behind it.

### A Day in the QLI Classroom

**Session I: Whole Group Activity:** In the morning, in all the three classroom settings that were observed it was seen that all the children were engaged by their respective teachers who were more like facilitators leading the whole-group activity. This session provided a broad, conceptual introduction to the topic being dealt with. Children were seen to be sitting in a large semi-circle in front of the teacher, who introduced the particular concept which was discussed later on. All the teachers then facilitated a discussion about and around the concept, through the use of the blackboard and questioning. Teachers were seen to address students by their names, involve as many students as possible while questioning or asking them to do a small activity. As one teacher asserted *this will allow the students to develop an interest in the topic, internalize and relate the concept to things they know and are familiar with too.* Another teacher highlighted that *it leads to associations with other concepts.*

**Session II: Small Mixed Group Activity:** After the whole group discussion was over, the teacher divided the students into smaller groups, around 4 to 6 groups each with roughly 5 - 7 students. The groups consisted of children of different ages and differing abilities. Each group was given a separate task to work on. The objective of the small group activity as explained by teachers during the interviews was to *help learners discuss, reflect, re-evaluate and engage with the concept in greater depth. They work together on different tasks and share their ideas with peers.* All the tasks address various aspects of the topic. After the task, each group presented their work in front of the other groups. The teachers were seen to promote active participation by the other groups by encouraging students to ask questions and give their opinions. Teachers shared that this way of teaching helped *promote student’s confidence, team work, leadership qualities and sharing with others.*

**Session III: Individual Practice Time (IPT)** Towards the end of the day, students were given individual tasks to do based on their learning levels as perceived by the teacher. The teacher went around the class monitoring and assisting students. The individual practice time allows children to develop skills and accumulate knowledge at their own pace and based on their own style of learning. More importantly as one teacher highlighted *it allows me to provide individual attention to students.*

It is notable to mention that one teacher did the IPT the next day as the time was not sufficient.
Teachers reported that the different strategies and participatory methodology had led to a shift and several changes in the classroom teaching-learning processes between 2016-2018. These are highlighted in the box below.

**POST THE QLI PROGRAM**

**I. Greater focus of teachers on:**
- Paying more attention to each child.
- Planning teaching-learning according to every child’s needs levels of learning and progress.
- Attempting to understand the background and needs of each child especially children with disabilities.

**II. Teaching-learning processes incorporated more:**
- Motivating and encouraging students to interact in groups and work in teams.
- Conducting more small group activities

**III. Assessment practices:**
- Provide regular feedback to students. Students learn better and progress is seen to take place.
- Focus on observing, documenting and analyzing children’s behavior and learning and planning for improvement—through use of Files and other tools provided by Prajayatna.

**IV. Teacher-student relationship**
- Closer relationship with and better understanding of students.
- Students interested in doing tasks and want to explore are curious and learn faster.

Two of the teachers who were interviewed from Bahraich and Chitrakoot summed up the overall effect of the QLI very succinctly as under:

- *After Prajayatna I have become more confident as I know I am doing good work and feel happy that things are happening by which I mean students are learning. I can now conduct more activities, keep students engaged and busy doing meaningful work. I feel I am actually...*
working for quality that we have been talking about for so many years. (Teacher from Bahraich)

- This was my first posting as a teacher, I always thought that the village children did not know anything so what will I do with my knowledge and education, it is of no use. But I can now teach in so many different ways. I find it easier to understand and relate to children and keep them happy and that too for the whole day. They are also learning well. (Teacher from Chitrakoot)

### Section Summary

As reported by most of the teachers and corroborated by the classroom observations an integrated curriculum and generally no textbooks were used while teaching which was in line with the QLI approach. A daily plan was also followed by teachers based on their monthly plan and concept map. The three main teaching strategies used as reported by half the number of teachers and observed in the classroom observations that were used were- whole group, smaller mixed age groups and Individual Practice Time. Thus all the components detailed out in the QLI implementation framework were being largely followed, by most teachers.

68% reported that they were still teaching English Hindi and Mathematics separately either on a daily basis or three to four times a week. 82% teachers reported that they were using the state textbook either daily or three to four times a week with 47% teachers assessing students’ progress through tests.

The weakest component that emerged was making adaptations / accommodations for students with disabilities, with 17% reporting they never did this and 23.4% doing it once a week.

### 3.5. Student Assessment

In the QLI approach assessment is visualized as both continuous and comprehensive and is viewed as integral to the QLI approach to be realized as a collaborative process in which the students, parents and teachers are to be involved. As explained by the facilitators and Chief Functionary - all the students are to be assessed continuously throughout the year using four levels, viz., evolving, involving, interested and self-directed, with self-directed being considered the “best” level. Student assessments should reflect not only the academic aspects but also other aspects and dimensions of behavior. Thus in the QLI assessments are visualized as more holistic focusing on -not only academic performance and progress but all round development of each student.

Out of a total number of 65 out of 75 teachers who responded to whether they undertook student assessment continuously or periodically, 77% reported that it was done by them on a continuous
and regular basis. A greater number of teachers from Bahraich district (86.7%) reported doing so as compared to Chitrakoot (68.6%), as is indicated in the table below.

**Table 16: Frequency of Assessment Undertaken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Periodic</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, after assessment a little more than one third of the teachers (35.1%) undertook consolidation and recording of the same on a daily basis (table 17), whereas 31.1% were doing it on a weekly basis, with 13.5% and 16.2% once in two to four months and biannually respectively.

**Table 17: Frequency of Recording Student Assessment by Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Once in two - four months</th>
<th>Bi-annually</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While undertaking student assessment teachers are expected to use the three Prajayatna tools (Refer to Appendices 8a & b) provided by the organization for assessing student learning and progress, which are highlighted in the box below

**Prajayatna Student Assessment Tools**

**Tool No: I. Ongoing Portfolio**
All the work each child does is consolidated in a file/folder, which is maintained by the teacher.

**Tool No: II. Teacher Observation Book**
This contains a monthly evaluation of children across different skills.
All the teachers reported that they knew about the tools and nearly all (92.3% to 94.3%) were also using them, as indicated in Table 18 below.

### Table 18: Teachers reporting of Tools used for Assessing Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Teacher Observation Booklet</th>
<th>Ongoing Portfolio</th>
<th>Progress Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When questioned about provision and frequency of feedback to students after assessment most of them in both districts reported that they gave feedback to all students and 76.9% were doing this on a continuous basis, as presented in Table 19 below.

### Table 19: Provision and frequency of feedback to students by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Provision of Feedback after assessment</th>
<th>Frequency of Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With specific regard to children with disabilities, it is interesting to note that 58.5% teachers reported that it was *not easy* to assess them, with more teachers (70.8%) in Chitrakoot reporting
having difficulties as compared to those from Bahraich (48.3%). It is to be noted that not all schools in the four clusters have children with disabilities enrolled and attending their classes.

Table 20: Perceived Level of difficulty in assessing children with disabilities by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Not easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative data analysis

The qualitative data collected through the three classroom observations and interviews with four teachers, does not corroborate or support what was reported by majority of the teachers in the Teacher Questionnaire with regard to student assessment. During all three classroom observations it was noted that the teachers were moving around observing and interacting with children while they were engaged in different activities, especially during the Individual Practice Time. However, none of the teachers were observed to be noting down or recording anything either during or after the class was over. However, since this was undertaken only once the observation needs to be interpreted with caution.

All the three teachers who classrooms were observed and interviews taken, reported that the observations of their students made by them were recorded at the end of the day or later on in the week. As one of them shared with the Consultant,

- “We know our children well and we generally observe only 2-3 of them every day. Even this is a little difficult to do as we have to keep the other students engaged. There is not much time left to record our observations at the end of the day”

The second teacher explained that- “it is mainly each student’s individual files/portfolios that give us an idea of the changes and progress in children’s learning”

The third shared that – “these files are also shown to the parents by them during parent-teacher meetings and is something that all the students, parents and even NPRCCs feel are very useful and prove that students are actually doing something”

The fourth teacher explained that – “using the tools took time and they did not have so much time, but both the portfolios and Observations finally led to preparing and filling up the Progress Card”

On further probing, a deeper insight and understanding of the actual situation and problems they face was shared which is revealed through the excerpts below:
- A format has been given for recording the observation for each child. However, I find this difficult to do with so many students in the class and also planning for and coordinating what group work and tasks to give during IPT. I try to do this during IPT. (Teacher from Bahraich)

- We come to know whether each child is learning through their files. All the work they do is kept there so it is easy. The Progress card is filled up twice a year. This April we got something new which is easier and quicker to fill up and complete which is good as all this takes a lot of time. Sometimes I do not understand exactly what it means and how I should rate the child. (Teacher from Chitrakoot)

- Before Prajayatna came students gave exams every 3-4 months, but that is not of much use. Continuous assessment like it is being done now is useful as time to time feedback is given to students and we and their parents know the child’s progress also. But I do not note down all the time. It is difficult as it takes time. (Teacher from Bahraich)

- The entire way of teaching and continuous assessment is good and needs to be done. But all this takes a lot of time even for a small break. Also I think we need training on assessing children with disabilities. (Teacher from Chitrakoot)

Two of the teachers shared that the skills considered for Class 3 include all the skills prescribed as per the state curriculum such as writing, simple math skills and shapes (procedural skills). These skills are assessed and the student’s level is recorded in the Teacher Observation Book. In addition, there are another major set of skills that are assessed also by teachers i.e. the process skills. However, this takes time, and though useful it is difficult to assess every child once a month. Also recording students’ progress on the different aspects and levels was a little difficult to do.

One teacher referring to the assessment of children with disabilities shared that initially they too were also assessed as were the other students but the progress card was changed by Prajayatna and a new version was given to us in April 2018. That is better.

What is interesting to note is that though none of the teachers’ mentioned that the progress card also contained their observations on other abilities of the student which are more cognitive and social, in nature such as- problem solving, observation, application, working in a group, analytic skills etc., the child’s interest in sports, arts, theatre and behavioral attributes; they were assessing their students on all these parameters. This is corroborated by documentary evidence.

#### Section Summary

Three fourths of the teachers reported that student assessment was done on a continuous and regular basis, generally through observation of students. All the teachers reported that they knew about the different tools and that nearly all of them were also using the tools. They all reported maintaining the Teacher Observation Book, each student’s file, documented each child work and also filled up the Progress Card.

Classroom observations, however, revealed that though all were moving around observing and interacting with children while they were engaged in different activities, none of them were noting down or recording students’ progress either during or after the class was over. Files however, were maintained in all three schools and appreciated by all the major stakeholders as a useful way of getting to know students’ progress and also it gave proof of their learning.

Providing feedback to students after assessment was reported by most teachers and 76.9% reported doing this on a continuous basis. Classroom observations revealed that teachers were providing verbal feedback generally during IPT and presentations.

Documentation and recording was reported by one third of the teachers on a daily basis whereas the same number were doing it on a weekly basis, with 13.5% and 16.2% once in two to four days.
In conclusion an attempt was made to find out if the teachers working in the QLI pilot schools felt that the QLI approach had proved to be useful to them as teachers. 67.1% found the approach to be very useful with 27.4% finding it somewhat useful for them as teachers (table 21). This was so despite the approach being quite different from the traditional way of teaching in schools, before the pilot was launched in 2016.

Table 21: Perceived usefulness of the QLI approach as reported by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>A little useful</th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to assessing how useful teachers perceived the QLI approach to be, they were also questioned on the effectiveness of the QLI program in improving the learning levels of children. Out of the 69 teachers who responded, 70.6% and 77.1% from Bahraich and Chitrakoot districts respectively as indicated in the table below, perceived that the QLI approach adopted by them in their classroom teaching-learning was effective to a great extent on improving their students’ learning. What is interesting to note is that not even one teacher in the pilot opined that the QLI approach was not effective in improving their student’s learning levels.

Table 22: Effectiveness of QLI in improving the learning levels of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Effective to some extent</th>
<th>Effective to a great extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning levels of students without disabilities

It is against this background, the effectiveness of the Prajayatna QLI program was evaluated through examining the data collected by PY based on their own indicators and learning levels for both students with and without disabilities in the 75 QLI schools from 2016 to 2018. This section only focuses on children without disabilities and their learning levels for 2016, 2017 and 2018 which is presented through a series of bar graphs below. This does not include children with disabilities their learning levels are presented in Section II of this chapter. The learning levels were measured by PY annually very year during the project period of 2016 to 2018. For the three subjects namely Hindi, English and Maths students could be placed at four levels from the lowest evolving to interested to involved and the highest self-directed.

For the 8 abilities identified as important by PY namely ability to recall, compare, observe, question, evaluation, analysis, application, comprehension and understanding there are three levels that students can be placed in. These levels are - need exposure (the lowest), need support and independent the highest level.

Table 23: Progress in the Learnings Levels of Children in QLI Schools (2016 to 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Hindi in 2016, more than 50% of the students were at the lowest level – evolving in all the three skills of speaking, reading and writing. By 2018 the numbers had reduced in this category to a range of 12% to 24.2% which shows reasonable progress.

Students at the interested level in the three skills increased in numbers from a range of 27.7% to 33.4% in 2016 to a range of 47% to 49.3% in 2018.

An almost negligible number of students 3.9%, 5.2% and 7.4% were at the self-directed level in the skills of writing, reading and speaking in 2018.
In English, in 2016, the maximum number of students 64.3% to 69.4% were at the lowest level - *evolving* in all three skills of speaking, reading and writing. Between 2016 and 2018 across the three skills, students at the lowest level-*evolving* reduced from the range of 64.3% to 69.4% to a range of 43.6% to 45.6%, which shows some progress.

Students at the *interested* level in the three skills increased in numbers from 20% to 24.2% range in 2016 to a range of 46.2% to 48.2% in 2018.

*An almost negligible number of students .7%, .8% and 1.0% were at the self–directed level in the skills of writing, reading and speaking in 2018.*

In Maths in 2016 the maximum number of children 80.49% were at the lowest level – *evolving*. In 2016 There were 14% and 3% children respectively in the interested and involved levels of learning which increased to 39% and 8% in 2018, which indicates that they are slowly moving to the higher learning levels. *A negligible number of students 1.8% were at the self–directed level in 2018.*
In the basic ability of observation in 2016 maximum number of students (78%) were at the lowest level - need exposure, with only 17.3% at the second level of need support and 4% at the independent level.

Over the three-year project period, there was a reduction of children at the lowest level from 78.7% in 2016 to 33.7%. In 2016, from 17.3% in the need support category the percentage went up to 58.9% which is more than double the number of students. At the start in 2016 there were 97 students at the independent level which increased to 300 in 2018. This shows progress as students are moving to the higher level.

In 2016, 75% were in the need exposure level with 19% at need support in their ability to recall. By 2018, from 75% students had reduced to 32% which shows quite a lot of improvement in their learning. By 2018, 52% were in the need support level and 10% independent. There were only 5.2% children at the highest independent learning levels in 2016 which went up to 10% by 2018. Progress of students in their learning levels for this ability is better than in others.

In the ability to compare, in 2016 the maximum number of students (77.8%) were at the lowest level - need exposure, with only 16.3% at the second level of need support and 0% at the independent level.

In the ability to question in 2016 maximum number of students (85.3%) were at the lowest level - need exposure, with only 11.4% at the second level of need support and 0% at the independent level.
support and 5.9% at the independent level.

Over the three-year project period, there was a reduction of children at the lowest level need exposure from 77.8% in 2016 to 38.4%. In 2016, from 16.3% in the need support category the percentage went up to 53.2% which is more than three times the number of students. At the start in 2016 there were 5.9% students at the independent level which increased to 8.4% in 2018. This shows progress as students are moving to the higher level.

In comprehension and understanding levels of students, in 2016 the maximum number of students (88.7%) were at the lowest level- need exposure, with only 8.1% at the second level of need support and 3.2% at the independent level.

Over the three-year project period, there was a reduction of children at the lowest level need exposure from 88.7% in 2016 to 49%. There was only a 13% increase in the need support category between 2016 and 2018. At the independent level, in 2016 there were 3.2% students which hardly increased in 2018. In this ability progress was slower than in other abilities.

**Figure 8: Learning Levels- Comprehension/Understanding**

In application, in 2016 the maximum number of students (89.9%) were at the lowest level- need exposure, with only 8.4% at the second level of need support and 1.7% at the independent level.

Over the three-year project period, there was a reduction of children at the lowest level need exposure from 89.9% in 2016 to 56.9% in 2018. At the second level the need support category the percentage went up from 8.4% to 40.6% in 2018 which is five times the number of students in 2016. At the start in 2016 there were only 1.7% students at the independent level which hardly increased to 2.5% in 2018. In this ability as in comprehension and understanding the progress was slower than in other abilities.

**Figure 9: Learning Levels- Application**
The learning graph for students’ ability to do analysis does not indicate a lot of progress, as in 2016 there were 89.5% children in the need exposure level which in 2018 only reduced by 26%. In 2018 there were still nearly two third of the total number of children in the need exposure category. Children who could work independently were almost negligible at 1.2% and 1.8% in 2016 and 2018 respectively.

The learning graph for students’ ability to evaluate also does not indicate a lot of progress, as in 2016 there were 90% children in the need exposure level which in 2018 only reduced by 23%. In 2018 there were still more than two third children in the need exposure category. Children who could work independently were almost negligible at 2.2% in 2016 and 1.4% in 2018.

Prajayatna also focusses on developing positive attitudes amongst students in five aspects namely relating to peers, sensitive to environment, using time effectively, responsibility towards task and working in a team. Students’ learning in these aspects is assessed at three levels: evolving, interested and involved. Figure 12 presented below highlights the learning levels of students in QLI schools for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018.
In 2016, students at the lowest evolving level ranged between 43.4% in working in a team to a maximum of 75.2% in using time effectively.

In 2016 at the second level of learning-interested, there were a minimum number of 20.2% students in using time effectively with a maximum of 47% in the attitude of working as a team. These numbers went up in 2018 to a minimum of 47.8% (relating to peers) to a maximum of 67.3% in working as a team. Students have doubled over time indicating good progress within this level.

Those children at the highest involved level were in the range of 4.6% (using time effectively) to 10.9% (relating to peers). By 2018 children in this category had only increased a little to a range of a minimum of 12.8% in responsibility towards a task to maximum of 25.7% in relating to peers. This does not indicate much progress.

Section Summary

On examining the data collected by Prajayatna on students learning levels for 2016, 2017 and 2018 for children without disabilities it is clear that there were no children in the QLI schools in the baseline i.e. 2016 and end line 2018 in the self-directed learning level which in Prajayatna is the highest level. In the second highest level of learning i.e. independent there were a minimum number in all the abilities that were evaluated across the three years. However, there has been movement of students from one level to the next, especially an appreciable increase is seen in the categories of need support for abilities and interested for subjects. In conclusion, the data on learning levels of students without disabilities does not corroborate with the positive opinion of teachers about the effectiveness of the approach in improving the learning levels of children.
Nearly all the teachers further opined that the QLI program should continue in the state of Uttar Pradesh in the future and also wanted it to be replicated and up scaled to the entire district.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Overall the QLI project was being implemented as intended in the pilot schools as reported by teachers and observed. Teachers appear to be knowledgeable about the QLI, and more importantly most of them as reported by the Prajayatna staff, NPRCCs and other government functionaries are transacting the approach into effective teaching-learning processes within their classrooms. Students are reported to be attending more regularly and learning.

The approach has promoted systematic monthly and daily lesson planning and preparation through the monthly teacher’s collectives. This component was acknowledged unanimously by all major stakeholders to be the most useful and beneficial aspect of the program; and was appreciated by one and all. Another factor that promoted QLI implementation as specified by teachers was the onsite support provided by facilitators. It was looked upon as useful but a sizeable number of teachers expected it to be more effective.

Most teachers reported and it was also observed that a child centered, participatory activity based methodology was being used in classrooms. Three of the main QLI strategies were adopted namely- whole group, smaller mixed age groups and individual practice time by all the teachers generally on a daily basis. Most teachers reported that they were attempting to engage all the children in their class including those with disabilities in different activities. Materials provided by Prajayatna were used by students during their tasks and activities which helped promote their learning.

Assessment was reported by most teachers to be undertaken continuously but not seen to be practiced during classroom observation. Interviews revealed that teachers found it challenging as it was time consuming especially recording and documentation. Individual student portfolios/ files were reported to be useful and liked by all the major stakeholders in particular parents and government officials.

What emerges from the qualitative data collected is that the programme has impacted and has led to visible positive changes in students, classrooms, schools and in some of the teachers too. However, the learning levels of students assessed by PY annually in 2016, 2017 and 2018 does not show much of an increase in the learning levels of children. The data reveals an appreciable in the interested and need support categories for the three subjects and abilities respectively. However, there are hardly any students at the independent or self -directed levels of performance in the three subjects and different abilities being developed through the QLI program by teachers.

In conclusion, 67.1% teachers found the QLI approach to be very useful with 27.4% finding it somewhat useful for them as teachers Nearly all of them opined that the QLI program should continue in the state of Uttar Pradesh in the future and also wanted it to be replicated and up scaled to the entire district.
**Dreams Can Come True**

“My disabled child’s life has changed. Imagine he goes to school daily and is happy. The children in the school no longer make fun of him, in fact a few help him to do work and are ready to sit with him. His behavior has improved and he wants to go to school, first we had to force him.”

