

# **Multi-Country Study on Inclusive Education (MCSIE)**

## **Trip Report**

Sub-award under 7200AA18CA00009

Produced by: Brent C. Elder, PhD and Hayley Niad, Inclusive Development Partners (IDP)

Positions: Research Team Lead- Cambodia, and Researcher/Program Manager

Arrival Date: November 3, 2019

Departure Date: November 9, 2019

**APPENDIX A – Meeting Summaries from meetings from November 4-8**

**APPENDIX B – Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation (CDPO) Meeting Agenda**

### **DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government

## BACKGROUND

Multi-country Study on Inclusive Education (MCSIE) is a three-year, \$3.585 million evaluation of three new USAID inclusive education activities in Cambodia, Malawi, and Nepal, investigating what works to improve the quality of education for learners with disabilities. The activities in Cambodia, Malawi, and Nepal represent USAID's most concerted effort to date to build systems to ensure students with disabilities have access to quality education. MCSIE will leverage this unique opportunity to derive lessons about what works to sustainably advance teaching and learning outcomes for children with disabilities in varying contexts. USAID and its partners will use this information to inform adaptations to its activities in Cambodia, Malawi, and Nepal but also to plan for new inclusive education programming globally.

## TRAVEL OBJECTIVES

1. To meet with key stakeholders and begin to collect information and conduct interviews to fill gaps of information in order to better inform data collection tools and data collection efforts;
2. To gain a detailed understanding of each of the activities currently underway, what activities stakeholders have planned, what they have already accomplished, etc.;
3. To gain a detailed understanding of key stakeholders for the activities and inclusive education programs and an understanding of what they hope to get out of the evaluation, how they will use the evaluation, what type of findings would be particularly useful for them in planning for and adapting interventions, etc.;
4. To acquire secondary data already collected under these activities and key reports/tools, including baseline EGRA data and tools, any Knowledge, Attitude, Practice, and Belief (KAPB) surveys conducted, any classroom observation data already collected, screening tools, key reports, etc.;
5. To finalize agreements with in-country partners;
6. To gain a detailed understanding of the activity sample frame and the sample for the planned/already administered EGRAs;
7. To gain a more detailed understanding of the timeline for activities and when it makes the most sense to gather baseline, midline, and endline data collection; and
8. To gain a better understanding of any in-country IRB requirements.

## TRIP SUMMARY

The following provides a summary of the trip outcomes based upon the initial objectives:

1. **To meet with key stakeholders and begin to collect information and conduct interviews to fill gaps of information in order to better inform data collection tools and data collection efforts.** Through several meetings with USAID, RTI, and other partners, IDP has a better of how project partners are collaborating and supporting project objectives. For example, it was helpful to learn more about the newly formed National Institute of Special Education (NISE), formerly Krousar Thmey, and how they are supporting deaf and blind students within the ACR program, as well as how they are developing supports for intellectual disabilities. Gathering this information and seeing how the various partners are supporting USAID will help IDP in their development of data collection efforts, specifically how IDP's collaboration with Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation (CDPO) will help collect field test data collection tools like initial, midline, and endline interviews and focus groups, and household surveys. See Appendix B for more details.
2. **To gain a detailed understanding of each of the activities currently underway, what activities stakeholders have planned, what they have already accomplished, etc.** IDP