These are the words of the father of a child with cerebral palsy who belongs to village Pachkhora in Asoha cluster in Chitrakoot district. The father is a farmer and mother a housewife. The child has five siblings -four sisters and one brother who died recently. The father is the sole breadwinner with an annual income of Rs. 24,000/- with which he takes care of the whole family. The mother shared that - *we knew there was something wrong with him from birth itself, he cannot speak at all, drools continuously and has a problem in walking too.* She was worried that *in the past one year things have become more complicated as the child has been suffering from fits too.*

The Prajayatna team came to know about the child when they conducted a survey in the village in 2016 to identify children with disabilities using the State SCERT Checklist. Three children with disabilities were identified in Pachkhora out of which two were going to school whereas this child was out of school. The parents were quite surprised that a man (PY facilitator for the QLI program) made a number of home visits to meet us. *He convinced us to send our child to school.* As the parents shared- *we were not at all keen as he used to drool and other children always used to make fun of him.* However, after a number of visits and discussion with the facilitator the parents agreed. The father said this was simply because *Sir, tried to understand our child’s needs and problems and we tried to find a solution to his drooling.*

The facilitator also interacted with the school teachers to convince them to let the child come to school as they were not at all keen that he should be enrolled in their school. The teachers were of the opinion that he will not be able to learn anything in the school and will only be a nuisance. They were also of the opinion that since they *were not trained to handle such children, it would be better not to enroll him in the school.* After a lot of insistence, the facilitators were able to convince the teachers and he was allowed to enroll in the school.

The child was finally enrolled in January 2017. In the beginning, due to his severe drooling problem many children not want to sit near him. In addition, the teacher highlighted that *at first he was disruptive, extremely naughty showed no interest in doing anything or listening to anyone. He only enjoyed doing physical activity.* The teacher called the parents to discuss and together identify ways of dealing with this situation. It was decided by all of them that he required certification and a tricycle for him to commute to school and back home. It was decided...
that the teacher would try to involve the child in activities, communicating to him through actions and one of the parents would come to drop and pick him up. This would also help in the teacher being able to discuss anything if he wanted to with them.

As the parents shared—there are so many things that helped my son and us too. What can I say— the visits by Sir, our attending the certification and medical camps, being given the tricycle to bring him to school, the role of the Prajayatna facilitator in our finally agreeing to enroll him, and teacher also and jointly deciding what to do for him with us. Now even the attitude of the other children has changed towards him. He has made friends in the school and some children help him in doing things in class.

**TODAY:** “We are much happier and so is our child”.

**How did this happen?** Let us try to understand the background and processes adopted by Prajayatna for providing inclusive education to children with disabilities in the sub-sections that follow.

### 2.1. Background: Special focus of Prajayatna on Children with Disabilities

With a view to addressing the evaluation question stated above in an objective and systematic manner it was necessary to understand the reason from Prajayatna for including children with disabilities in the pilot. The Chief Functionary highlighted that in their quest to ensure that all children have access to quality education, Prajayatna realized based on their earlier field experiences in Kalikayatna, that, despite the Right to Education Act and different policies there were some children who were being completely ignored by the system and we are getting left out. These were largely those children with disabilities. The work of Prajayatna across different states clearly indicated to them that, the program suffers from lack of quality intervention for children with disabilities on the ground due to a number of reasons. These include a lack of awareness and enthusiasm on the part of both community and government officials (including teachers), lack of resources, lack of knowledge about children with disabilities, deep seated negative attitudes and biased beliefs about them and also socio-religious aspects.

Further, two members of the Prajayatna team, expressed their concern that despite the mandate of The Right to Education (RtE) Act stating that education is free and compulsory for all children of 6 to 14 years of age, all children with disabilities are still not enrolled and even if in school are not provided meaningful education nor are learning. One member highlighted that - the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) programme has adopted the zero rejection policy and there are interventions in place for promoting and strengthening inclusive education for Children with Special Needs (CWSN) such as- identification, functional and formal assessment, provision of aids and appliances, teacher training, resource support, preparation and use of Individual Education Plan (IEP) amongst others. Yet the ground reality reveals that there are still a significant number of these children left out of the formal schooling system and they also have no provision for either special schooling or home based education.
Based on the policy directives and ground situation Prajayatna in the QLI pilot in Uttar Pradesh decided to consciously focus on children with disabilities by addressing issues faced by them through multiple strategies/processes at every level in the system. Prajayatna is thus striving towards realizing universal enrolment and providing meaningful education to children with disabilities in government primary schools through the existing governance education structures of the government especially the Gram Panchayats and SMCs to ensure that schools become a conducive place for learning for all children especially those with disabilities. Thus the organization is working towards ensuring that the QLI pilot becomes truly inclusive in its approach.

The different strategies and processes adopted by the organization are detailed out below.

**2.2. Processes adopted for Including Children with Disabilities in QLI schools**

**2.2.1. Identification of children with disabilities**

For children with disabilities a beginning was made with Prajayatna initiating the first important step i.e. identification of children with disabilities despite data being available at the district level. This however, was not found to be reliable thus the staff themselves undertook a house to house survey in the four QLI project clusters. The main objective was to create a proper database of children with disabilities. Finally, a total number of 175 children were identified by the organization between 2016-2018, as is presented in the table 24 below. Out of the 175 children who were identified, 65 children were enrolled in schools by the Prajayatna team.

Another initiative taken by the PY was developing a format for obtaining information about the child entitled- *Information about children with special needs* (Appendix 9). Important aspects about the child and parental background, type of disability, issues faced, enrolment status, certification, camps attended, need for aids/assistive devices and if given were tapped. This was found to be useful in planning the future course of action by PY for each child with disability.

The team observed that initially, apart from the 65 children who were enrolled into QLI schools due to the efforts by Prajayatna, there were some who had been identified earlier on, were on the school records, but were extremely irregular in attending school. This was because both parents and teachers did not feel the need for ensuring that they go regularly to and attend school. As reported by three members of the Prajayatna team, most of the teachers were very explicit in stating that they were not able to deal with these children if they were to come regularly to school. They were also not confident to teach, a few believed that these children would not learn even if they came to school. This was an issue that the team felt required to be addressed on a priority basis especially those enrolled in classes 1 to 4 which are covered under the QLI.
Table 24: Identification and Enrolment of children with disabilities in Chitrakoot and Baraich (2016-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Inclusion of Children with Disabilities</th>
<th>Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Bahraich</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Survey of children with disabilities by Prajayatna for creation of database. (Children in the age group of 3 to 18 years)</td>
<td>47 (LEGD)</td>
<td>24 (LEGD)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enrolment of children with disabilities by Prajayatna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children with disabilities (Out of School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prajayatna Records

During the interviews with the Prajayatna staff and FGDs with parents of children with disabilities from the 4 schools and SMC members from 8 schools some reasons for these children not going to school were shared such as- children with disabilities requiring a high level of support not being able to commute to school on their own or with their parents help, or are not capable of sitting up in class due to physical and mental disabilities or have multiple disabilities. This highlights the need for planning alternative measures to provide them quality education and also a better quality of life. This calls for networking with the government departments to plan each child’s specific need based rehabilitation program.

2.2.2. Promoting enrolment of children with disabilities

Once children with disabilities had been identified the next challenge was to ensure their enrolment and also regular attendance. This was an important aim of the PY project. To achieve this, it was realized by the Prajayatna staff that they needed to adopt a dual approach which called for simultaneously interacting with both teachers and parents of children with disabilities, to change their fears, negative attitudes and beliefs about these children going to schools. This involved working closely with the parents of these children, to convince and support them in enrolling and ensuring that they attend school regularly and the concerned teachers to allow them to come to school.

Generating Awareness and Sensitizing Teachers

In enrolling children with disabilities in schools, Prajayatna staff members shared that initially admission of children with disabilities in schools was a major hurdle as teachers complained that they- are not properly trained to take care of children with disabilities and do not feel confident
enough to teach them. In addition, two of the teachers in the interviews also highlighted that the necessary infrastructure required for education of such children was not available in their schools and they did not have so much time to give special attention to them. The program staff worked tirelessly in making teachers understand the need for including children with disabilities. As one PY staff elaborated – I told them that they are capable of learning, maybe slowly but they can and they too have a right to coming to school and learn and mixing with other children. We will work with you in developing the IEPs which will provide the necessary action plan as well.

One strategy that emerged as central to all the work undertaken by PY for children with disabilities in all the four clusters was the conduct of home visits, by the Prajayatna team members.

2.2.3. Conduct of Home Visits

The conduct of home visits was perceived and proved to be the most effective way of sensitizing, motivating and involving parents in improving the lives of their children with disabilities. The Prajayatna staff working in both the districts highlighted that frequent home visits and spending time with the families of these children in particular parents helped them in achieving a number of objectives that are presented in the box below.

### Perceptions of Prajayatna team on the Advantages of Conducting Home Visits

- Identification of children with disabilities and understanding their background, needs and requirements
- Generating awareness amongst parents about the needs, schemes, provisions and type of disability their child has.
- Providing support to parents once their children are enrolled
- Providing information about camps, check –ups, certification etc.
- Developing a bond between the school teacher, parents and SMCs.
- Assessing the performance of children with disabilities and working out an action plan for the future

During the home visits a rapport was established with the parents and they felt that someone cared enough to visit them, provide information and finally convince them to send their children to school. The importance, value and effectiveness of home visits was fully endorsed by parents, department officials and the Pradhans who were all appreciative of the time and effort that the Prajayatna team spent on conducting home visits. The excerpts below taken from the interactions with parents of disabled children highlight their appreciation and the value they attach to this simple yet effective strategy:

- A lady came with the Prajayatna Sir to visit me at home. She spent time with us and asked us about my son. She also told me and my husband what we should and should not do with him,
how we need to motivate him to do small things on his own (Mother of a child with disability)

- My child was enrolled in the local primary school but never used to want to go. These people (pointing to Prajayatna facilitators) came home a number of times and made me realize how important it is for my son to go and even just sit with the other children. They told me that very, very slowly there would be a difference in him and to my surprise there was. Only because of them did I send him to school and now he is happy. (Father of a child with disability)

- The Prajayatna people came home and told us about the certification camp and made sure we went with our son and now he is certified and also has a wheelchair in which he can now go to school. We also met some other parents who had children with problems like our son. It was good we spoke to each other and were also given information about how to take care of our children by someone from outside. This has greatly helped in his being more regular and attending school every day. (Father of a child with disability)

- We were trying to do whatever we could for our child who has so many problems. But it was the Prajayatna people who convinced us to send or daughter to school. The teacher is also teaching nicely in the past two years. She cannot hear properly but is now participating in all the activities and likes going to school, which she did not before. (Mother of a child with disability)

The results of Prajayatna’s efforts on both fronts (parents and teachers) is visible in the favorable trend revealed by secondary data on the increase in attendance rates which is also supported by interviews and FGDs with different stakeholders. As presented in the figure below Prajayatna has succeeded in enrolling 37.14% children out of the 175 who identified by Prajayatna between 2016-2018, into the local QLI primary schools, in the villages where these children reside. This depicts an increase in the percentage of children with disabilities attending schools in both districts. It is noteworthy that the attendance rates of children with disabilities has improved from 4% to 50% in Chitrakoot and 15% to 25% in Bahraich as is indicated in figure 13 below. Thus the effect of conducting regular home visits was seen in both the increased enrolment and regular attendance and the advantages are unquestionable.

(2016-2018)
Over time the Prajayatna team realized that though necessary it was difficult to visit the home of each and every child with disability and devote so much time on a one by one basis with the parents. Therefore, other more effective ways had to be adopted by the organization. One such strategy that was implemented was organizing meetings with a group of parents of children with disabilities together.

### 2.2.4. Organizing meetings with Parents of CWD

One important strategy adopted by the organization was that of organizing meetings with parents of children with disabilities (Refer to the List of Children with Disabilities in Selected QLI schools for classroom observation in Appendix 10.). These meetings were undertaken a number of times over the three years at different venues and for different purposes. It was also pointed out by the Chief Functionary and two other staff members that - *the issue of disability and the need to create a conducive environment for them has been discussed in all the meetings. This reflects the organization’s concern and commitment to inclusion of children with disabilities in schools.*

During the interviews the facilitators working in the two districts shared that an important initiative taken by the organization was planning home visits by a consultant for inclusive education to interact and provide expert advice and guidance to those parents who had children requiring a high level of support. A number of such meetings took place over the three- year project period. The beneficial effects of organizing these collective meetings was corroborated by parents, SMC members, government officials and teachers during the FGDs and interviews, as illustrated below:

- *we were called for a meeting at the BRC and when we reached we saw a lot of people there. Sir was there too and the meeting was conducted by them. They told us about the need and importance of sending our disabled children to school, the advantages and benefits of their being with other children.* *(Parent of a disabled child)*

- *it is amazing how much the Prajayatna team does for these children. Not only have they got many children whom we had identified in SSA as disabled into attending school regularly, but then they also got experts to come and talk to the parents of disabled children. An expert had come from another state. I believe she also went and met the parents at home. She helped them by telling parents how to take care of their children better.* *(BEO)*

- *the Prajayatna team has done many things for children with disabilities. Besides promoting their enrolment and attendance they have also made numerous home visits and organized meetings with all the parents in different QLI clusters together. In these meetings they provide information, counsel parents, solve their issues and give hints of how they can take better care of their children. Really creditable, as this is just the beginning.* *(DIET Official)*

However, the visits to both districts and schools revealed that there are still a sizeable number of children with disabilities who are out of school which requires to be addressed. During the
interviews with the Prajayatna staff and FGDs with parents of children with disabilities and SMC members some reasons were shared by the stakeholders such as – their lack of ability in taking good care of those children requiring a high level of support (those who are either not being able to commute to school on their own, or are not capable of sitting up in class or are mentally challenged or have multiple disabilities) which also makes it difficult for them to attend schools. What is required as pointed out by the district official for inclusive education in one of the districts was - the need for home based interventions and strengthening the networking with other government departments who can provide necessary services. It is also equally important to plan each child’s specific need based rehabilitation program.

Section Summary

Prajaytna has successfully enrolled 37.14% children with disabilities out of the 175 who were identified by them between 2016 -2018, into the local primary schools, where the QLI pilot is being implemented. Attendance rates have also improved from 4% to 50% in Chitrakoot and 15% to 25% in Bahraich between 2016-2018 and 2017-2018 respectively. This is corroborated through interviews with teachers, parents, government officials and SMCs. Much more needs to be done as there are still children out of school.

All the work accomplished was largely possible due to the numerous home visits made by the PY facilitators to convince parents to send their children to schools and teachers to change their negative attitudes and beliefs about children with disabilities.

2.3. Organization of capacity building programs

With children enrolling and attending schools it was necessary for the organization to cater to their requirements, needs and provide quality inclusive education to every child with disability. By implication this called for capacity building of not only the Prajayatna staff and teachers in the QLI program but also parents. Capacity building through trainings and orientations is considered a necessary and valuable input by one and all in the Prajayatna team.

Between 2015-16 to 2018-2019 a total number of 21 training programs/orientations were organized by Prajayatna, 9 in Bahraich and 12 in Chitrakoot districts respectively. The main target groups who received the trainings were the Prajayatna staff, parents of children with disabilities and teachers working in QLI schools. The venue was generally the Block Resource Centre in one of the 4 blocks or the Prajayatna Office, so that a larger number of participants could be accommodated. The trainings were largely conducted by two experts in the field of disability, Prajayatna staff alone or jointly with the SSA Iterant teachers. For the concerned teachers working in QLI schools the monthly collectives provided the necessary platform to address and deal with all such issues on a regular basis.

2.4. Provision of support through different camps
In the three-year project period Prajayatna has encouraged the participation of children with disabilities and parents in different camps for purposes of rehabilitation and improving their quality of life. As reported by the team, parents and teachers’ efforts have been continuously made by Prajayatna teams in both districts towards informing and encouraging the parents of children with disabilities to participate in different types of camps. These camps were either organized by the PY, the SSA office and or other departments and organizations.

A Glimpse into a Two Camps

**Certification Camp**

Prajayatna organized two Certification camps in the Block Resource Center in Chitrakoot on October 9 and 23, 2017. In the camp, Disability Certificates for 139 such children were made with the efforts of Prajayatna. For participating in the camp, the information of the organization of the camp was conveyed to the parents of the children with disabilities through Prajayatna’s facilitators. Parents were informed well in advance and told about the necessity and benefits of their child getting certified which will entitle these children for various government benefits and schemes. School teachers and Gram Pradhans were requested to support parents to bring their children to the camp on the scheduled dates.

**SSA Measurement Camp**

Prajayatna participated in the measurement camp organized by Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan in the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya(KGBV) premises in Ashoha, Pahadi on November 28, 2017. The information of the organization of the camp was conveyed to the parents of children with disabilities through Prajayatna’s facilitators, school teachers and Gram Pradhans. The parents were requested to bring their children to the camp on the scheduled date. A total number of 66 children participated in the camp through the efforts of Prajayatna and community members. It was expected that they would receive their recommended devices by the end of March 2018.

The type of support provided by Prajayatna to children with disabilities during the three-year project period (2016-18) is detailed out in table 25 below.
A gender-wise distribution was also examined to understand Prajayatna’s views regarding gender. It is encouraging to note that Prajayatna views all children in a similar way giving the respect, care and attention to every child with disability irrespective of the gender as is presented in table 26 below.

Table 26: Gender wise provision of facilities by Prajayatna for children with disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No. of children with disabilities identified by PY</th>
<th>No. of children with disabilities certified</th>
<th>No. of children with disabilities requiring Aids</th>
<th>No. of children with disabilities provided Aids</th>
<th>No. of children with disabilities who attended Medical &amp; other camps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chitrakoot</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bahraich</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the tables presented above clearly indicates that the Prajayatna team in a short span of two years has tried to provide, promote, organize and undertake a number of critical activities essential for the overall holistic development of children with disabilities, including education. These services and inputs have helped both the parents and their children in improving their quality of life. It has also led to promoting and ensuring that children with disabilities especially those who require a lot of support get enrolled and if enrolled regularly attend the local primary school.

### Section Summary

Capacity building of major stakeholders is another component given importance by Prajayatna while working for and with children with disabilities. The major target groups focused on were the staff themselves, parents of these children and teachers. A total number of 21 programs have been conducted, 09 and 12 in Bahraich and Chitrakoot districts respectively by the staff, outside experts and SSA literate teachers. There is a demand for more trainings by teachers, staff and parents.

Support has been provided in multiple ways by Prajayatna namely through conduct of camps, organizing parental meetings, ensuring certification, medical check-ups and measurement camps for provision of aids and appliances and getting experts to visit the homes of children with disabilities. These strategies were viewed as critical by one and all in the rehabilitation of children with severe disabilities and improving the overall quality of children’s lives.

The next sub section focusses on what is happening with children with disabilities once they are in school and attending classes. The important objective of providing inclusive quality education to children with disabilities in QLI pilot schools will be discussed.

### 2.5. The Primary School Scenario: Inclusion of children with disabilities

The most critical aspect that requires to be evaluated is the extent to which children with disabilities are included and if learning has taken place and to what extent. These important aspects been evaluated based on three classroom observations (two in Chitrakoot and one in Bahraich) and feedback from teachers and parents during interviews and FGDs, conducted by the consultant.

It needs to be noted that on the day of the visit in each of the three schools not all the children with disabilities who were enrolled in the three schools were present. It was reported by both the teachers and parents that only those children who can commute themselves or are in a position to be brought to the school by their parents come to the school but those who do, come regularly. What was observed is highlighted in the following sub section, supported by data from the teachers’ questionnaire as well.

### 2.5.1. Social inclusion: the first step
In all the three schools it was observed that all the children with disabilities who were present were sitting quietly with other children and listening to what the teacher was telling them. They were not attentive throughout the day but were neither found to be disruptive, being a nuisance or making a noise etc. They also went for the Mid-Day Meal (MDM) along with the other children except for one child who wanted to go home but was finally coaxed by his teacher to have food and then go. What was seen across all the three schools was that these children were socially accepted and include in all the classroom activities. The extent of their participation varied from one child to another based on the type and degree of disability and length of time the child had been attending school regularly.

Teachers shared that these children- do not disturb the class as they were doing two years ago, manage to do some of the work assigned to them in groups or individually, talk and answer less than other children. As one teacher put it- this child is now happier to sit and watch what the others are doing.

2.5.2. Peer acceptance of and sensitivity towards children with disabilities

In all three schools the children with disability were seen to be accepted by their peers, who were interacting with them from time to time. A few children were helping the child with disability to do their tasks while working in mixed groups i.e. explaining what had to be done, assisting in holding the pencil/crayon and actually showing the child with disability where to write / color, wiping the saliva coming out of the child’s mouth. This also shows other children’s sensitivity to these children which is a positive aspect.

2.5.3. Use of Individual Education Plan (IEP)

In all three schools the teachers shared that they used the IEP format (Refer to Appendix 11) provided by the Prajaytana to teachers in 2016, for planning what action will be taken by them to help children with disabilities learn better. Since the IEP is what determines the action plan for the teacher in providing quality learning to the child, it was examined carefully by the consultant. The IEP format focuses on aspects such as: type of disability, duration of plan, main constraints, solutions to overcome the constraints, retaining the child in school, kind of plan made by the teacher to provide opportunity for the child with disability and type of plan made by the teacher to feed necessary information to the child with disability. This is adequate for initiating a beginning with these children. The consultant was informed by teachers, parents and PY staff that this plan is developed jointly by the teacher, facilitator and parent/s.

Once the child is comfortable and social inclusion achieved by the teachers, it was realized by PY that the feedback from teachers based on the IEP format was not helping in planning and taking action as much as it should. As the Chief Functionary explained- “For two years we could not see much progress based on literacy and numeracy. We needed to look beyond this as everything could not be captured and thus growth was not seen”. Thus PY developed a more relevant and suitable format for developing a plan for the child as presented in the box below.

Further she clarified that -for those children with disabilities who are in line with other
students the old Progress card could be used but for those who are not the modified one needed to be used by teachers.

On examining the modified IEP plan, it was noted that there are a few points that were included that would facilitate planning better. However, in view of the desired learning by the children that PY focuses on namely on:

- Development of listening, speaking and writing skills in Hindi and English and Mathematics
- Abilities to observe, recall, compare, evaluation, analysis amongst others and
- Development of attitudes such as- relating to peers, sensitive towards and environment, using time effectively, responsibility towards task and working in a team

None of these abilities/skills find a place in the IEP. It would help the teacher and PY facilitator if the team relooks at the IEP and identifies what aspects and how they can be represented in the IEP to facilitate more action oriented transaction for these children.

---

**Individual Education Plan (Recent Version)**

**Name of the teacher:** Name of the school:

**Name of the child:** Gender: Age:

**Type of disability:**

**Duration of the plan:** From: MM/YYYY to: MM/YYYYMM

1. **Constraints for the child to attend the school on a regular (or regular interval) basis.**
   **Main constraints:** dripping saliva, not able speak, difficulty in walking, distance of the house from the school, non- cooperative parents, lack of toilet training, others

2. **Solutions to overcome the constraints:** Getting treatment, understanding and support from peers, understanding the child by more than two people, provision of tricycle, getting the certificate of disability made, others

3. **Retaining child in the school**
   - Identified child’s requirements
   - Materials required in order to create collaborative environment
   - Predetermined collaborative activity
   - Name of the peer /peers who are friend of the child -
   - Orientation to the children in the class to make them accept the child with disability – Yes/no

4. **Kind of plan made by the teacher to provide opportunity for the child**

5. **Type of plan made by the teacher to feed necessary information to the child**

Teacher’s signature with date:

Form filled by: Date:
In the QLI assessment is a continuous process which looks at assessment as part of the learning process. It is expected that assessment should be able to give feedback to the student on a regular basis so that the student knows where he/she is and can take corrective action/guidance wherever necessary. It also helps the teacher to decide and plan what kind of support is required for the student.

As shared by the Chief Functionary in the interview – *what is important is that the assessment undertaken in QLI should not only give feedback on the procedural skills such as language and maths, but rather look at all the other skills that needs to be developed in a child in order to ensure the development of all abilities in the child. Hence it should be formative in nature.*

As stated earlier on in Section 1 of this chapter, a number of tools are used by the teacher for assessing each child all these tools are also used for children with disabilities. As for other children a portfolio is maintained for children with disabilities too. This ensures that the work of the child goes into the file on a regular basis with the feedback given by the teacher. On the one hand, this helps the teachers to gauge the learning of the child on a regular basis, especially with regard to the procedural skills. On the other hand, the observations maintained by the teacher reveals the growth of the student with respect to other abilities and skills which look at the cognitive, social and emotional skills - the process skills as well as the attitudes. Thus assessment is holistic in nature, and does not only focus on academic aspects.

In the context of children with disability, there is a need to look at what needs to be assessed more carefully. *This is so, as the development of the skills are generally being delayed in the case of most of the students’ with disabilities, either due to lack of exposure, lack of intellectual development etc. (depending on the type and degree of disability).*

The Chief Functionary and other staff shared with the consultant that *in the case of children with disability, the experience of the first two years of the QLI pilot showed that though there was a lot of improvement in the children, it was not being captured in the Prajayatna progress card since the parameters being looked at were very different. This called for the organization to evolve a suitable and more appropriate tool to track the progress of these children in a better manner. The aim was to be able to document each child’s progress and also be used for communicating the same to their parents and teachers so that it could help in understanding better where support was required for the child and what kind of support.*

Two tools were thus, prepared for children with disability:

- Those who required some level of support (moderate impairment)
- Those who required a high level of support (severe impairment)

It was felt that the children who had crossed these two levels could then be assessed along the lines of the tools being used for all children in the QLI pilot schools.

The development of these two tools it was hoped will help in providing a better and more accurate picture of the child and her/his progress after enrolling and attending the QLI school.
regularly. The very process of modification indicates that the Prajayatna is looking at inclusion of children with disabilities as a dynamic, need based evolving situation.

Teachers who were interviewed shared that for them assessment of children with disabilities posed a number of challenges. The difficulties cited were -  *It is time-consuming, difficult to do as it is subjective in nature and placing children at different levels is challenging despite explanations of each level being given.* The excerpts below taken from the interviews highlight the difficulties they faced.

- *assessment the way it was to be done in this project (QLI) was a new experience and required a lot of time from our side and support from facilitators to be able to observe, understand and assess the abilities and skills in a child. Documentation takes the most time.* *(Teacher from Chitrakoot)*

- *we were used to giving tests before Prajayatna came, so this is difficult as I was not used to assessing students in so many aspects and levels. I am not very sure if I am placing the child at the right level and especially the children with disabilities in my class. It is more difficult doing it for them.* *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

- *filling the first progress card was quite difficult even though we do it twice in a year. There are so many aspects, sometimes I was not confident if I was filling it up correctly. Then they gave us a new card in April this year so that is easier I feel. But this way of assessing takes a lot of time although it is better than just giving tests like we used to do before. We still give tests though.* *(Teacher from Chitrakoot)*

- *assessment of children with disabilities is not easy as most of them are not reading writing or speaking as much as other children. Placing them in levels is not easy. It would help if we are given some kind of training just on this. It will also help us for completing the progress cards of other children.* *(Teacher from Bahraich)*

The consultant was informed that in March 2016 the teachers filled the progress cards for the first time and it was seen that the documentation of some of the children was random. The next year 2017 saw *more improvement in teachers doing this exercise, as the skills of observation and analysis had increased in the teachers.* This further improved in 2018. The Chief Functionary further went on to elaborate by sharing that *this year has seen the assessment of the maximum number of children with disability.* She perceived that this was probably the result of the new progress cards and worksheets made by the teachers and Prajayatna so that there would be *documents for proof when it came to the procedural skills.* This - *we at PY thought would help a lot* as it would also be considered as a summative assessment so that the teachers could then fill the progress card based on both the formative and summative form of assessment. What emerges is that the process of assessment is continuously evolving according to the needs and situation of children with disabilities and teachers also.

The assessment undertaken by teachers is presented and discussed in the following section. This also indicates the effect of the QLI on the learning levels of children with disabilities.
2.6. Learning levels of children with disabilities

To evaluate the extent to which children with disabilities who are regularly attending the QLI schools are learning and their progress from 2016 to 2018 it was felt necessary to examine the data related to their learning levels that was collected by the teachers who were working in the QLI programme from time to time and consolidated by PY on an annual basis in the progress card. It needs to be noted that 2016 was the beginning and the baseline. 2017 and 2018 were the two times when it was measured and 2019 March will be the final. This data is for all the students enrolled in classes 1, 2, 3 and 4, in the three years of the QLI pilot. Based on this secondary data a series of graphs are presented below on their learning levels in three subjects –
Hindi, English and Maths. In addition to learning levels in the three subjects, different abilities and attitudinal dimensions of the students are also assessed by teachers.

**Hindi:** In the three important skills of speaking, listening and writing there is an improvement in the learning levels. This is indicated by the increase in the percentages of those at the *involved* and *interested* stages in 2018 as compared to 2016. There are a very few children at the self-directed level in 2018, but to reach this level is a greater challenge for these children as compared to others.

*Note: In 2018: 33 children, 2017-18 children & 2016: 15 children*

**English:** Most of the children across all three years are at the evolving level of learning. This is to be expected as English is a second or perhaps even a third language for the children. It needs to be noted that in 2016 there were 13.3% to 20% children who were at the self-directed with the %s strangely dropping in 2018. This is due to these children passing out.
**Maths:** The maximum number of children across the three years were at the evolving level. However, what is important is that the numbers decreased from 80.5% to 51.9% in this category. In 2018 at the end of the three years one third of the children were at the interested level. Since children with disabilities take more time requiring a lot of repetition and consistent effort in comparison to other children without disabilities, the progress seen is an achievement for them.

*Figure 16: Learning Levels in Maths*

In 2016 there were 78.7% who needed exposure with 17.3% who needed support in developing their ability to observe which is a basic skill. By 2018, there were one third of the children at the need support level with 7.5% independent. Teachers need to work with the 58.9% children who are still at the need support level of functioning.

*Figure 17: Learning Levels- Ability to observe*

From 75.3% children in 2016 who needed exposure in recalling, only 32.8% were in this category in 2018. A little more than half required more support in 2018. 10% children were independent. Thus the number of children in this category had nearly doubled by 2018 as compared to the baseline in 2016. Out of all the abilities being assessed maximum number were independent in the ability to recall.

*Note: In 2018 : 33 children, 2017- 18 children & 2016: 15 children*
In 2016 (baseline) 77.8% children when assessed for their ability to compare were in the need exposure category and just 16.3% who required support from the teacher, peers and parents, with a negligible number in the independent category.

By 2018 children had progressed as there were more than half the number who needed support and only one third who needed exposure.

85.3% children needed exposure in developing their questioning skills and ability which had by 2018 reduced to less than half (44%). The maximum number (50.3%) children were in the need support category by 2018. There was hardly an increase in those children who could independently question.

In 2016, most of the children (88.7%) were in the need exposure category, which reduced very little in 2017. The greatest improvement took place between 2017 to 2018 since there are nearly an equal number in the two categories of need exposure and need support.

There is hardly any increase in the % of children who have become independent between 2016 to 2018.

In 2016 nearly 90% children need exposure to various activities and opportunities to develop their application ability. By 2018 there are 40.6% who lie in the need support category. This indicates some improvement in learning levels. Children in the independent category are very few.
Developing the ability to do analysis appears to be as challenging as evaluation as indicated by almost a negligible number are in the independent category across all 3 years. In 2018, 63.8% children still remain in the need exposure category after 2-3 years of school education.


Developing the ability to evaluate in children with disabilities appears to be the most challenging as almost a negligible number are in the independent category across all 3 years. In 2016, 90% are categorized in the need exposure which reduced to 67.3% in 2018. Thus a lot of inputs, activities providing learning opportunities need to be planned by teachers supported by parents.

Figure 25: Learning Levels of Children with Disabilities across Attitudinal Dimensions

Figure 23: Learning Levels - Analysis
Figure 24: Learning Levels - Evaluation
The assessment data in the graph above clearly show the attitudinal change of children with disabilities across all the aspects highlighted above. Across all the five attitudinal aspects viewed as important in developing amongst these children by Prajayatna the figure indicates that by 2018 approximately 50% had progressed towards the interested level of learning.

The baseline data of 2016 indicates that the maximum number of children 60% and 53.3% were in the evolving category in their attitudes related to sensitivity to the environment, using time effectively and relating to peers.

Those children who had reached the desired level of involved across all the attitudes were in the range of 3.0% to 12.1%, which is very low, indicating that teachers need to work with those children at the interested level in a more focused manner.

Maximum number of children across all three years were seen to be at the evolving level especially in the second year of the pilot i.e. 2017, in three of the defined attitudes namely: using time effectively 66.7%, working in a team77.8% and in relating to peers 83.3%.

*Note: In 2018: 33 children, 2017- 18 children & 2016: 15 children*

**Section Summary**

The learning levels for children with disabilities between 2016 to 2018 shows an improvement and progress, as children have progressed from the lowest level to the next one, across all the skills/abilities identified by the Prajayatna. This progress is to be appreciated considering the short time the QLI has been operational and the target group in question.

In Hindi, English and Maths children have progressed from evolving to either interested or involved. There are hardly any children at the self-directed level of learning.

Out of all the abilities viewed as important by PY developing the two abilities— to analyse and evaluate, appears to be the most challenging as indicated by almost a negligible number in the independent category across all 3 years. In 2018, a little less than two -thirds of children still remain in the need exposure category even after 2-3 years of school education.

Across all the five attitudinal aspects the data indicates that by 2018 approximately 50% had progressed towards the interested levels of learning.

In the four schools where classroom observations were planned to be undertaken, the consultant met with the parents of children with disabilities enrolled in all the four schools separately.

**Views of Parents**

All the parents were appreciative and grateful to the Prajayatna team for undertaking a number of activities that were viewed as critical, necessary and important by them. The different activities are presented below, namely:

- identification (in a one /two cases),
- conducting home visits that convinced them to send /bring their child to school
- certification of their child
- providing timely information about the organization of different camps (certification, measurement, medical check -ups etc.)
- orientation about their child’s disability and how to take care of the child at home
- supporting them in taking care of their children
• developing an IEP jointly with the teacher for their child
• sharing the progress of their child

Parental perceptions and feelings are highlighted through the excerpts presented below:

- we did not believe that our child was capable of doing anything at all in school, not even sitting for the full day. Sir came so many times and the teacher also came a few times and told me slowly everything is possible. Now we sit together and plan together and decide what the teacher should do with my son. He also shows me my son’s work in the file (Parent of child with disability from Bahraich)

- I was not keen to send my child to school as the children made fun of him, but after the Prajayatna person came more than three to four times and spoke to me about the importance of sending him to school to be with other children, socialize, develop good habits, I decided to try once again. (Parent of child with disability from Chitrakoot)

The important and supportive role of Prajayatna in identification, enrolment, improving attendance and other aspects related to improving the quality of life of children with disabilities was fully endorsed by all the major groups of stakeholders; as is illustrated through the excerpts from interviews and FGDs in both districts.

- The facilitators are doing a wonderful job in every way. More so with those children who have disabilities. They have made house visits and have managed to convince many parents to send their children to school. Taken them to camps and trained teachers in the collectives and in the BRCCs. Some expert had also visited parents. - (NPRCC Bahraich)

- What we could not do and achieve the Prajayatna has done, by not only identifying children with disabilities but also convincing their parents to send them to school and also attend regularly. This is only because they go to their homes a lot and spend time with them, showing that they care and this matters to them. (District Official Bahraich)

- I have seen the Prajayatna person go to the houses of children with disabilities in my village and talk to the parents about many things. He was the one who convinced them to send their child to school, informed them about camps being organized and once even took the child who had a disability along with the parent for certification and check-ups. We have realized that these children can also learn slowly with the help of teachers and aids etc. (SMC member Chitrakoot)

- In my villages I know there are a few children who are require a lot of help care and support and need aids too. The PY team have gone from house to house, got them certified and tried to get aids for them also. (Gram Panchayat President)

- The Prajayatna team is always in touch with us and keep us informed of all meetings, camps etc. that they are planning to organize for including children with disabilities in schools. We also tell them of our SSA camps or if any other camp is being conducted. A lot has to be done, they have done a lot in a very short time. They are also working with our Iterant teachers. (DIET Official Chitrakoot)
- In our meetings which are held regularly because of Sir we discuss many issues including children with disabilities. We did not know these children could also be able to learn but they can. We were told it is possible by these people (Prajayatna). We also have started discussing how we can help and what the Gram Panchayat can do for them. (SMC Member Bahraich).

**Section Summary**

The supportive role of the Prajayatna team emerges as the single most critical factor in improving the enrolment, regular attendance and acceptance of children with disabilities by teachers and other children QLI in schools. Home visits conducted by the facilitators, their efforts and time spent with family members and in particular parents appears to have triggered a change in the attitude of the community in general and parents in particular towards these children. 

Equally important has been the visible change in teacher’s attitudes and beliefs about these children and their abilities and other children accepting and helping them in the classroom. However, for the severely disabled who cannot come to school for a variety of reasons home based education and other avenues of providing support jointly with the government departments emerges as an area for future work, by the organization.

**Overall Summary of the Findings**

The QLI approach has contributed significantly to promoting the social inclusion of those children with disabilities who are attending schools. This is the logical and necessary first step for actual learning to be promoted in these children in schools.

Planning for each child with disability is jointly undertaken by the teacher-facilitator – parents through the use of the IEP format provided by Prajayatna. The IEP format needs to be reviewed in view of ensuring better and more focused learning by children. The progress of these children is shared by teachers verbally and through the child’s ongoing portfolios which is highly appreciated by the parents. Over time it was realized that the IEP was not proving to be very useful thus it was developed further, to include a number of important aspects. Teachers expressed a need for training for planning and implementing the QLI for these children, based on different disabilities. Facilitators endorsed this for themselves too.

The assessment process which is central and integral to planning for each child poses challenges to teachers and these could be overcome through more onsite support and capacity building. An interesting aspect that emerges is that the process of assessment is continuously changing according to the needs and situation of children with disabilities and teacher’s difficulties.

Data on learning levels indicates that between 2016 to 2018 there is an improvement and progress, as children have moved from the lowest learning level to the next one, across all the skills/abilities in subjects and otherwise identified by the Prajayatna. Across the five attitudinal aspects the data indicates that by 2018 approximately 50% had progressed towards the interested levels of learning. There are hardly any children at the desired top most level of – independent, which is to be expected with this target group and learning consolidation will take more time than for those without disabilities.
Section III

3.1. Decentralisation of Education Governance Structures

In the QLI pilot the focus on decentralisation of education governance processes was to develop the capabilities of the local community and community based structures to address school development, through their involvement ultimately leading to their ownership of primary schooling. Educational governance processes were to be implemented with the involvement of key elected representatives from the Panchayati Raj at the three levels- the Gram Panchayat, the Taluk or block and the Zilla or district level. The main focus was to promote and strengthen the involvement of Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRI) and School Management Committees (SMCs) as they are the elected representatives and thus key stakeholders in the community. Key learnings gained from the implementation of the project will be institutionalised by conducting necessary advocacy and trainings. The Departments of Education and the Rural Development would also be actively engaged in solving school and education governance related issues and concerns through Prajayatna processes.

The desired overall outcome of all activities by PY was that it would lead to - creating an ecosystem in the blocks and districts where the issues of all children and school education will be a priority. The processes adopted by PY would also enable local education governance structures to focus on issues affecting children with disabilities and all related aspects to ensure that optimal provision of facilities, entitlement and inclusive education is provided to each and every child with disability.

It needs to noted that DEG processes are being implemented throughout the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich, whereas for this evaluation study and in particular the question stated above; local education governance structures in the 4 QLI clusters and villages in these clusters along with the 75 schools will form the scope of the evaluation being undertaken.

To evaluate to what extent the above outcome has been realized the major activities envisaged by Prajayatna in achieving the same will form the basis of evaluating the extent to which the PY has promoted and strengthened DEG and has achieved what was planned. The effectiveness of the DEG will also be evaluated against the major processes- activities proposed and targets that were to be achieved by Prajayatna. The next sub section highlights these activities that operationalize the Prajayatna strategy for realizing DEG as presented in the figure below.
3.2. Major activities proposed to be implemented in the program

An overview of the main activities proposed by Prajayatna was provided by the Chief Functionary and further detailed out by the State Coordinator during lengthy interviews with both. This served as an apt framework for evaluating the extent to which the proposed activities had been implemented by the organization and effect of the same on improving decentralized governance structures.

### Major Activities Planned for Promoting DEG

1. Collection of Local Education Governance Data (LEGD)
2. Organising Shikshana Gram Sabhas
3. Creating Gram Panchayat Networks
4. Organising Block and Nyaya Panchayat Level Workshops
5. Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats
6. Advocacy with the Department
7. Documentation Activities
8. Activating and Strengthening School Management Committees (SMCs)
The methods used to evaluate whether the major activities were conducted and effect of the same on creating an enabling school environment for all children in general and children with disabilities in particular, was through the collection of secondary data from Prajayatna and its analysis. This data is supported essentially by the qualitative data collected through the conduct of Focus Group Discussions by the Consultant with School Management Committees (SMCs), Gram Panchayat (GP) Presidents and parents of children enrolled and attending the QLI schools in four clusters two each in Chitrakoot and Bahraich districts respectively.

Secondary data was collected from the Prajayatna offices in both the project districts, which was then collated by the staff and shared with the Consultant in tables jointly developed by the Prajayatna and CBM staff and Consultant. Information on the major activities that were planned at the start of the project and how it proceeded was gathered through interviews with the Prajayatna staff working across all levels in the project: Head Office - State – District- Cluster levels.

3.3. Implementation Status of Planned Activities

### 3.3.1. Planned Activity No:1  Collection of Local Education Governance Data (LEGD)

The first major activity planned to be undertaken by Prajayatna was collection of school data through the PY staff and trained volunteers in both the project districts in all the four QLI clusters. This was to serve the dual purpose of:

- Providing the actual status of each school with respect to a number of critical variables namely: infrastructure, enrolment, teacher availability and issues affecting the school adversely.
- Using this as a tool by Prajayatna to engage with communities by starting a dialogue on improving schools and in interacting with functionaries of the Gram Panchayats and the Department of Education on the situation in their schools.

#### Status of Achievement

LEGD was to be the base for all future plans and work to be undertaken by the local governance structures mainly the Gram Panchayats and SMCs. The PY ensured that all the data was collected in the first year itself of the QLI pilot. Thus the target planned was that all the 75 villages where the QLI schools are located will be covered. LEGD was got from all 75 villages in the project thus in both the districts the target that was set was achieved, as is presented in table 27 below. Logically this was to be expected as this data was the basis of planning all the future work across all the QLI schools and children belonging to those villages.

One of the Prajayatna staff members stated that -the data helped us in working using evidence with the SMCs and GPs as it threw light on the status of children’s enrolment, attendance, children with disabilities in the villages and the issues they face in availing of school education.
This was acknowledged by one and all. Another pointed out that- *It also contain information on the facilities and incentives available and accessible for children with disabilities.*

Discussions using the LEGD was acknowledged by some of the Gram Panchayat Pradhans during the FGDs with them. They did not know the *technical name for it* which was totally understandable but shared that the PY team had *presented data to them in meetings about schools* in their GP on the basis of which issues were identified, discussed and future action to be taken decided.

This was also corroborated by the SMC members a few who clearly stated that- *data about their school was shared with them initially in 2016.* All of the members whom the consultant interacted with in the FGDs conveyed that *this data helped a lot in prioritizing issues to be addressed and planning how to take action for school improvement.* Infact as one of them pointed out *for the first time we realized we were not paying attention to children with disabilities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Major Activities Planned</th>
<th>Target Achieved Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Target Achieved Bahraich</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Collection of Local Education Governance Data (LEGD)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organizing Shikshana Gram Sabhas (School level SMC Meetings)</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Creating Gram Panchayat Networks + GP FU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Organizing Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Block level (GP Presidents and Secretaries)</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Nyaya Panchayat Level SMC Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>(6 GPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. No. of schools covered through Nyaya Panchayat level – SMC training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nyaya Panchayat Level GP Follow up (Shikshka Samitis)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>(6 GPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. No. of schools covered through Nyaya Panchayat level (Shiksha Samithi)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2. Planned activity No:2. Organising Shikshana Gram Sabhas

School level meetings were to be organized by Prajayatna where parents of the children enrolled in school, the teachers and the elected representatives of the Panchayat, the larger community etc. would be motivated and encouraged to participate. Prajayatna planned that in these meetings the school report prepared from the earlier Local Education Governance Data (LEGD) would be presented and shared with the community and also SMC members.

It was clarified by the Chief Functionary that in their initial plan Panchayat level meetings were to be organized and if required then Gram Sabhas would be conducted in the villages where the need was felt.

Status of Achievement

A total number of 102 meetings were organized by PY out of which 65 and 37 were organized in Chitrakoot and Bahraich respectively in the schools where the QLI program was being implemented as indicated in table 27. This data is supported by the PY staff sharing that one meeting has been organized in each of the 75 schools, the additional numbers that are reflected in the table are the SMC meetings wherein more community members and GP Pradhans also came and attended.

The efforts made by the PY staff was acknowledged by all the SMC members in the FGDs with members from 8 SMCs (4 each from each district). Some of the SMC members present during the FGDs highlighted that in the Shikshana Gram Sabhas the LEGD which was shared by the Prajayatna staff and discussions conducted on the same facilitated by PY helped in different ways such as:

- Facilitating and leading the SMCs to prepare a realistic, need based school development plan and thereby indirectly make them take ownership and responsibility for its implementation along with the school staff.
- Generating awareness and educating the community on the needs, problems, issues and facilities available and required for children with disabilities
- Examining the requirements of schools by the community and SMC members in terms of facilities, the priorities and who and how and in what time period could the same be provided to the school. This further helped in developing a clearer idea and plan as part of the School Development Plan (SDP).
The Prajayatna had visualized the importance of networking all the SMCs of all schools in a Gram Panchayat at the Gram Panchayat level. This was viewed as critical so that all the SMCs in one GP could meet, present the issues and plans of their individual schools to the Gram Panchayat elected representatives and the officials and discuss issues and arrive at solutions.

As one of the PY staff asserted that this is an important platform for the Gram Panchayat to develop a vision of and a plan of its own in improving the existing situation in their school/s. The Gram Panchayat Education Plan would cover all aspects of school improvement such as infrastructure development, student enrolment, learning needs and teacher vacancies/requirements amongst other issues and concerns and also explore and decide and arrive at feasible solutions to address all the issues and mobilize resources for the same. Thus it was expected that each of the SMCs if more than one would look at their own individual school and the Gram Panchayat would look at the overall Gram Panchayat level school development including the need for additional teachers/schools and lobby with the Department of Education on this.

The Gram Panchayats could address the issue of children with disabilities and create mechanisms for tracking them and ensuring that they are given the required support and resources to effectively aid inclusion.

**Status of Achievement**

In the QLI project there are 36 Gram Panchayats and 75 schools and it was envisaged that there would be networking of all the GPs in the QLI project. Over the project period 2016 to 2018, a total number of 42 Gram Panchayat meetings were organized, by the PY. Out of these 25 were facilitated in Chitrakoot and 17 in Bahraich. This shows that all the networks have been created meetings conducted and as reported by two senior staff members in PY follow up meetings have also taken place. Thus the target set has been achieved and PY has gone beyond it too, which is creditable. This was done as probably as they realized how critical GPs were and in the first phase of the project were focusing on strengthening local structures closest to the schools.

The work undertaken by the GPs in Chitrakoot and Baharaich is presented below in two separate tables 28 and 29. In both districts in 2016 there is no focus on school improvement, probably as the QLI project had just begun and LEGD was collected after which sharing of the same took place with GPs and SMCs as this was first year of the pilot. A sizeable amount of funds have been mobilized in both districts by the GPs. Table 28 highlights the issues discussed and resources mobilized by GPs in the two QLI clusters of Kapsethi and Asoha in the Chitrakoot.
district. What emerges is that maintenance of different buildings such as the school, Panchayat bhavan and anganwadi centre seem to be of importance for the GPs in both clusters; with repair of toilets and boundary walls also being given priority. Thus the school and related facilities were given importance in both clusters in 2017 and 2018. In Asoha more funds have been mobilized in 2018 as compared to Kapsethi though it is a smaller cluster, which is surprising.

Table 28: Issues Discussed and Resource Mobilisation of Gram Panchayats in Two QLI Clusters of Chitrakoot District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters and Aspects</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kapseti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of school</td>
<td>Maintenance of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance Panchayat Bhawan</td>
<td>School Link Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance Anganwadi kendra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of classroom with toilet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,37,000</td>
<td>6,05,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of school</td>
<td>Maintenance of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of boundary wall</td>
<td>Maintenance of Panchayat Bhawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance Anganwadi kendra</td>
<td>Maintenance of Anganwadi kendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Interlocking in school field</td>
<td>Maintenance of boundary wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,03,000</td>
<td>38,66,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PRI Government Portal

Table 29: Issues Discussed and Resource Mobilisation of Gram Panchayats in Two QLI Clusters of Bahraich District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters and Aspects</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badrauli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK PLAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX NO.OF ISSUES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of hand pump</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of Panchayat Bhawan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance Anganwadi Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROX VALUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1396540</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambhaura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK PLAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX NO.OF ISSUES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Maintenance of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Repair of toilet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The work undertaken by the GPs in Bahraich is presented above in table 29. The table highlights that it was only in 2016-17 that GPs started putting together plans for development as no plans are reflected in 2015-16, whereas 14 plans were made in Badrauli in 2016-17, with 12 in Bambhaura in 2017-18. The issues discussed were fewer as compared to Chitrakoot districtas but similar as maintenance of the Panchayat Bhavan and Anganwadi Centre, repair of toilets and boundary walls were being focused on.

The conduct of these meetings was corroborated by the Gram Pradhans in the FGDs conducted with them across all four clusters. They were quite appreciative of the efforts made by the PY team in sharing the LEGD for the schools and facilitating a discussion on the major issues in their schools and finding solutions together. A few of the GPs shared that though they were keen on wanting to do much more than what was being done the major issue confronting them was insufficient funds. Lack of funds was unanimously cited as a major problem, in getting work done in schools. To complicate matters further there was no separate fund for education. The excerpts from the FGDs across the four clusters with Gram Panchayat Presidents highlight their views on the same.

- it is difficult to do any work in the field of education as the administration pays no attention to this area. They say it is important but nothing is done. Education is never taken seriously. Prajayatna people keep coming to our villages and are trying their best to help, by conducting meetings. (Representative of the Gram Pradhan Asoha)
- meetings are organized by Prajayatna at the block and cluster levels, a lot of discussion takes place, we have developed plans also but it takes long for things to happen everything takes so much time it is because of many reasons fund shortage, approval by the Secretary takes a long time and education is not a priority for the Zilla Panchayat. (Gram Panchayat Pradhan Kapsethi)
- we have so many things to be done for our village improvement, roads, water electricity etc. Education is important and we want our children to study and learn a lot, but where is the money. Even then a lot has happened schools are improving. (Gram Panchayat Pradhan, Badrauli)
- flooding is a big problem every year and to make sure that the school is safe and secure a lot of money will be required to do something. (Gram Panchayat Pradhan, Bambhaura)
With a view to strengthening the local governance structures at the start of the program and subsequently throughout the project period PY had planned that the staff would conduct meetings/workshops at two levels in the system - the block and the cluster.

I. **Block Level Workshops:** These were planned to be organized across all the blocks of both districts where Gram Panchayat functionaries of all the Gram Panchayats along with the Block Development Officer and the Block Education Officer (officers in charge of development and education at entire block) would participate along with the Block Panchayat President. The block level educational status with specific information on schools from the LEGD would be shared and plans for addressing the needs of CWD would also be decided upon.

II. **Nyaya Panchayat Level Workshops:** Parents especially those of children with disabilities were to be the main target group in these workshops.

**Status of Achievement**

**Block level Meetings/ Workshops: Joint meetings of SMC and Standing Committee of Education in the Gram Panchayat**

With the objective of institutionalizing the education governance structure at the Gram Panchayat level, joint meetings between the Standing Committee of Education in the Gram Panchayat and the SMC are held at the GP level. This is a joint meeting of the Standing Committee members, constituent school committees, the Cluster Resource Person and the Anganwadi supervisor to represent pre-school issues at the GP level. A network meeting builds and enables a collective vision of SMC and this enables building of a collective vision and reinforcing this vision through formulation and implementation of GP level education plans that are based on the school level plans. This process builds on the mutual strength of these two key stakeholder groups (GP and SMCs) and supports institutional building in terms of planning, resource mobilisation, budgeting, sharing of responsibility and also working together as a group.

**Follow Up Meetings at the Nyaya Panchayat (Cluster)levels**

The development of plans for school improvement at the GP level was further strengthened by PY through the follow up meetings which are organized by PY at the Nyaya Panchayat level (cluster level). Here all the SMC and the standing committee members of the GP come together and review the plans that were made at the GP meetings along with the strategy for implementation. This platform is also used to train the SMCs and the members of the Shiksha Samithi from the GPs in order to make them aware of their roles and responsibilities and to lead to their capacity building.

This strategy was initiated but as GP Pradhans across both districts communicated in the FGDs:

- **There is only one Secretary for a number of GPs rather than one Secretary for each GP. One Secretary is usually in the present scenario in-charge of all the GPs in one cluster. This causes a lot of delay in approvals of funds for the plans made by GPs.**
- the Secretary is not easily available this delays decisions and approvals for work to start based on our plans.

### 3.3.5 Planned Activity No: 5. Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats

It was critical to support the SMCs at the village level and then create networks at the GP level to function as accountable structures. However, Prajayatna also realized the importance of strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats, as they are responsible for education at the block and district level and PY had set a target of strengthening these structures that were critical to school development, the Education Standing Committees at taluk and the district level are strengthened, by providing necessary and accurate information about issues faced by the schools on a taluk/district level. Feedback on the implementation of the schemes, allocation of infrastructure based on the real needs of the schools, issues pertaining to learning, teachers, etc. is deliberated upon and shared with the Standing Committee.

**Status of Achievement**

This was one major activity where the PY between 2016 to 2018 has not been able to adopt any strategy or mechanism to start the process of working with and strengthening these important structures. Thus the envisaged activity has not been realized at all. However, it becomes pertinent to understand the reasons behind this. The evaluation, was useful in that it revealed the major hurdles and issues for PY not making a headway with work related to the Education Standing Committees at the Block and District Panchayat levels. The ground reality itself was extremely challenging, which made it difficult for PY to implement this major activity though planned for with these important local governance structures.

Interviews with the PY staff and FGDs with the Gram Pradhans clearly brought out the complex and difficult ground reality which are illustrated through the qualitative data in the form of excerpts from interviews with the Prajaytana staff below.

- we found it quite shocking that these structures were virtually defunct in both the districts. everything is there on paper but meetings most of the times did not take place.
- a lot of work would be required to get things moving and more so in these two backward districts. He went on to further elaborate that These committees would have to be activated, made aware and strengthened in order for them to get involved in the development of the schools in their block/districts.
In the next phase initiating work the Education Standing Committees in the Block and District Panchayats is critical and necessary so that various issues which cannot be resolved at the school and gram panchayat level could be discussed and solutions found at the higher levels of governance where they are more capable of decision making and translating decisions into actions at the school level.

### 3.3.6. Planned Activity No: 6 - Advocacy with the Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Major Activities Planned for Advocacy and Documentation of Activities</th>
<th>Target Achieved Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Target Achieved Bahraich</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Advocacy with the Department (DIET/BEO/SCERT/HT meeting/collectives)</td>
<td>17 13 06</td>
<td>18 16 06</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Documentation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Quarterly newsletters of each district</td>
<td>0 06 02</td>
<td>Nil Nil Nil</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Need based field studies</td>
<td>0 02 03</td>
<td>Nil Nil Nil</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is a well-established fact that any kind of work in the government system requires coordination with the main department in this project there are two i.e. education and rural development besides other departments too. With a view to generating awareness, planning and implementing the QLI in the 75 schools supported by the local governance structures calls for advocacy with all departments that the PY viewed as important for realizing the success of the QLI. PY envisaged that workshops with department personnel at different levels would promote advocacy. These would become **excellent forums to discuss the issues faced at different level and status enabling decision making at the appropriate levels.** As one senior PY staff stated- *it will make it possible to consciously focus and deliberate upon issues of children with disabilities so that reformative measures become possible.*

**Status of Achievement**

Table 30 below indicates that a total number of 76 such advocacy workshops or meetings have been conducted by the PY during 2016 to 2018 in both districts. These have been organized essentially for government functionaries working at different levels in the system- district- block-cluster-school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Block Level Reports</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Annual Citizen’s Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Any other documentation activity not planned for such as: Reports of the collective meetings in the 4 clusters, reports of processes undertaken with the QLI pilot and decentralized governance structures. Reports of medical and other camps the PY attended and students participated eg. Camp held at Janakikund Hospital.</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Advocacy and Documentation Activities planned and Targets Achieved in Chitrakoot and Bahraich Districts.

*Source: Prajayatna Records*

### 3.3.7. Planned Activity No: 7- Documentation Activities

The Chief Functionary highlighted that along with a strong advocacy agenda focusing on the QLI including children with disabilities and local governance processes, it was considered important to document field processes and undertake need based field studies which would include quarterly newsletters of each of the two districts. An annual citizen’s report would be prepared and shared with the government.

**Status of Achievement**
The table above presents that a total number of eight quarterly newsletters and three Annual Citizen’s Reports were prepared, two in Chitrakoot and one in Bahraich for sharing with the government on the work the PY had been doing.

The table highlights that a large number of other documentation work besides what has been listed out by PY that was undertaken. The Chief Functionary confirmed that these were largely material related to meetings with Head teachers, DIET faculty, Children with Disabilities Comparison report (PY and Government data), parents’ meetings, reports prepared for funders amongst others. In the documentation work planned for by PY, staff working in Chitrakoot appears to have undertaken a few more activities i.e. need based field studies as compared to the staff in Bahraich. In addition, to all the above it needs to be highlighted that the consultant also read some case studies and reports of trainings conducted by the PY which would be extremely helpful for sharing with the government in view of replication or upscaling of the program.

In addition to those activities highlighted by the Prajayatna team one important additional activity which emerged in the field visits was organizing and conducting School Management Committee (SMC) meetings in all 75 QLI schools and the efforts made by them in improving the school environment in their respective schools. Thus one more important and major activity has been included as Activity No: 8, where the structure at the school level the School Management Committee is the key agent of change and a mandated structure in place within the school itself.

### 3.3.8. Activity No: 8. Activating and Strengthening School Management Committees (SMCs)

The School Management Committees (SMCs) had been constituted quite a few years ago in every village. They were initially known as Village Education Committees under SSA. After the RTE Act 2009 they were reconstituted according to prescribed norms as SMCs. These Committees were supposed to meet every month and discuss issues related to the school and children enrolled in the schools, to ensure and monitor that learning was taking place. They were also expected to prepare need based School Development Plans.

However, when the QLI programme was launched as a pilot in 75 schools in the four clusters in Chitrakoot and Bahraich, it was reported by the Prajayatna staff that the SMCs are constituted and meetings are being conducted every month on a regular basis as far as possible since the QLI pilot was launched. Before the Prajayatna pilot was launched the situation was very different as was shared by SMC members during the FGDs. The major aspects that they highlighted which existed prior to the Prajayatna coming to their villages-schools were:

- SMC meetings were not conducted regularly every month.
- Lack of awareness about their roles and responsibilities
- SMC members were members on the records but did not know they were members
- Meetings if conducted were a formality with 2-4 members attending
- Minutes were available in the school records
- Records of the meetings and minutes were maintained.
- Lack of awareness about the School Development Plan and how to prepare the same.
- Lack of connection with the Gram Panchayats on an official level
- Issues related to education were discussed at times but solutions and actions not given due attention
- Children with disabilities were not a part of most discussions or meetings

This was fully endorsed by the Prajayatna staff and SMC members themselves in interviews and FGDs conducted with both respectively as is highlighted below:

- *initially a number of SMC members were not aware of their roles and responsibilities, some did not even know they were in the SMC, we were really surprised to see this and others had no idea what happened in the meetings if at all they were held. So basically it was a formality on paper (PY staff)*

- *None of the SMC members we met knew about the need for a School Development Plan. They had given up on anything happening for improving their schools as over the years not much had been done. They were concerned but had given up hope of anything happening and those who had any idea were helpless as even if meetings were held no one came for the meetings! (PY staff)*

- *before Prajayatna came to our school none of us knew about what we were supposed to do and how to do it. They sat with us told us our roles and discussed what we felt was required for our school. What issues did we think were important and then we shared ideas on what to do to improve the school. (SMC member Chitrakoot)*

- *Sir has been calling for meetings of our SMC in the past two years. He is always present and guides us. We have always wanted to do something for our school and children but did not know what to do. Now we have a toilet, a proper playground and repairs are also taking place. Also all the children are attending regularly and we also come and see the files which have been kept by the teacher. That really shows our children’s progress. (SMC member Bahraich)*

**Status of Achievement**

With the launching of the QLI program in 75 villages in 4 clusters things started changing. The PY staff visited the schools interacted with the SMC members and school staff and organized SMC meetings. Table 31 below clearly indicates that in the first year 2016-17 the number of meetings conducted were in the range of 0 - 11, 3-11, 2-11 and 1-11 in each of the four clusters; probably as this was the start of the project. In 2017-18, 4-11, 8-11, 2-11 and 2-11. In 2018-19 to date 1-6, 2-6, 1-7 and 1-5 is the range. This shows an improvement in the number of meetings being organized, with it being the best in 2017-18. There appear to be more meetings conducted...
in Chitrakoot as compared to Bahraich. The average number of participants in the meetings that were conducted are reported to be between 7 to 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Clusters</th>
<th>Chitrakoot (No. of schools 40)</th>
<th>Bahraich (No: of Schools 35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspects</td>
<td>Kapseti Asoha Bamboura Badrauli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum-Maximum number of SMC meetings</td>
<td>0/11 4/11 1/6 3/11 8/11 2/6 2/11 2/11 1/7 1/11 2/11 1/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of meetings</td>
<td>46 65 69 55 92 82 50 70 45 38 52 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of participants</td>
<td>9 9 8 7 8 7 9 10 9 9 9 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Major Issues Discussed in SMC Meetings in QLI schools

Most of the major stakeholders in both districts were surprised, pleased, happy and appreciative that the SMC meetings were taking place and these meetings seemed to be of some use and were productive in that they were helping in improving the school infrastructure and facilities available for children.

It was interesting to note that all the major stakeholders namely teachers, parents, PY staff, GP Pradhans and SMC members themselves spoke very positively about SMCs and the meetings that were conducted ever since the PY QLI project was launched. All those individuals the consultant interacted with had a lot to say about how the SMCs were working towards improving the school through provision of infrastructure facilities, their concern about children’s enrolment and regular attendance, learning and children with disabilities. This is supported by the data presented in table 32 below taken from minutes of the SMC meetings recorded in each of the 75 QLI schools (40 from Chitrakoot and 35 from Bahraich). Enrolment, irregular attendance of children with and without disabilities and learning review are the topmost issues that were discussed as taken from the minutes of the meetings. In provision of infrastructure facilities, playgrounds and toilets for girls and boys and repair of rooms emerged as common concerns, across all four clusters Most of the issues discussed were similar across the four clusters however, there appears to be more of a focus on issues related to children with disabilities in Bahraich as compared to Chitrakoot.
It was on the basis of the different issues discussed in the SMC meetings that the SMCs planned, prioritized and undertook the responsibility of ensuring that school improvement takes place. The empowerment of SMCs and their more regular functioning in both districts in the 75 QLI schools where they are established is visible in the resource mobilization which is reflected in Table 33 below. Provision of these resources through the efforts of the SMCs has led to an improved school environment across most schools. In a few schools as communicated by the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster: Kapsethi</th>
<th>Cluster: Asoha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment/irregular, repair of rooms, learning review, playground, certification of children with disabilities, rooms, learning review, playground, certification of children with disabilities.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment/irregular, health camp, review of learning, certification of children with disabilities, repair of rooms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District: Bahraich</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cluster 3: Bhambaura</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: School Records of SMC meetings**
GPs despite plans being made for school infrastructure improvement funds were not available for getting the work done.

Table 33: Resource Mobilization by SMCs for School Environment Improvement (2016-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Resource/Facility</th>
<th>District Chitrakoot</th>
<th>District Bahraich</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound /Playground /Boundary wall</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemented Benches &amp; Table for Mid-Day Meal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MDM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up of an Anganwadi</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prajayatna Records

The table above indicates the variety of facilities/resources that have been made available/procured by the SMCs with a significant number of 53 toilets and 22 drinking water facility being provided. In most of the QLI project schools, teachers and parents shared that playgrounds with a boundary wall for their children’s safety and security was a major concern and as is visible in 25 schools work related to the compound/boundary wall or playground facility has been accomplished. Other facilities provided were—classrooms, electricity, ramps, benches, link roads and even setting up of an anganwadi in one school.

Availability of all these facilities through the efforts and perseverance of the SMCs indicates that members belonging to these school level institutions are not only aware but working actively for improving their schools, although two or three members did state a lot more is happening, but much more needs to be done by us.

During the visits to the QLI schools where the consultant met with the SMC members they appeared to be confident, interested in their school functioning well and concerned about their village children’s attendance and learning. They also knew what their roles were and the issues that required to be resolved. All those who were present in the FGDs acknowledged that their own school’s environment had improved, due to which children were attending and learning more than two years ago. They also pointed out that they were participating in the meetings, finding solutions to problems faced by teachers and students and monitoring what was happening in their schools much more than before, had realized that children with disabilities
could learn and were trying to help them in different ways only because of the efforts and time spent by the Prajayatna team. One member was grateful that the facilitator in his school had told them so much about their role, what all they could do and how to go about it. They even organize our meetings, attend with us and help us to do something good for our school and children.

Empowerment and better functioning of the SMCs is depicted through two case studies one from Chitrakoot and the other from Bahraich districts where the QLI is operational. The two case studies clearly illustrate how the SMCs have contributed to improving their own schools and thereby children’s learning.

**Case Study 1: CHANGED MADARSA TIMINGS IMPROVES STUDENT ATTENDANCE**

Gram Panchayat Kohli is located in Kaiserganj block of Bahraich district in Uttar Pradesh. It is 52 kms from the district headquarters. The panchayat has a population of around 2000 people, out of which 65% are Muslims. The GP is well connected to the block and district headquarters by a pucca road. It has all the basic facilities but no Panchayat building.

Members informed that after Prajayatna started working in the Panchayat a number of meetings were organized in which the community in particular parents were encouraged to participate. A Shikshan Gram Sabha in February, 2016; Gram Panchayat Meeting in December 2017 and a meeting with parents in July, 2018 were organized. During these meetings a number of school related issues were discussed such as increasing the enrolment and retention of children in the school, repair of classrooms, lack of boundary wall and procuring glasses / plates in the kitchen for the MDM. One issue which was raised repeatedly was that of the timings of the primary school and Madarsa which is located next to the primary school being the same and thus clashing resulting in many Muslim children not being able to attend the primary school. This meant that these children were getting deprived of formal school education in spite of a primary school being located in the village where they resided.

In the Shikshan Gram Sabha organized by Prajayatna in Kohli school on February 23, 2016, the fact sheet of the school was shared by Prajayatna staff with all the participants. It was observed that while 86 children were enrolled in the school at that time, on an average only around 50% of them came to school regularly. This issue of irregular students was raised and ideas of dealing with the same explored. The main reason for irregular attendance was that a lot of children were attending the Madarsa and thus could not come to school despite the parents of these children being ready to send them to the school. However, they were not willing to withdraw them from the Madarsa. The only practical option that emerged was changing the Madarsa timings so that it does not clash with that of the primary school.

One of the members shared that- though we all had informally discussed this issue many a time the meeting organized by Prajayatna provided a platform for all of us to come together and
discuss various school related issues. Since this platform was not available earlier, the Madarsa issue though important was not solved.

The community members approached the Pradhan with their proposal to change the Madarsa timings. While there was a lot of resistance in the beginning, due to the tireless efforts and persistence of SMC President and other members, in-charge HT and Prajyatna staff, the Pradhan ultimately agreed to change the timings. This was despite the Madarsa being owned by a relative of the Pradhan, who was not keen to change the timings. This decision taken by the GP Pradhan has resulted in a visible increase in the regular attendance of the children enrolled in the school.

Case Study 2: “OUR SCHOOL IS BEAUTIFUL “

But was it always like this? Let us look into how this change took place.

Gram Panchayat Chakjafar Mafi is located in Pahadi block of Chitrakoot district of Uttar Pradesh which is 10 kms from the district headquarters. The Panchayat has a population of around 4000 people and has a Panchayat building with basic facilities. The Gram Panchayat has one primary school in which presently 116 children are enrolled.

When Prajyatna started working in the school it initially organized a Gram Panchayat meeting in Chakjafar school in October 2016 in which a total of 36 people, including the Pradhan participated. A number of school issues were highlighted by the SMC members and parents
namely- classrooms requiring immediate repair, broken and uneven floor and water dripping from the roof in the monsoons. There was also no drinking water facility and the toilets were in an unusable, pitiable condition. The members felt that the atmosphere of the school was not conducive to learning and requested the Pradhan to improve the condition of the school and surroundings so that the children could study in a proper manner.

The School Management Committee (SMC) prepared an action plan for school improvement facilitated by Prajayatna staff and a proposal was submitted to the Pradhan. Two CWD are also enrolled in the school - Rani and Hansraj and the members proudly shared that we also made a plan for getting a certificate for Hansraj. After the SMC meeting in August 2017, the Pradhan got the toilets of the school repaired and a drinking water facility was made available. Hansraj’s parents took him to the certification camp after being informed by Prajayatna and he was certified as disabled.

Members shared that- with the Prajayatna coming we have been conducting meetings regularly every month. A member hesitantly shared that- we did not know our roles and what we were supposed to do but now we do. Other issues were also pointed out such as- attendance of children and it was realized that attendance was better in the school in 2016 and 2017 as compared to 2015. The reason was that – students in classes 1-3 were interested and enjoying group work, going out and seeing things, reading books which was due to the Prajayatna programme. The SMC members opined that- this has resulted in student’s attendance increasing and their involvement in classroom work and learning which we can see from the files.

Today the school is in a good condition, clean and well-kept with all the necessary facilities and more beautiful as compared to 2016. Today it is also equipped with CCTV cameras and solar plates. As one member stated- So many changes have been possible due to all of us working together the Pradhan, SMC members, Head Teacher who does a lot and community members with Prajayatna guiding us. Now we believe we can do anything if we want to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Status of Targeted Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Collection of Local Education Governance Data (LEGD)</td>
<td>LEGD was got from all 75 villages in the project. Thus in both the districts the target set by PY was achieved in 2016 the first year of the pilot itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Organizing Shikshana Gram Sabhas</td>
<td>A total number of 102 meetings were organized out of which 65 and 37 were organized in Chitrakoot and Bahraich respectively in the schools where the QLI program was being implemented. PY staff shared that one meeting has been organized in each of the 75 schools. The additional numbers are the SMC meetings wherein more community members and GP Pradhans also came and attended. Thus the target set was achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Creating Gram Panchayat Networks</td>
<td>A total number of 42 Gram Panchayat meetings were organized by the PY. 25 and 17 each in Chitrakoot and Bahraich respectively. Networks in all 36 Gram panchayats, have been created. Meetings were conducted in each school as reported by PY staff and follow up meetings have also taken place. PY has accomplished more than the targets set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Organising Block and Nyaya Panchayat Level Workshops</td>
<td>A number of meetings/workshops have been organized by PY at both the block and Nyaya Panchayat levels. The planned target has been realized to some extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strengthening the Education Standing Committee in the Block and District Panchayats</td>
<td>PY between 2016 to 2018 has not adopted any strategy or mechanism to start the process of working with and strengthening these structures. The planned target has not been realized at all. The reasons behind the planned activity not being undertaken as the data from interviews with PY staff and FGDs with GP Pradhans revealed is that the ground reality was extremely challenging as these structures were found to be virtually defunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advocacy with the Department</td>
<td>Data indicates that a total number of 76 advocacy workshops have been conducted by the PY during 2016 to 2018 in both districts. These have been organized essentially for government functionaries working at different levels in the system- district-block-cluster-school. The targets set were achieved by PY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Documentation Activities</td>
<td>Most of the documentation planned was completed. A total number of eight quarterly newsletters and three Annual Citizen’s Reports were prepared. Other documentation work besides what was planned was alos undertaken such as- reports and minutes of meetings with Head teachers, DIET faculty, Children with Disabilities Comparison report (PY and Government data),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parents’ meetings, case studies, training reports and reports prepared for funders amongst others. The targets set were achieved and more accomplished.

| 8. | **Activating and Strengthening School Management Committees (SMCs)** | With the launch of the QLI pilot a number of changes had taken place with regard to SMCs. Meetings were being conducted regularly, more members were attending. They knew their roles and responsibilities and issues related to education were discussed in the meetings. All the major stakeholders namely teachers, parents and PY staff spoke very positively about the meetings that were conducted. Data from school records indicates that SMCs were working towards improving the school through provision of infrastructure facilities, children’s enrolment and regular attendance, learning and inclusion of children with disabilities. These were taken from minutes of the SMC meetings recorded in each of the 75 QLI schools. Qualitative data through interviews with parents, teachers and government officials highlighted school environment had improved largely due to active SMCs. The target and activities planned were realized to a large extent by PY. |
Section IV

Evaluation Question No: 4. To what extent has the program achieved the stated objectives set at the design stage? Why or why not?

The fourth and final evaluation question seeks to address to what extent the overall objective set by Prajayatna at the design stage which was - *To create an ecosystem where the schools are conducive for learning for every child including children with disabilities*, has been realized.

To address this question it needs to be pointed out that the scope of the present evaluation study is on the Quality Learning Initiative pilot undertaken by Prajayatna in 75 project schools in four clusters in the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich. The extent to which the QLI Pilot program has achieved the stated objectives at the design stage will be addressed in three ways.

1. **Indicators proposed at the design stage will be examined** based on the secondary data provided by Prajayatna. The data will be consolidated and analysed for purposes of evaluation.

2. **Impact of the QLI program in the 75 project schools will be evaluated** based on data/evidences collected from major stakeholders about the project and the major findings presented.

3. **Reference will be made directly to the detailed findings presented for three evaluation questions in the earlier sections** of this chapter, which are all integral to the achievement of not only the specific objectives but also ultimately the overall objective.

In sub section 1 that follows, indicator wise findings will be presented, with references to the earlier evaluation findings in Chapter 3 of the Report wherever applicable. A brief summary will however be provided for the reader’s convenience.

It also needs to be noted that the results should ideally have been examined, at the end of December 2018, when the program comes to a close. Thus there is still six months left and therefore the findings pertaining to this evaluation question need to be looked at keeping this in view.
Sub Section 1: Log Frame Indicator -wise Analysis and Presentation

**Indicator 1.** At least 70% of the SMCs of all target schools are strong and active in making school plans, implementing them and mobilizing resources for school development. (Target schools are 75)

The findings related to this indicator have been dealt with in detail earlier on in Sub Section 3 of this Chapter with reference to Evaluation Question No:3.

School records reveal that after the PY started work in 2016 in the 75 pilot schools regular SMC meetings are being conducted nearly once a month in most schools, with an average number of 9-11 members attending every meeting. Minutes of the meetings obtained from school records reveal that the major issues identified and discussed were related to enrolment, irregular attendance of children with and without disabilities and learning. Provision of infrastructure facilities namely – playgrounds, toilets for girls and boys and repair of rooms emerged as common concerns, across all four clusters. In Bahraich, there was more of a focus on issues related to children with disabilities in as compared to Chitrakoot.

The school environment in most of the 75 schools has improved as a variety of facilities/resources have been made available /procured by the SMCs between 2016 -18. 53 toilets and 22 drinking water facilities have been provided. In 25 schools work related to the compound/boundary wall or playground facility has been accomplished. Other facilities provided were- classrooms, electricity, ramps, benches, link roads and even setting up of an Anganwadi Centre in one school. Teachers, parents and PY staff attribute the school improvement to the efforts of the SMCs in the past two years which indicates that members belonging to these school level institutions are not only aware but working actively for improving their schools.

**Indicator 2: At least 60% of the Gram Panchayats Education Committees are active having Gram Panchayat education development plans and mobilizing resources to support all aspects of school development.**

The findings related to this indicator have been dealt with in detail earlier on in Sub Section 3 of this Chapter with reference to Evaluation Question No:3. Briefly what emerges in the findings is that all the GPs in Chitrakoot and Baharaich in the 4 QLI clusters have developed Gram Panchayat Education Plans with a sizeable amount of funds being mobilized for school improvement and development, in 2017 and 2018. The issues identified were those of maintenance of different buildings such as the school, Panchayat Bhawan and Anganwadi.
Centre, repair of toilets and boundary walls. It is interesting to note that though the Panchayat Bhavan was not initially a part of the plan made by PY with the GP, later on it was included as it was felt that repairing and maintaining the Panchayat Bhavan was an indicator of activating the GP to function effectively. Thus, though Panchayat Bhavan is not directly related to school development, it was also discussed and included in the plan.

**Indicator 3:** At least 60 schools (80%) ensure that a learning environment for all children (including children with disabilities) is created. *(For 75 schools)*

The findings related to this indicator have been dealt with in Section I for children without disabilities and in Section II for children with disabilities. However, the overall summary of findings at the end of each of the two sections is presented below for the reader’s convenience.

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS (Section I)** *(For Children without disabilities)*

Overall the QLI project was being implemented as intended in the pilot schools as reported by teachers and revealed in the classroom observations. This has resulted in students attending more regularly and learning. Most teachers reported and classroom observations indicated that a child centered, participatory activity based methodology was being used in classrooms. Three of the main QLI strategies that were reported to be adopted were- whole group, smaller mixed age groups and individual practice time by all the teachers generally on a daily basis. They also attempted to engage their children including those with disabilities in different activities. Children were seen to be busy, happy, using PY materials and confidently questioning and answering teachers. The change in classrooms has led to an increase attendance rates.

Qualitative data indicates that the improved learning environment has impacted and led to visible positive changes in students, classrooms, schools and in some teachers themselves. Two factors that have promoted this change were the monthly teachers’ collectives and onsite support provided by PY facilitators.

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS (Section II)** *(For Children with disabilities)*

The QLI approach has contributed significantly to promoting the social inclusion of children with disabilities who are attending schools. Children wanted to come to school and were seen to be engaged and happy which was not the case before the Prajayatna started the pilot. Attendance rates have gone up. Planning for each child is jointly undertaken by the teacher- facilitator – parents through the use of the IEP format provided by Prajayatna. Other children were seen to sit with them and help them to do work. Assessment is integral to teaching-learning and children’s
progress is shared by teachers verbally and through the child’s ongoing portfolios which is highly appreciated by the parents.

**Indicator 4:** Ensure maximum of 90% enrolment of children with disabilities in schools (including special schools). *(For 75 schools)*

The secondary data related to the above indicator is presented in table 34 which indicates that a total number of 175 children were identified by the PY between 2016-2018. Out of the 175 children who were identified, 65 children (37.14%) were enrolled in QLI schools by the Prajayatna team which is approximately one third of the target set by them. The others are enrolled on the school records but cannot attend. These children are those who require a lot of support due to their disability and find it difficult to go to school as a result of their disability. The alternative of special or home based education as reported by the PY team members is not available for those children requiring a high level of support.

**Table 34: Identification and Enrolment of children with disabilities in Chitrakoot and Baraich (2016-2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of CWD Inclusion</th>
<th>Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Bahraich</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Survey of CWD by Prajayatna for creation of database. <em>(Children in the age group of 3 to 18 years)</em></td>
<td>47 (LEG D)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enrolment of CWD by Prajayatna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 (12 to Primary and 5 to UPS)</td>
<td>06 (UPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CWD (Out of School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prajayatna Records*
At the Gram Panchayat level all the 36 Gram Panchayats to which these 75 QLI schools belong are addressing a number of educational issues with the objective of improving the school environment and resolving issues related to children’s enrolment, attendance. The awareness and sensitivity to issues related to improving student’s learning are not attended as much as those related to enrolment, attendance and ensuring proper school infrastructure and availability of basic facilities.

At the other two levels namely: block and district at the design stage Prajayatna had planned on strengthening the Education Standing Committees at both levels, as they are critical for school development. However, as stated by all the PY staff during interviews with them work has not been initiated to strengthen these structures. The main reason behind this as shared with the consultant by senior PY staff- was the challenging ground reality which made it difficult for PY to address this major activity. FGDs with the Gram Pradhans also further brought out the complex and difficult ground reality which existed at these two levels in the Panchayati Raj system in the two districts.

**Indicator 5: 75% of the Standing Committee at the GP, Block and District levels will address educational issues.**

The findings related to this indicator have been dealt with in detail earlier on in Sub Section 3 of this Chapter with reference to Evaluation Question No:3.

With a view to assessing whether schools have improved governance process for building quality education the Chief Functionary was asked to operationalize what the PY expected to see on the ground. Some of the indicators delineated by the Chief Functionary of PY in their work for improving governance are outlined below namely on the basis of which this indicator will be evaluated based on findings presented in the previous three sections of this chapter and each of the indicators will be evaluated on a 4-point scale, which is highlighted in the table 35 below.

**Indicator 6: 90% of schools have improved governance process for building quality inclusive education. (For 75 schools)**
Table 35: Status of Improved Governance Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Status of improved governance process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realized to a little extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Credibility for the School Management Committees (SMCs) among all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SMCs and communities prepare and implement school development plans resulting in improved school infrastructure, better learning environments for the children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enhanced capability of the community to access resources from different sources and ensure effective use of government plans and schemes.</td>
<td>X (From GPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Increase in teacher accountability to local communities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Increased interaction on learning of children between the communities and the teachers.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Improved attendance and retention of children in schools</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gram Panchayats realizing their responsibility towards education and enabling access to resources etc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Enhanced interaction between the different levels of governance structures—the Panchayat Raj Institutions and also between the Department and the PRI little</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Enhanced accountability and transparency between the SMC and the GP.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Block/Zilla Panchayats paying attention to broader issues of education that is being faced by the block/district Not at all</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 7: Minimum 10 relevant issues at the district level are identified and highlighted and this supports in policy and decision making.**

The findings related to this indicator have been dealt with in detail earlier on in Sub Section 3 of this Chapter with reference to Evaluation Question No:3.

The data taken from minutes of the SMC meetings recorded in each of the 75 QLI schools (40 from Chitrakoot and 35 from Bahraich) highlight that most of the issues discussed were similar across the four clusters however, there appears to be more of a focus on issues related to children
with disabilities in Bahraich as compared to Chitrakoot. The major issues that were identified and discussed were related to enrolment, irregular attendance of children with and without disabilities and their learning and progress. With regard to improving the school environment through provision of infrastructure facilities, the main items were: playgrounds/compound walls, toilets for girls and boys, repair of rooms emerged as common concerns. Other issues identified in fewer schools were related to TLM, libraries, certification of children with disabilities, health camps, toilets for them and teacher’s ability to take care of them and provide quality education.

All the issues highlighted above were identified firstly at the SMC level in the 75 QLI schools and then at the Gram Panchayat levels in the four clusters. These issues can broadly be placed under two major categories. The first, for improving the school environment and the second, for ensuring better learning and progress of students who are with and without disabilities.

In order to take up these issues at the district level in the next phase, the PY needs to work in a focused manner and closely with the taluka and zilla panchayat structures and standing education committees for ensuring that the issues at the SMC and GP level put in the school development plans are translated into effective action through approvals and funds provided by local governance structures at the higher levels.

**Indicator 8: 30% of the children, including children with disabilities will be in self-directed learning with 60% in the involved stage. (For 75 schools)**

The detailed findings with regard to this indicator are presented and discussed in Sections I and II of this Chapter. A brief summary of the findings with specific reference to the progress in learning levels of children with and without disabilities, it was found that the data collected by Prajayatna on students learning levels for 2016, 2017 and 2018 on an annual basis for children without disabilities in Section I of this chapter and for children with disabilities in Section II of this chapter in three subjects, eight abilities and development of five attitudes clearly indicates that 30% children are not at the self-directed learning level nor are 60% children in the involved stage. Thus the set targets were not achieved.
## Overall Summary of the Findings (Section 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No./Indicators</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1:</strong></td>
<td>School records reveal that after the PY started work in 2016 in the 75 pilot schools regular SMC meetings are being conducted nearly once a month in most schools, with an average number of 9-11 members attending every meeting. Minutes of the meetings obtained from school records reveal that the major issues identified and discussed were related to enrolment, irregular attendance of children with and without disabilities and learning. Provision of infrastructure facilities namely – playgrounds, toilets for girls and boys and repair of rooms emerged as common concerns, across all four clusters. In Bahraich, there was more of a focus on issues related to children with disabilities in as compared to Chitrakoot. The school environment in most of the 75 schools has improved as a variety of facilities/resources have been made available /procured by the SMCs between 2016 -18. 53 toilets and 22 drinking water facilities have been provided. In 25 schools work related to the compound/boundary wall or playground facility has been accomplished. Other facilities provided were- classrooms, electricity, ramps, benches, link roads and even setting up of an anganwadi in one school. Teachers, parents and PY staff attribute the school improvement to the efforts of the SMCs in the past two years which indicates that members belonging to these school level institutions are not only aware but working actively for improving their schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong></td>
<td>All 36 GPs in Chitrakoot and Baharaich in the 4 QLI clusters have developed Gram Panchayat Education Plans with a sizeable amount of funds being mobilized for school improvement and development, in 2017 and 2018. The issues identified were those of maintenance of different buildings such as the school, Panchayat bhavan and Anganwadi centre, repair of toilets and boundary walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3</strong></td>
<td>Children without disabilities Overall the QLI project was being implemented as intended in the pilot schools as reported by teachers and revealed in the classroom observations. This has resulted in students attending more regularly and learning. Most teachers reported and classroom observations indicated that a child centered, participatory activity based methodology was being used in classrooms. Three of the main QLI strategies that were reported to be adopted were- whole group, smaller mixed age groups and individual practice time by all the teachers generally on a daily basis. They also attempted to engage their children including those with disabilities in different activities. Children were seen to be busy,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At least 70% of the SMCs of all target schools are strong and active in making school plans, implementing them and mobilizing resources for school development. (Target schools are 75)*

*At least 60% of the Gram Panchayats Education Committees are active having Gram Panchayat education development plans and mobilizing resources to support all aspects of school development.*

*At least 60 schools (80%) ensure that a learning environment for all children (including children with disabilities) is created. (For 75 schools).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No./Indicators</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>happy, using PY materials and confidently questioning and answering teachers. The change in classrooms has led to an increase attendance rates. <strong>Children with Disabilities</strong> The QLI approach has contributed significantly to promoting the social inclusion of children with disabilities who are attending schools. Children wanted to come to school and were seen to be engaged and happy which was not the case before the Prajayatna started the pilot. Attendance rates have gone up. Planning for each child is jointly undertaken by the teacher-facilitator – parents through the use of the IEP format provided by Prajayatna. Other children were seen to sit with them and help them to do work. Assessment is integral to teaching-learning and children’s progress is shared by teachers verbally and through the child’s ongoing portfolios which is highly appreciated by the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4</strong></td>
<td>Ensure maximum of 90% enrolment of children with disabilities in schools (including special schools). <em>(For 75 schools)</em> Out of the 175 children who were identified, 65 children (37.14%) were enrolled in QLI schools by the Prajayatna team which is approximately one third of the target set by them. The others are enrolled on record but cannot attend as they are the severely disabled children who cannot go to school as a result of their disability. With regard to special or home based education the PY team members reported that there is no mechanism in place whereby home based education could be provided to those children with disabilities who need this. It is mainly those who are severely disabled who need to be in special schools or home based education and rehabilitation support, as they cannot go to school as a result of the degree and complexity of their disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 5.</strong></td>
<td>75% of the Standing Committee at the GP, Block and District levels will address educational issues. Work has not been initiated by PY to strengthen these structures. The main reason behind this was the challenging ground reality which made it difficult for PY to address this major activity. FGDs with the Gram Pradhans also further brought out the complex and difficult ground reality which existed at these two levels in the Panchayati Raj system in the two districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 6</strong></td>
<td>90% of schools have improved governance process for building quality inclusive education. <em>(For 75 schools)</em> 10 indicators were identified by PY for assessing the status of governance processes in the 75 schools for building quality education. Out of the 10 indicators, 3 have been realized to a large extent, 4 to some extent and 3 to a little extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicator 7.** | Minimum 10 relevant issues at the district level are identified and highlighted and this supports in policy and decision making. Approximately 10 issues were identified at the SMC and GP levels during 2016-2018. They were related to enrolment, irregular attendance of children with and without disabilities and their learning and progress. With regard to improving the school environment through provision of infrastructure facilities, the main items were: playgrounds/compound walls, toilets for girls and boys, repair of rooms emerged as common concerns. Other issues identified in fewer schools were related to TLM, libraries, certification of children with disabilities, health camps, toilets for them and teacher’s ability to handle them. All the issues highlighted above were identified firstly at the SMC level in the 75 QLI schools and then at
Indicators and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No./Indicators</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Gram Panchayat levels in the four clusters.</td>
<td>In order to take up these issues at the district level in the next phase, the PY needs to work in a focused manner and closely with the taluka and zilla panchayat structures and standing education committees for ensuring that the issues at the SMC and GP level put in the school development plans are translated into effective action through approvals and funds provided by local governance structures at the higher levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 8.

30% of the children, including children with disabilities will be in self-directed learning with 60% in the involved stage. (For 75 schools)

The annual data collected by Prajayatna on learning levels of children with and without disabilities, indicates that 30% children are not at the self-directed learning level nor are 60% children in the involved stage. Thus the targets set at the design were not achieved.

Sub Section II: Impact of the Programme

In evaluating to what extent the program has achieved the stated objectives it becomes equally necessary to understand and gather data/evidences from major stakeholders about the impact of the QLI program in the project schools. This was collected essentially through qualitative methods.

For teachers an open ended question in the teacher questionnaire that was administered to all teachers working in the QLI, yielded rich data. Further, interviews with teachers, students and classroom observations by the consultant in four schools that were randomly selected provided deeper insights and understandings. In addition, interviews with other key stakeholders namely parents, SMC members and Gram Panchayat Presidents along with government officials and Prajayatna staff also helped in arriving at a more holistic picture. Thus this sub section highlights and presents the impact of the project on students, schools and classrooms and teachers themselves as perceived by teachers. The evidences have been thus provided by both primary and secondary stakeholders involved in the implementation of the QLI pilot in schools and decentralized governance processes.

I. Teachers Views

a. Changes in Children

In both the project districts, a total number of 75 teachers reported and highlighted a number of significant changes they had observed in students, themselves, the school and classroom after the QLI program was launched in 2016. The major changes as reported have been highlighted briefly in the two tables below with frequency of the responses given against each change.

Table 36: Changes reported by teachers in schools and themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Changes in Schools- Classrooms</th>
<th>Changes in Teachers themselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Increase in enrolment-10</td>
<td>More group work-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Increase in attendance18</td>
<td>Hesitation reduced- and more confident - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Changes in Teachers themselves

Data from the questionnaires and also during the interviews with four teachers acknowledged that the program had not only impacted positively on the children enrolled in their schools but also on themselves. The major changes they saw in themselves were their views about what quality education is and how it should be provided. One of the teachers shared that the QLI had influenced and changed his attitude and also behavior towards children. He had become closer to students, realized the importance of building a good relationship with every child and the importance of understanding her/his background and needs, for teaching well.

During the interviews teachers shared that 'we did not realize the importance of preparing a daily lesson plan, paying attention to each student, conducting different activities, allowing children to ask questions. What surprised them were the benefits of using group work not only for learning but developing other important qualities in our students. amongst other things.

One teacher emphasized that - "I did not understand or realize the need and importance of allowing children to ask questions explain what they had drawn or made."

Another admitted that - "initially I was not convinced that children will be able to learn in mixed groups and also be quiet and participate in different activities. But it really works and they are also happy, discuss things and help each other".

The third teacher was surprised to see that - "young children also want to go through books and try to read, identify words and letters and then write them according to the task we give them ".

c. Changes in the Schools and Classrooms

Teachers also reported and shared changes they had observed in their schools and classrooms, as highlighted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Reported Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE ------Prajayatna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Better school environment (friendly, cordial, free and healthy)-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More discipline-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improved teacher-student relationship- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others ( TO ADD ON)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students were irregular and disruptive in the classroom, fighting amongst themselves.

SMC meetings were not conducted regularly and also did not do anything for improving the school environment especially facilities needed.

Children with disabilities did not come to school and if a few did they did not stay for the full day.

Sharing of student’s learning and progress with parents was less/almost negligible.

Teacher- Parent – SMC relationship was poor.

Attendance has increased and students are engaged in different activities in the classroom.

SMC meetings are being conducted every month through the help of Prajayatna staff and the school environment has improved.

More children with disabilities have been enrolled and those who can come/brought to school by parents are coming more regularly.

Student portfolios/Files are maintained in the project and are shown to the SMC members, parents and officials.

Relationship between teachers-parents (some) and SMC members has improved and parents visit the schools.

Table 37: Changes reported by teachers in students and classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>I. Changes in Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Supportive behavior- 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Interest in learning-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enjoying working in groups-20 (team work/learning by doing things together/working together)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Development of skills better 17 (questioning, reading, writing, speaking, listening, observation, thinking power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Development of different abilities-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Others-25 (Hesitation reduced, like coming to school, interested in cleanliness, overall development is better, accept children with disabilities and help them, do not make so much noise, are busy working, use TLM more, express ideas better, discuss, follow instructions are more positive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>II. Changes in the Classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Regular attendance -13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>More participation in classroom activities -12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>More group work and students enjoying doing this-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students learning from each other, happy and taking interest in their work-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Listening more, learning from others and by doing activities-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Positive happy environment-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in the above table the positive effects of the program are not only visible in the students and classrooms but also in the school and teachers themselves. Classroom observations also revealed that most children were participating, many children were showing leadership qualities, speaking and presenting their work confidently in front of the whole class, questioning other students on what they had done and helping their classmates.

**Teachers views on changes in their students**

- "The children are talking more, they are not scared to ask questions and also want to do things. Even if the answer is wrong they are not frightened as they were in the beginning. They are busy and enjoy what they do".
- "Some of my children are helping other children in doing their work. Any child whether SC or OBC or is a child with disability all now sit together only because they are working in small teams".
II. Students Speak

Earlier we used to quarrel a lot but it stopped once the teacher started making us sit in groups and gave us work to do. I have also told the class what our group did.

We used to sit in straight lines before nowadays I like to do work as we all sit in groups, talk and then present what is done in front of the others.

I like coming to school as we do lots of activities and sometimes the teacher takes us outside. We collect leaves and stones and then with that do work.

Earlier we used to quarrel a lot but it stopped once the teacher started making us sit in groups and gave us work to do. I have also told the class what our group did.
III. School Management Committees

All the members who had participated in the FGDs from 8 school were very vocal in most of the FGDs about how schools had changed and students too. It was interesting to note that all of them were appreciative of what the PY had done for their teachers, schools, students and themselves. They were happy that their schools had improved a lot, it had more facilities, children were all enrolled and attending classes regularly, the midday meals were better, teachers were teaching and children learning. The materials given by PY were also appreciated and they felt that due to this children were learning more. A lot of different activities in groups was taking place in the classes and the teachers were coming on time and not wasting time but teaching. The most important change reported by them was that children were happy and wanted to go to school.

The views as shared by a few of the SMC members and President is highlighted below:

- After the PY has come to our school everything has changed. Teachers are in the class for the full day. Children have started coming regularly, they sit and learn instead of running around doing nothing. The midday meal quality has improved also. We are also making sure that teachers are doing good work as some of us visit the classes. (SMC President Bahraich)

- There are files kept by the teacher that tells us what each child can do. There was nothing like this before. We feel happy to see the files and so do our children. It means they are learning. (SMC member Bahraich)

- We the SMC members come to school to make sure that the schools open on time, teachers are coming on time and teaching, the midday meal is of good quality and children are getting it daily, also that children are getting their dress, books etc. Before we never did so much. Sir told us we are responsible for what happens in our school for our children Now we come. (SMC member Chitrakoot)
- Children with disabilities are coming to school more regularly, unless they cannot commute because of their disability. The school has improved a lot in the past two years; toilet is there, playground is better, electricity is also available. We have also got repairs done. (SMC member Chitrakoot)

- Our children are now wanting to go to school. They enjoy the classes and are very happy. They are also learning and do not fight. They are no longer scared of the teacher. They tell us what they do in school. (SMC President Bahraich)

IV. Parents Voices

Documentary evidence based on meetings held with parents of CWD and non CWD students in all four schools also corroborates the changes that have been highlighted by teachers. Parents also reported having noticed changes in their children and appreciated the positive effects of the project. Most of them felt that the program had led to their children not running around in the village or school wanting to go to school happily and stay there, learning better, being more organized and learning more than two–three years ago. The parents of CWD children also perceived that they had become a little more independent, disciplined and were happier to go to school.

The voices of parents in the form of quotes, have been taken from the FGDs conducted with them to illustrate the major changes observed by them in their children.

Since these people have started coming to the school teachers are teaching, children sit and do work. They don’t run around and waste time. They are learning. The school has also improved MDM is good, pencils, paper and books are there. (Mother of student in Chitrakoot)

In the past nothing happened. Now children write their names and know counting. Files are kept in the school. Teachers show us these files through which we come to know about our child’s progress. (Mother of a student in Bahraich)

A lot of things have changed in our school in the last two years. A room has been constructed. Painting has been done. Boundary wall is not there. The school has improved. (Mother of student in Chitrakoot)

Teachers teach children in circles. Now there is no issue of front and back benchers in the class. Due to this, all children have started learning. Children go to school happily now. I have not visited the school personally but my child has started talking good about the school and his teachers.
IV. School Management Committees

V. Gram Panchayat Presidents

All the Gram Panchayat Presidents who were present during the four FGDs in the two districts expressed their satisfaction with the work of the PY and the effect it had on SMCs involvement in improving the schools and teachers in their teaching-learning. The PY had led to a lot of positive changes in the schools and students. The excerpts taken from the FGDs highlight the changes that were shared by the GP Pradhans.

- No one in the village used to pay attention. Not even parents. Teachers also never visited the homes in the villages. Prajayatna’s people work very hard. They go to villages and spread awareness among parents. They are often in field even on Sundays. They work also on the issues of children with disabilities. Mid-day meal was closed in our Panchayat. They got it restarted. (GP Pradhan Bahraich District).

- Level of cleanliness has increased in the school. After they held meetings, I got the toilets built in the school and spent around Rs. 16,000 on it. A small kitchen garden has also been started in the school. Number of children has also gone up in the school. Earlier they used to just keep roaming in the village. We have also started visiting the school regularly and are keeping an eye on the teacher and ensure that he teaches in the school (GP Pradhan Bahraich District).

- children’s enrolment was not such a problem but attendance was a big issue in our schools children are coming regularly are more disciplined and learning more. The files shown by the teacher tells us the children’s progress. They are also more disciplined and not running around. (GP Chitrakoot District)
teachers are taking the class for the full day and actually teaching children. They are not on their mobiles but doing their work. Children are going to schools and learning. Also the schools have improved with toilets, playground and repair work done. (GP Chitrakoot District)

VI. Government Education Officials

The QLI is being implemented by the Prajayatna in partnership with the Department of Education and key district, block and cluster level officials have been involved in the planning process from the beginning as the approach is democratic by design and encourages target groups to mobilize resources and solve their issues collectively. The officials and Prajayatna staff shared that their role was essentially to provide administrative support so that implementation could take place smoothly.

In the interviews with the key government officials in both the districts, it was interesting to note that they all were unanimous in their opinion that the QLI initiative in both the districts and in all four clusters had benefitted a lot of students including children with disabilities in primary schools. This has helped the government in realizing their goal of providing quality education to all children. Common features of the Prajayatna program that the DIET and DPO staff, BEOs and NPRCCs unanimously praised and appreciated a lot were - the conduct of the monthly teachers’ collective meetings, identification of children with disabilities in the villages and more importantly convincing parents to enrol and send them to schools regularly, organizing monthly SMC meetings, identifying issues in the school that required to be addressed and working closely with the community, SMCs and GPs for improving the school environment.

The District Co-ordinators in SSA for Inclusive Education and DIET Principals in both the districts expressed their satisfaction in the work being done by Prajayatna in general and for children with disabilities and community, in particular.

At the block level the BEOs were appreciative of the work being done by the teachers in selected schools and felt that they were doing a lot of good work, keeping the children engaged, ensuring their participation through a lot of activities, due to which enrolment had increased and student’s attendance improved a lot. A number of positive effects were highlighted such as- creating a friendly learning environment, learning in groups, improved teacher- student relationship, students feel comfortable and confident and being there for them.

An interesting observation made by one of the BEOs and NPRCCs was that this way of teaching solved the problem of teacher vacancies as this method required one teacher for handling three classes. This was also emphasized by one of the BEOs who categorically stated – all of us know that multi -grade teaching is a reality and will continue to be so in our country so this approach is a very good way of dealing with this situation.

All four NPRCCs praised the conduct of monthly collective meetings which facilitated interaction between all the teachers of the cluster. The NPRCs in particular opined that it helped teachers in many ways planning their lessons better and in a more focused manner. The
classrooms had become *learning spaces* and students were busy, *learning and enjoying school*. In a two/three schools they shared that they had got reports of children from private schools joining the government schools where the QLI was being implemented.

A few of the NPRCCs and two BEOs had visited QLI classrooms and they were quite surprised to observe that the teachers selected for the QLI program were doing *a lot of good work, keeping the children engaged, ensuring their participation through a lot of activities*, due to which enrolment and student attendance had increased. A number of positive effects were highlighted by them such as- creating a friendly learning environment, learning in groups, improved teacher-student relationship, students feeling comfortable and confident and learning. Infact one of them said *what they are doing is in line with what the NCF 2005 and SSA wants us to do.*

The basic ideas expressed by officials working at different operational levels in the system is illustrated through the excerpts from interviews conducted by the Consultant. The excerpts below reveal their positive feelings and views about the effect the QLI program has had very clearly:

- *whenever I have visited schools informally I always find the students engaged and happy and the teacher is totally occupied in classroom transaction. They are doing good work, students appear to be comfortable happy and are speaking confidently after the program started.* (NPRCC)
- *a strong relationship is being developed by the efforts of Prajayatna between the school and community. Though we had established SMCs they were not really active but Prajayatna has managed to do wonders. School facilities have improved and we hear that parents are taking more interest in their children’s education.* (Block Education Officer)
- *The home visits and amount of time spent and effort made by the Prajayatna facilitators in the villages with the parents of CWD has promoted their enrolment and helped in their actually attending school. This is a huge step forward. We had identified these children but could not get them to come to school.* (SSA District Coordinator for Inclusive Education)
- *A lot of good work is happening because of the Prajayatna. The teachers are teaching and keep the children busy and engaged. Children with disabilities are going to school all because of their hard work and home visits. The teachers are using group work and activities and teach all the subjects together.* – (Ex DIET Principal)
- *A multi-grade situation exists in many schools this is the reality. The QLI approach solves this major problem that our government faces of teacher vacancies and at the same time students are also learning better.* (NPRC Coordinator)

**VIII. Prajayatna Staff**

The PY staff are responsible for triggering off all the changes that have been highlighted by different groups of stakeholders. They themselves perceived that the QLI along with the local governance project has led to many significant changes that have impacted both schools and the students as pointed out below:
Increased enrolment and improved regular attendance by both children with and without disabilities.

Improved school infrastructure and facilities due to the work of SMCs and GPs.

GPs and SMCs have conducted meetings more frequently to identify and discuss education related issues. Plans made for addressing the identified issues and resources mobilized.

Students happy to come to school. They are more confident, busy, interacting better with the teacher and other children.

Students are learning better and assessment is continuous with feedback provided. Files have been appreciated and found useful by one and all.

Community and in particular parents more concerned and involved in their child’s education. There is more interaction of parents with teachers.

Sub Section III: The QLI Programme: Challenges and Positive Aspects

The impact seen at the ground level in schools and with the students is no doubt encouraging. However, it is equally necessary to understand what were the challenges faced by stakeholders in planning and implementation of the program as well as the positive features that helped achieve the objectives of the program to the extent desired. This sub section will focus on the above in three parts – challenges and positive aspects. This analysis it is hoped will help in understanding the reasons as to Why or Why Not were the objectives state at the design stage achieved or not.

A. The Challenges

When the pilot was initiated in the four clusters of Uttar Pradesh there were numerous challenges as communicated by the Prajayatna staff during the interviews which are highlighted below, in three subsections:

1. The QLI Program
2. Inclusion of Children with Disabilities
3. Decentralization of Education Governance Program
Figure 26 on the next page presents a consolidated picture of the challenges faced by different stakeholders in implementing the QLI pilot.

1. The QLI Pilot Program

a. Teacher related problems

All the Prajayatna staff during the interviews highlighted a number of issues all related to teachers, who were to play the key role in the QLI. The issues are highlighted below. The most significant being:

i) **Teacher vacancies in both districts in the project schools.** In 2016 when the QLI was initiated is as clearly presented in table 38 below. The situation in Baharaich was slightly better than Chitrakoot in 2016. There was no recruitment of teachers as till the end of 2016, however then the issue of Shiksha Mitras not working in schools came up, as was shared by the staff. This was corroborated during the school visits where the consultant observed that this cadre of teaching staff were present in all schools but not working. On probing further, a senior member of the Prajayatna team shared that - *in some schools where there are two teachers and one is a Shiksha Mitra the QLI teacher has to handle all the classes this affects the quality of the QLI being delivered.* Another scenario presented by another staff member was - *even in schools where there are three teachers if one goes on training and one is a Shiksha Mitra, the QLI teacher has to take charge of all the classes and also has the HTs administrative duties to perform.*
Figure 26: Challenges faced by Major Stakeholders in QLI Pilot
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### Table 38: Status of Teachers in QLI Project Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Bahraich</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>40 Schools</td>
<td>35 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctioned Posts</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled posts</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant posts</td>
<td>50 (37.59%)</td>
<td>21 (17.79%)</td>
<td>23 (18.25%)</td>
<td>27 (20.76%)</td>
<td>19 (18.26%)</td>
<td>22 (23.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Iterant teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Prajayatna Records

**ii)** Teachers in the two districts in most of the project schools were not used to working for the full day. As a senior staff explained- In the QLI teachers have to be 24X7 involved and busy organizing, conducting and participating in the classroom processes with students. The students cannot be left alone. To get the teachers to be engaged and involved in their work for the full day took nearly one year. Now things have changed.

**iii)** A huge social gap existed between the teachers and the student. The latter who came from Dalit and OBC families. In the villages the children from the higher classes go to private schools whereas the lower classes avail of the government school facilities. Thus building the teacher-pupil bond and relationship was a difficult task for us. A number of teachers felt that these children were not capable of learning and came to school only for the free mid-day meal.

**iv)** Changing teachers’ attitudes and fixed mind sets towards children and their traditional way of teaching.

**v)** Traditional way of looking at teaching and student learning by most teachers. This was further complicated as many students were first generation learners. Thus teaching-learning was all the more challenging for teachers.

### 2. Teachers

Teachers who were the key agent implementing the approach in this pilot had to face their own difficulties while implementing the QLI, despite support being provided by the Prajayatna facilitators. All the teachers reported the extent to which they faced difficulties in transacting the various components of the QLI approach in classrooms. Nearly two third of the total number of teachers (68) who responded 62.3% as indicated in the table 39 below reported facing difficulties while implementing the QLI program in their classrooms, whereas the rest did not. A greater number of teachers 73.5% from Chitrakoot faced difficulties as compared to 51.4% from Bahraich. A more detailed question was posed to understand which of the important aspects in the implementation of the QLI created problems for them and to what extent.
### Table 39: Difficulties faced in implementing the QLI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakoot</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.5</td>
<td>% 26.5</td>
<td>% 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraich</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 51.4</td>
<td>% 48.6</td>
<td>% 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 62.3</td>
<td>% 37.7</td>
<td>% 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 40: Extent of difficulties faced by teachers in QLI implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Aspects</th>
<th>Not at all difficult</th>
<th>Somewhat Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that each child participates and learns</td>
<td>N 19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 28.8</td>
<td>% 63.6</td>
<td>% 4.5</td>
<td>% 3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing activities to ensure each student learns by herself/himself</td>
<td>N 13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 19.7</td>
<td>% 69.7</td>
<td>% 7.6</td>
<td>% 3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching all subjects together</td>
<td>N 24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 36.9</td>
<td>% 38.5</td>
<td>% 20.3</td>
<td>% 4.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students in mixed groups</td>
<td>N 22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 33.3</td>
<td>% 40.9</td>
<td>% 19.7</td>
<td>% 6.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching without a textbook</td>
<td>N 21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 32.8</td>
<td>% 42.2</td>
<td>% 20.3</td>
<td>% 4.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using concept mapping as a way of teaching</td>
<td>N 31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 48.4</td>
<td>% 42.2</td>
<td>% 7.8</td>
<td>% 1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with disabilities</td>
<td>N 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 25.7</td>
<td>% 25.7</td>
<td>% 37.1</td>
<td>% 11.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including students with disabilities in the class</td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 31.4</td>
<td>% 22.9</td>
<td>% 37.1</td>
<td>% 8.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Individual Education Plan for student with disability</td>
<td>N 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 22.9</td>
<td>% 28.6</td>
<td>% 34.3</td>
<td>% 14.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a portfolio for each student</td>
<td>N 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 46.9</td>
<td>% 31.3</td>
<td>% 14.1</td>
<td>% 7.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing and Providing Feedback to students on a continuous basis</td>
<td>N 31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 47.0</td>
<td>% 37.9</td>
<td>% 9.1</td>
<td>% 6.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing capabilities of each student</td>
<td>N 32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 48.5</td>
<td>% 37.9</td>
<td>% 10.6</td>
<td>% 3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping for each student and tracking</td>
<td>N 28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Aspects</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Not at all difficult</td>
<td>Somewhat Difficult</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each child’s learning</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents in their child’s learning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining records and providing parents feedback on</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their child’s progress</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above indicates that:

- Out of all the basic aspects the maximum number of teachers 63.3% to 69.7% teachers reported that they found it somewhat difficult to ensure that each child participates and learns and also to develop activities for their self-learning respectively. However, 30% teachers did not find it difficult to do.
- The other aspects of the QLI approach namely: teaching all subjects together, using a concept map, conducting work in mixed groups and not using a textbook were found somewhat difficult to do by 38% to 42% teachers. One third of the teachers did not find it difficult.
- In the four items related to student assessment, maintaining individual portfolios, recording and providing feedback, 32.8% to 47% teachers had no difficulty in undertaking them. However, a little more than one third had some difficulties, with the remaining finding it either difficult or very difficult.
- Activities related to children with disabilities such as teaching and including them along with developing IEPs were found to be difficult and very difficult to implement by 45.7% to 48.6% teachers. This calls for attention as the number is sizeable.
- Involving parents in their children’s learning and providing a feedback to them about their children’s progress was viewed as challenging by 27% to 44% teachers.

This reveals that most teachers have some amount of difficulty in implementing most of the QLI aspects. This could be due to the fact that their understanding, skill development and ability to transact in the correct way is at different levels of functioning. The next sub section will present teacher’s abilities as measured by the Prajayatna.

### 2. Inclusion of Children with Disabilities

- Existence of Data gaps (between actual number of children with disabilities and data available with the education department). Identification of children with disabilities requires to be undertaken in a systematic and scientific manner based on reliable criteria for categorizing children into different disability groups and then verified with different stakeholders.
- Mismatch between enrolment numbers in the registers and records and students in schools.
- Lack of co-ordination between key departments.
- Lack of parental, community and teacher awareness leading to neglect of children with disabilities.
- Lack of rehabilitation services for all children with disabilities in general and those requiring a high level of support in particular.
- Iterant teacher- children with disabilities ratio very high.
- Lack of onsite services for children with disabilities.

### Table 41: Ratio of Iterant Teachers - CWD Enrolled in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Chitrakoot</th>
<th>Bahraich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Schools</td>
<td>35 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2016  2017  2018</td>
<td>2016  2017  2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of CWD Enrolled</td>
<td>25  23  22</td>
<td>0  27  50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of CWD Out of School</td>
<td>03  10  0</td>
<td>0  07  33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number needing IT services</td>
<td>28  33  22</td>
<td>0  34  83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Iterant Teachers</td>
<td>14  14  14</td>
<td>36  36  40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data from Prajayatna Records   **Note:** The Number of CWD Enrolled and Out of School from 2016 to 2018 is only for QLI project sites-schools

### 4. Decentralization of Education Governance Program

The challenges faced in this program were faced by two major groups of stakeholders- the Prajayatna staff and the Gram Panchayats in supporting schools to improve the quality of education for students with and without disabilities.

The Prajayatna staff highlighted some challenges which they had faced while implementing the local governance program as reflected in the excerpts below:

- only when one works at the ground level does one realized how complex and difficult is the actual ground reality, and how everything is influenced by so many factors some of which are political and nothing can be done to resolve the same.
- we found it quite shocking that these Panchayati Raj structures were virtually defunct in both the districts.
- oh! everything is there on paper but meetings most of the times did not take place. Records are maintained because they have to. Minutes etc. are signed. Some of the panchayat bhavans have not been used and are in a dilapidated condition. We have started doing something now in these buildings.
- a lot of work would be required to get things moving and more so in these two backward districts.
One of the staff members concluded by asserting that These committees would have to be activated, made aware and strengthened in order for them to get involved in the development of the schools in their block/districts. That is what we are doing.

In the FGDs with Gram Panchayat Presidents a number of issues that affected their work for and in supporting schools in providing quality education to all children emerged which are outlined below:

**Insufficient funds for education:**

All the GPs Presidents drew attention to the fact that there were no separate funds /budgets allocated for schools. Thus all school related work has to be done with the budget available with the Gram Panchayat.

**Lack of support from School Staff:**

The Head Teachers (HTs) who are member secretaries of their SMCs and other teachers are irresponsible, do not call us for meetings and are not interested in teaching.

**Education not a high priority area for the Zilla Panchayat**

The ZP and Secretary do not pay much attention to the schools and the field of education. It has never been taken seriously. With the Prajayatna coming things are changing and there is some improvement. Their attempts are good. The work undertaken by PY should be given to the administration in the form of a Report.

**B. Positive Aspects**

The evaluation study also led to the identification of a number of positive aspects which emerged as critical to the success of the programme as perceived by the major stakeholders. These aspects have been presented for the QLI pilot. It is hoped that the identification of these aspects will serve the dual purpose of– firstly, promoting the use of the same to strengthen the overall programme in the future by Prajayatna and secondly, develop a sustainability/exit plan using and upscaling the positive aspects within the existing government education system in the districts -state. Possibilities of replication in other states can also be explored by the organization.

**1. Alignment of the QLI approach to the Vision in the NCF 2005**

The QLI approach as enunciated in Prajayatna’s documents/materials and as communicated during the interviews and also observed during the classroom observations clearly revealed that the strategy followed was one promoting an inclusive learner centered participatory one where children were actively involved in the learning process and in co-constructing knowledge through discussions, thinking through, sharing concepts, etc. This is in alignment with the vision and principles of school education as advocated by National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005,. This itself provides the potential for replication by the state, in the future as the SSA and all education frameworks and documents advocate the same.
2. Teachers Collectives – An Empowering Platform

There was a unanimous appreciation by the teachers, government education department functionaries across all operational levels (district-block-cluster-school) about the benefits and gains of the monthly teacher collective meetings being organized and facilitated by the Prajayatna. These meetings were regularly conducted in the NPRCs across the four clusters where the pilot was being implemented.

The collectives were reported to be useful by all the teachers as it gave them regular and timely peer support and also opportunities to share their learnings and clarify their doubts and arrive at solutions to problems together. This was regarded valuable by the teaching community as it was a process of empowerment which was continuous. Probably this was the main reason why teachers showed a lot of motivation and enthusiasm towards teaching. This is another component that is similar to the idea of having Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs) and coordinators for providing onsite guidance and support through monthly meetings. However, there exist a huge gap between what was initially envisaged and what was implemented in and by these SSA structures. The collectives offer a ready – made solution of what and how these monthly meetings can and should be conducted to support teachers in both planning for and transacting quality teaching learning practices.

2. Provision of Materials for students in schools

The importance of materials in the form of stationary, books and other things being provide to each of the QLI schools by Prajayatna, was highlighted as a critical component of the programme by one and all during interactions with different stakeholders including students themselves. It was perceived to have contributed significantly to promoting student’s participation in different tasks and their learning and progress. In addition, it also promoted student’s creativity and their involvement and enjoyment of educational processes in the classrooms. The materials provided by PY gave them the basic facilities necessary for writing and reading, which their parents could not afford and the SSA or government schools were not providing.

4. Use of Group Work Across Mixed-Age Groups

In the QLI approach there were a number of strategies that were advocated by the staff and being practiced by teachers in their classrooms, most of the teachers found the use of group work beneficial whether it was whole group or small mixed groups. However, between the two they found the latter more useful as it was seen to lead to children working collaboratively with each other, made them more sensitive and caring individuals (as they helped each other in completing tasks), confident as they presented the work that was assigned to them, became team workers, developed leadership qualities and it promoted quicker and better learning amongst students.

5. Maintaing Individual Portfolios/Files
Students, parents, SMC members, government officials and GP Presidents were all aware, had seen and realized the importance of the Files the teachers maintained of each student’s work. It was looked upon as valuable aid since it informed them about each child’s learning and progress. Students were motivated to do better and were proud of their work and happy when it was shown to their parents and other people. The education department officials also appreciated this recording system.

All these aspects indicate that the QLI Pilot has the potential of being replicated and up scaled, within the existing government system of education.

**Overall Summary of the Findings**

Qualitative data reveals and highlights the impact of the QLI pilot in the 75 schools and on students and their learning. It has been reported by the major stakeholders that enrolment and regular attendance has increased and students are happier, engaged in different activities, more confident, are developing leadership qualities and at the same time have become more sensitive and caring even towards children with disabilities. They are also learning much more than before the project was launched. More children with disabilities have been enrolled and those who can come/brought to school by parents are coming more regularly to schools. Student portfolios/Files are maintained in the project and are shown to the SMC members, parents and officials.

The relationship between some teachers-parents and SMC members has improved and parents visit the schools more often to find out about their child’s progress. SMC meetings are being conducted more regularly and issue related to education are discussed and action taken to resolve them. Thus overall the school environment has improved in different ways.

However, there were a number of challenges faced by different stakeholders and Prajayatna in particular in piloting the QLI approach which has been highlighted in Figure 26. A number of positive aspects also emerged during the evaluation that were appreciated and found to be beneficial by the major groups of stakeholders. These were namely: Alignment of the QLI approach to the vision and philosophy in the NCF 2005, teachers’ collectives as an empowering platform, group work across mixed age groups, provision of materials to students, and maintenance of portfolios/files. These provide the way forward for the organization in collaboration with the state to replicate and/or upscale the work in the future.
Chapter Four presents the conclusions of this study which aimed to evaluate the implementation and impact of the piloting of the Quality Learning Initiative Programme (QLI) which was launched in 2016 in 75 primary schools located in 4 clusters in the two districts of Chitrakoot and Bahraich in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The conclusions of the evaluation study are briefly summarized separately in three sub sections. The first focusses on the QLI, the second on Children with Disabilities and the third on Decentralization of Education Governance Structures.

1. The QLI Pilot Program

- The QLI Pilot implementation was very well received and appreciated in both the districts by all the major stakeholder groups in the program. The study highlighted the unequivocal view among teachers, parents, SMC members and government officials that QLI had led to improved enrolment and regular attendance of children including those with disability; as well as promoted learning for children.

- Overall, the findings indicate that the implementation of the QLI was undertaken as intended by teachers in the 75 selected schools. Teachers used the different strategies in line with what the organization was promoting. Teachers reported that whole group, mixed age smaller groups and Individual Practice Time (IPT) was used by them in teaching–learning on a regular basis. This was corroborated through the classroom observations and feedback from students, parents, SMC members and NPRCCs.

- The QLI strategies were perceived to be very useful by more than two thirds of teachers and 73% effective to a great extent in promoting learning amongst their students. However, the quantitative data indicates that there was not much of an impact on the learning levels of students with and without disabilities as there is not an appreciable across subjects, abilities and attitudes during 2016-2018 as was visualized at the design stage.

- A number of unintended gains and benefits were also attributable to The QLI according to different stakeholders in the programme. They included positive behavior and attitudinal changes in students, improved teacher-pupil relationship and acceptance of children with disabilities in schools by both teachers and students.

- The Teacher Collectives organized every month at the cluster level (NPRCs) by the PY was looked upon favorably by all the teachers and valued as an important platform for sharing experiences, planning for the next month, discussing issues and solving problems. Working in whole and smaller mixed groups coupled with learning by doing and discussion were methods that were reported to have facilitated capacity building of
teachers. The benefits and usefulness of these collectives was fully endorsed by the NPRCCs and BEOs in the interviews with them.

- Evidence regarding teacher’s level of knowledge and understanding indicates that teachers found the more basic practices in the QLI programme easier to understand, conduct and transact. In comparison, observing and assessing them, recording/documenting the same and using this information in a systematic manner for further improvement was found to be relatively more difficult, more so for children with disabilities.

- The vision and basic features of the QLI approach had been understood broadly by all teachers implementing the programme. An integrated curriculum, no textbooks and administration of tests were some of the tenets of this approach. However, since the approach was different from what teachers were practicing earlier 68% teachers reported that they were still teaching English Hindi and Mathematics separately either on a daily basis or three to four times a week with 82% using the state textbook either daily or three to four times a week and 47% assessing students’ progress through tests. The weakest component that emerged was making adaptations / accommodations for students with disabilities, with 17% reporting they never did this and 23.4% doing it once a week. A daily plan was followed by teachers based on their monthly plan and the concept map. The three main teaching strategies of QLI - whole group, smaller mixed age groups and Individual Practice Time were reported to be practiced by half the number of teachers and also observed in the classroom observations. Thus some features were followed by most teachers, whereas some were not.

- Weekly and daily planning and preparation for the conduct of the QLI programme in the classroom was undertaken by teachers. Child centered, activity based methodology using the materials provided by the PY were visible. Strategies such as learning by doing, exploration, questioning, outdoor trips, and storytelling were practiced. However, all the teachers were not found to be on the same or optimal level of functioning.

- Classroom climate in the three schools were seen to be enabling, child- friendly. There were hardly any charts, displays or children’s work seen. Classes were quite well lit, ventilated, safe and secure, though the flooring was uneven and dirty and ceiling was leaking, as it was raining during the visits. Teacher's behavior towards children was friendly, positive and encouraging.

- Students were more engaged and happier doing whole and smaller mixed group work as compared to Individual Practice Time(IPT). During individual work time, there were some children who sat around waiting to be given their assignment, three to four students just did what they wanted to, a few were coloring because they wanted to do this and not because they were told to.

- Provision of materials by Prajayatna were used optimally by students and perceived to promote student learning, as many children were from backward poor families and did
not have notebooks, pencils, crayons, books etc. Teachers, parents, students and government functionaries all appreciated the benefits of materials given by Prajayatna.

- Assessment was reported by most teachers to be undertaken continuously but not seen to be practiced during classroom observation. Interviews revealed that teachers found it challenging as it was time consuming especially recording and documentation. Individual student portfolios/files were reported to be useful and liked by all the major stakeholders in particular parents and government officials.

- The QLI program had positively impacted both children and teachers. Changes in children were reported by teachers and parents and also observed during classroom observations. Children had become more confident, happier, were doing activities on their own and taking more interest in undertaking different tasks. They were not scared or hesitant to ask or answer questions. Most of the students were reported to be happy, busy and engaged in their tasks, freely and confidently asking questions, made presentations and helped their peers when necessary, from time to time even those children who had disabilities.

- Teachers’ attitude and behavior towards students has changed. They reported and shared that they had become more sensitive, caring, planned their work and observed children more carefully; understanding and catering to each child’s needs and requirements. This was stated to be of great importance for children with disabilities. This was also observed in the classrooms.

- Provision of periodic onsite support to teachers by the PY facilitators through school visits was an important component in translating the QLI approach into effective practice. The approach which was new to teachers and different from the traditional way of teaching required changed mindsets and attitudes for affecting desired changes in classrooms and students. Half the number of teachers found the support useful to a large extent and the rest to some extent. However, in all processes related to children with disabilities half the number of teachers did not find it useful.

- Teachers reported that the PY facilitators visited regularly and undertook a number of activities. A variety of roles were performed by them such as guiding monthly planning, material distribution, school surveys, building school – community bonds, facilitating the enrolment and attendance of children with disabilities, amongst others. Interviews with facilitators and teachers highlights the multiple roles performed by the PY staff on a regular basis. However, the two roles of helping them to undertake assessment better and use the IEP in planning better for children with disabilities were opined to be performed to a lesser degree.

- Classroom observations and interaction with students indicates children speaking confidently, an eagerness to learn and enjoyment while reading books and increased participation in the classes. Conduct of classes by teachers shows the use of different activities, continuous interaction, talking to students and attempts to make the classes more interesting, whilst practicing good manners.
The major challenges faced by the PY staff in implementation of the QLI were: bridging teacher-student socio-cultural divide, lack of rehabilitation services for those students with disabilities who required a high level of support and children with multiple disabilities, insufficient knowledge & skills for providing support to teachers in handling children with disabilities and Lack of technical on ground support from the government functionaries. Teachers had problems related to classroom transaction such as: shifting from the traditional teaching methods to the QLI approach, handling large classes, activities were time consuming especially documentation work and undertaking continuous assessment through the use of the three tools. Dealing with children with disabilities was even more challenging especially using the IEP and assessing their learning and progress.

II. Children with Disabilities

This was part of the QLI pilot but since there was a special focus given by Prajayatna to this the conclusions based on the findings for Evaluation Question No. 2 are presented in the sub section that follows.

The Prajayatna through the QLI pilot and local governance has made a significant beginning in initiating inclusion of children with disabilities in the 75 QLI primary schools. This was realized through the organization’s efforts and contribution in promoting the identification, enrolment, regular attendance and social inclusion of children with disabilities from the 75 villages where the pilot schools are located. Quantitative data indicates that 37.14% children with disabilities out of the 175 who were identified have been successfully enrolled. Attendance rates have also improved from 4% to 50% in Chitrakoot and 15% to 25% in Bahraich between 2016-2018 and 2017-1018 respectively. These positive effects are corroborated through the qualitative data from interviews with teachers, parents, government officials and SMCs. However, there are still a sizeable number of identified children with disabilities who require a high level of support and multiple disabilities who are not attending school.

Acknowledging that capacity building holds the key to educating children with disabilities, continuous capacity building of all those involved in their development was planned for by Prajayatna. The maximum number of such programs were planned and organized by PY for their own staff and teachers. For teachers who are the main agents of change training was delivered on a continuous basis through the monthly collectives. Despite a systematic delivery mechanism being in place, teachers expressed the need for more training in aspects such as: using the IEP for effective planning, implementing the QLI approach and most importantly, assessing children with different types of disabilities. The PY facilitators also expressed a need for capacity building through trainings for different types of disabilities. There was a demand for more trainings by parents too.
Inclusion was largely achieved due to the conduct of numerous and frequent home visits by the PY facilitators. This was perceived to be the one component that played a key role in realizing a number of important objectives namely:

- identifying children with disabilities and understanding their background, needs and requirements,
- generating awareness amongst parents about the needs, schemes, provisions and type of disability their child has.
- providing support to parents once their children are enrolled
- providing information about camps, check-ups, certification and how to deal with children etc.
- developing a bond between the school teacher, parents and SMCs.
- assessing the performance of children with disabilities and working out an action plan for the future.

A favorable and positive change in the attitudes and behavior of both teachers and other students towards children with disabilities, was reported over the three-year project period. These children have been accepted by both teachers and other students. Prior to the QLI launch, teachers were not at all keen to have these children in their classes as they believed that they were- incapable of learning, difficult to manage, will disturb other children students. Observations reveal a positive encouraging attitude, sensitivity of teachers towards their needs and slowly a bond is developing between the teacher-student. Other students were found to be sitting with them and did not make fun, ridicule or get angry or upset with them. A few were also helping them to do their work. This change has resulted in the social inclusion of children with disabilities in school-classrooms, which is a significant necessary first step in true inclusion in schools.

Assessment is a continuous and comprehensive process integral to teaching-learning in the QLI for all children. Though most teachers (77%) had reported undertaking assessment through the use of Prajayatna tools namely- teacher observation book, ongoing portfolio and progress card, it was not observed to be practiced in class. Immediate feedback too, was not seen to be undertaken. Children’s progress was shared by teachers with the students verbally and through the child’s ongoing portfolios with parents which was a feature highly appreciated by parents. The assessment process which is central and integral to planning for each child appears to pose more challenges than any other QLI component to teachers. It was perceived to be time-consuming, difficult to do as it is subjective in nature and placing children at different levels was challenging despite explanations of each level being given. Teachers also suggested that this could be resolved through more onsite support and capacity building. An interesting and valuable aspect that emerged was the dynamic and evolving nature of the assessment process, which changed according to the needs and situation of children with disabilities and teacher’s difficulties.
Moving from the first step of social inclusion to actual learning was found to be challenging for both teachers and PY staff. Children’s learning and progress was revealed through the data collected annually from 2016 to 2018 by Prajayatna on their learning levels in subjects, abilities and attitudes. Learning levels for children with disabilities between 2016 to 2018 shows slight improvement and progress, as children have progressed from the lowest level to the next one, across all the skills/abilities identified by the Prajayatna. This is noteworthy in view of the short time the QLI has been operational this is to be appreciated and built on. In Hindi, English and Maths children have progressed from evolving to either interested or involved. Across the five attitudinal aspects the data indicates that by 2018 approximately 50% had progressed towards the interested levels of learning. However, there are hardly any children at the desired top most learning level of – independent/self-directed. However, this is to be expected with this target group of children as learning definitely takes more time for them as compared to those without disabilities.

An important outcome of this work was the Improvement in the quality of life of some of these children as reported by parents, SMC members and government officials. This is the result of the multi-pronged, supportive strategy adopted by Prajayatna through the conduct of home visits, medical/health measurement and certification camps, parental meetings and providing the advice of experts through meetings and home visits to parents of children with disabilities. All the strategies were viewed as extremely valuable and important by parents, government officials, GP Pradhans and SMCs, in particular conduct of home visits by PY staff. This was especially beneficial for initiating and raising awareness of parents and their demand for rehabilitation services for children with severe and/or multiple disabilities.

The supportive role of the Prajayatna team emerges as the single most critical factor in improving the enrolment, regular attendance and acceptance of children with disabilities by teachers and other children QLI in schools. Home visits conducted by the facilitators, their efforts and time spent with family members and in particular parents appears to have triggered a change in the attitude of the community in general and parents in particular towards these children.

Data indicates that those children who are still out of school though enrolled are those children with severe or multiple disabilities. These children are unable to attend school for a variety of reasons. The need for PY to explore other avenues of providing education arises as an important area for action in the future. Home based education and other avenues of providing support to these children need to be worked out collaboratively with government departments.

The major challenges PY facilitators and teachers faced with regard to promoting inclusion of children with disabilities were: convincing parents to send their children to schools, changing teachers’ negative attitudes and beliefs about children with disabilities. The lack of rehabilitation services that include medical check-ups and measurement...
camps and delay in supply of aids and assistive devices. Absence of networking at the district level between all the government departments critical for the welfare of these children was another factor.

III. Decentralization of Education Governance Structures

The DEG project proposes to address quality in all aspects of the public schooling system by ensuring community involvement through a decentralised approach to educational governance. The PY believes that education has to be a shared vision of what a school means or does to a society. The approach thus centres on community ownership and for this to be realized calls for the community to be part of the learning process.

- When the project was launched the survey conducted yielded data referred to as LEGD. This facilitated the development of a shared vision for promoting school improvement and student learning by the community structures. The LEGD established an evidence based framework for enabling the ground level community structures i.e. SMCs and GPs to develop need based school plans for initiating the change that they desire. Thus the LEGD was used by Prajayatna to engage with communities by starting a dialogue on improving schools and in interacting with functionaries of the Gram Panchayats and the Department of Education on the situation in their schools. It focused on providing the actual status of each school with respect to a number of critical variables namely: infrastructure, enrolment, teacher availability and issues affecting the school adversely.

- An effective strategy that was appreciated by SMCs and also parents was the organization of Shikshana Gram Sabhas as it facilitated an important activity the development of School Plans by SMCs. A total number of 102 meetings were conducted for sharing the LEGD and discussions facilitated by PY staff. This helped SMCs and communities in becoming aware and realizing the importance of education, how to improve their schools and students’ learning. SMCs expressed that it led to the preparation of a realistic, need based school development plan, became aware about the needs, problems, issues and facilities available and required for children with disabilities.

- Creation of GP networks within the 36 GPs in the QLI pilot is a significant achievement. This is critical as it is the GPs and the SMCs that are the governance structures closest to the schools and know the ground realities better than structures at the taluka and zilla levels. The usefulness of this platform was reported by SMC members and the Pradhans.
in the FGDs that this is an important platform for each Gram Panchayat to develop their own Gram Panchayat Education Plans focusing on infrastructure development, student enrolment, learning needs, teacher vacancies/requirements amongst other issues and concerns. Qualitative data indicates that it has promoted exploration/identification of issues and discussion between the SMCs and GPs to decide and arrive at feasible solutions and mobilize resources for the same.

- Resource mobilization by Gram Panchayats was an important gain of the program. These were for issues related to school improvement that they and SMCs identified based on LEGD. This provided the necessary direction for creating a suitable and enriching learning environment for effective implementation of the QLI. However, due to problems like delayed approvals, fund delays, insufficient funds and less priority given to education by the Panchayati Raj, limited action could be taken by GPs despite their desire to do more.

- Good governance practices were reported and observed such as all the SMCs in the 75 schools were established based on specified norms and functioning through monthly meetings conducted regularly. The Gram Panchayats were taking responsibility for developing and executing the School Development Plans. This has resulted in improved infrastructure and student enrolment and attendance in most schools, which is supported through data collected from school records and minutes of SMC meetings and also observed and reported by stakeholders. There is also increased enrolment and attendance of children with disabilities in primary schools in the QLI schools.

- The impact of the enhancing community ownership through the efforts being made by Prajayatna in and for improving the schooling system has been realized as reported through quantitative and qualitative data in the areas of school infrastructure development, student enrolment and attendance for both children with and without disabilities and institutional capability of SMCs and GPs.

- Key elected representatives from the Gram Panchayat level were largely engaged in school improvement related work. However, at the other two levels- the Taluk or block and the district level hardly any engagement and dialogue was reported. Similarly, the Departments of Education and Rural Development were not as actively engaged in solving issues of schools and education governance through Prajayatna Processes, as visualized.

- A number of challenges were faced by the Prajayatna team in this initial phase of their work for promoting the activation of local governance structures such as promoting awareness and action at and for education of children at the Block and Zilla Panchayat levels, networking and facilitating the important connect for enhanced interaction between the different levels of governance structures namely the Panchayat Raj Institutions (PRI) and the Department and the PRIs and promoting enhanced accountability and transparency between the SMCs and the GPs.
With a view to improving the program further a number of major suggestions were provided by all the teachers, government officials and PY staff which are presented below:

- Appointment of one teacher per class, especially in schools where the enrolment figures are high.
- More training programs for teachers, in addition to the collectives. The areas specified were requiring were: use of assessment tools, planning, use of the IEP and promoting learning of with children with disabilities.
- Participation of government functionaries at the block and cluster levels (BEOs and NPRCCs) in all the QLI workshops and teachers’ collectives.
- Joint planning by Prajyatna staff and government functionaries for effective QLI implementation within the existing system.
- GPs participation in their schools’ SMC meetings.
- Activating the Standing Committees on Education and developing linkages with block and Zilla Panchayati Raj structures.

Finally, to conclude all the major stakeholder groups involved in the project were unanimous in their view that the QLI should continue in the next year and be up scaled in their respective districts. Some wanted the project to be operationalized in the whole state and a few even felt it should be spread to other states in the country, as there were many benefits and gains observed.
Chapter 5: Recommendations

Chapter Five presents the major recommendations for consolidating, improving and upscaling the QLI pilot program. These recommendations are based on the findings of the evaluation study which were presented earlier on in the Report, with reference to each of the four evaluation questions. The recommendations are specifically addressed to Prajayatna since the QLI pilot program which is the focus of the evaluation study was designed, planned and implemented by the organization. The recommendations are presented in two Parts A & B.

**Part A:** This part focuses on recommendations specific to the three main foci of the program – Quality Learning Initiative, Inclusion of Children with Disabilities and Decentralization of Education Governance processes that were all an integral part of the present evaluation study.

**Part A:** The second part highlights the general recommendations that have been proposed in view of the present scenario of school education in the country vis-à-vis the recent enforcement of the RTE Act 2009 and ongoing Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) programme which has recently been reframed as the Samagrah Shiksha Program. An attempt has been made to present these recommendations through an Integrated model for upscaling the QLI programme in the future which presented in Figure 27.

**Part A. Specific Recommendations**

In this part the specific recommendations that are presented aim at consolidation and strengthening the QLI program, the work going on for Children with Disabilities and further strengthening of the Decentralized Education Governance structures in three subsections separately.

**I. Quality Learning Initiative**

A set of recommendations have also been proposed with the basic purpose of strengthening and improving the overall quality of the QLI Pilot. The recommendations have been suggested based on two major assumptions.

- Firstly, that the QLI project will continue for a minimum period of two years more in the four clusters where it is presently being piloted for purposes of consolidation.
- Secondly, that it will be up scaled to other blocks/districts in Uttar Pradesh.

It is visualized that in 2019-20, consolidation of ongoing work in classes I, II, III and IV is to be undertaken and inclusion of Class V. To realize the same, it is recommended that Prajayatna undertakes the following activities:
• Jointly delineating the roles and responsibilities of functionaries representing key institutions (Prajayatna and Government District- Block-Cluster- School).
• Establishing a system of joint monitoring of QLI project schools by Prajayatna staff, SMCs and SSA functionaries.
• Ensuring that officials from the District level education department visit schools at least twice a year to motivate the QLI teachers, community and project staff.
• Constituting collaboratively with the Districts - Block level education departments a group of Resource Persons from effective participating teachers in the on-going programme in the four pilot clusters.
• Developing a video on ‘A day in the QLI Classroom’ to illustrate the processes, materials and activities being followed.

Finally, an important recommendation is adopting 5-10 Anganwadis in each of the 4 clusters to implement the ongoing QLI program. This is viewed as necessary for the early identification and stimulation of children with disabilities and their continuity into primary schooling.

II. Children with Disabilities

• Strengthening networking with other departments specially education and health for providing a holistic package of services/rehabilitation children with all types of disabilities but in particular those children who require a high level of support (severe and multiple disabilities). Particular focus needs to be given by the district authorities in ensuring safe transportation of these children to school and back.
• Planning for a systematic capacity building program for teachers is a non-negotiable for teachers on critical aspects such as IEP, assessment amongst others. Trainings should be organized for other stakeholders operating at all levels including parents.
• Moving from orientation and sensitization of PY team members to delivery of training on different types and aspects of children with disabilities in order to enable quality implementation of the project.
• Developing a plan for the government Iterant teachers to provide more support to children with disabilities in QLI schools.
• Capacity building plan for government Iterant teachers in collaboration with SSA and concerned state departments.
• Exploring the most viable model out of different models/alternatives for joint collaboration with other key departments.
• Preparing a feasible and practical action plan in collaboration with the DIETs- SCERT-SPO and other key institutions working for children with disability.
• Developing a strategy plan with the parents, SMCs and Gram Panchayats for those children with disabilities who require a high level of support.
• Using the IEP and promoting learning amongst children.
• Documentation of ‘Case Studies’ on children with disabilities for advocacy and raising awareness amongst teachers and parents.

Considering that the QLI approach is attempting to institute an alternate culture of learning and that too within the context of mainstream government schooling, it is important that the philosophy and approach of the programme is both legitimated and accepted by the education department. Thus, support from the Department of Education (DEO) including Samgraha Shiksha Abhiyan office, not only in coordinating and supporting administrative requirements (like sending circulars and letters, attending meetings and paying visits) but also in planning and conducting trainings, providing resources, orienting and training NPRCCs, Block Education Officers (BEOs) amongst others is critical.

Further, it is important that the DEO in collaboration with the SCERT provides recognition to the alternative forms of teaching-learning (integration of subjects, learning in mixed groups, continuous assessments and going beyond the textbook) in a formalized manner. This will give the necessary push to the important QLI components becoming an integral part of the inclusive classroom pedagogy. The department of education validating the use of the QLI approach will make it easier for teachers to adopt and practice the same as part of their regular routine.

To realize the above visits by the government functionaries to the project sites needs to be organized for sharing the on ground experiences and this can be followed up by the constitution of a Core Advisory Group by the SCERT- SSA and Prajayatna.

III. Decentralization Education Governance

With a view to getting the community to take ownership of what happens in their schools the Prajayatna processes adopted for strengthening DEG has made a good beginning with the local village communities, SMCs and GPs in which the QLI pilot schools are located. To facilitate further strengthening and consolidating the work realized so far the major recommendations proposed are highlighted below:

• Moving beyond discussing and resolving the basic issues of infrastructure, enrolment and retention that have been addressed in most of the QLI schools to actual monitoring by SMC members of students’ learning and progress, teaching-learning in classrooms, teachers dealing with children with disabilities amongst other concerns.
• Developing a joint action plan by SMC members, teachers and the PY staff for monitoring schools by assigning roles and responsibilities.
• Networking with the block and zilla panchayat structures and functionaries
• Strengthening the relationship between SMCs and Gram Panchayats and developing a joint work culture
• Sharing School development plans at the GP /Block levels between schools in different GPs as a cross learning exercise.
• Strengthening the involvement of parents who are probably the most important stakeholders in the process of schooling need to be motivated and more involved in monitoring their children’s attendance, participation and learning.

Finally, it needs to be stated that all the recommendations though made in separately for the three projects/components are all integral and support the overall QLI pilot programme in strengthening, consolidation and up scaling in the future.

**Part B: General Recommendations**

**Upscaling & Replication of the QLI pilot**

The QLI pilot has demonstrated that the approach implemented in classrooms has the potential for upscaling to other areas in the two districts and/or other districts in the state. Upscaling of the QLI has also been suggested by nearly all the teachers involved in the programme and other major stakeholders such as- government officials (DIET faculty, BEOs, NPRCCs), SMCs and GP Pradhans.

The impact of the program is clearly visible in the increased enrolment and regular attendance of all students including those with disabilities. Equally important is that in a period of three years it has led to positive changes in student behavior, teachers themselves and student-teacher relationship. The approach has also contributed to making the QLI classrooms child-friendly, learner centered, participatory and engagement of students in a variety of activities. *(Refer to Chapter 3 – Section IV)*. More importantly the vision and ideology and processes advocated in the approach are in alignment with the vision advocated in the National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005 which would make it more acceptable and easier to be mainstreamed by key decision makers, administrators and functionaries in the state government education system.

A number of positive aspects of the QLI have also been reported by major stakeholders in interviews and FGDs that were conducted and also observed by the consultant during the evaluation *(Refer to Chapter 3 – Section IV)*. These components hold the power of replication while the program is being up scaled. However, it is strongly recommended that every aspect in the entire program is considered carefully and given more time for consolidation. It would also be useful if a randomized control study is undertaken before replicating the program in its entirety. Some features could be replicated as they are in different contexts, others may require modification /adjustment based on the contexts, target groups and existing situations.

Inclusion of children with disabilities which is an integral part of the QLI pilot, needs to be consolidated, strengthened and some aspects developed further before being either replicated or up scaled. It is a well-known and accepted fact that working with and promoting the inclusion of children with disabilities is a tremendous challenge, and the results are slower than for other target groups in the student population.

*Upscaling of the QLI*
Upscaling and promoting sustainability of the QLI pilot is based on optimally promoting and integrating the positive components that have been identified in the study (Refer to Chapter 3 – Section 4), within mainstream primary schooling. This calls for sharing the same with the SCERT UP and subsequently developing an action plan for integrating the components into ongoing State wide efforts and practices at the Primary level of schooling in the Samgraha Shiksha Abhiyan and implementation of the RTE Act 2009. An attempt has been made to present a set of recommendations highlighted through an Integrated model for Upscaling the QLI pilot initiative in the future that is presented below in Figure 27, and important points for upscaling outlined in the final sub section of the Report - The Way Forward.

**Figure 27: Upscaling the QLI Pilot: An Integrated Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Depts.</th>
<th>SCERT &amp; SPO</th>
<th>Other DIETS in Uttar Pradesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchayati Raj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on: Networking with departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRAJAYATNA &amp; DISTRICT STRUCTURES (Resource Centre for QLI approach in Primary and Pre-school Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIETs Bahraich &amp; Chitrakoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on: Preparing Master Trainers in: QLI &amp; Disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decentralized Education Governance Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue programme across the two entire districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on working closely with Block and Zilla Panchayat structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen linkages between GPs &amp; SMCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Learning Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance of ongoing work in classes I, 2, 3 and 4 &amp; including children from classes IV in QLI pilot schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance in all pilot schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring home based education option with all Govt. Departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiate a QLI Pilot in Anganwadi Centres in the 4 QLI pilot clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Focus on Early Identification &amp; Stimulation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Way Forward

- Developing a holistic ‘Plan of Action’ focusing on strategies and mechanisms for upscaling the programme and forging linkages with key government education institutions at the district and state levels.
- Developing a long term strategy by Prajayatna to incorporate and integrate all the positive aspects/components in the QLI project into ongoing State-district level programmes and initiatives.
- Constituting an Advisory Group comprising Prajayatna senior staff, Uttar Pradesh state government officials (SCERT and SPO), the two DIETs in Chitrakoot and Bahraich, four block and cluster level representatives (BEOs and NPRCCs), Gram Panchayat Pradhans, members from four SMCs NGO, one representative each from other government departments (and innovative teachers.
- Establishing a baseline for the next phase and including programme evaluation as a periodic an integral component of the future QLI program.
- Ensuring academic rigor by planning for the use of a ‘randomized control design’ as part of the future Action Plan in order to provide systematic, empirically valid data/evidences.
- Networking with key government departments especially for provision of a package of rehabilitation services for children with disabilities.
- Strengthening DIET functionaries by preparing Master Trainers for promoting the QLI approach.
- Constituting a Core Group of potential Master Trainers from teachers who participated in the project from 2016 to 2018 to train, support and monitor the quality of the project once it is up scaled; and prepare future teacher collectives.
- Developing two schools in each cluster in the QLI pilot as demonstration sites for upscaling.
- Developing a variety of materials (pamphlets, brochures) to promote advocacy and provide information on the QLI approach along with inclusion of children with disabilities.
- Preparing an appropriate plan for providing onsite support and guidance to teachers.
- Developing a joint monitoring mechanism with the government education department and Panchayati Raj structures for upscaling.
- Developing an exit plan as part of the sustainability plan.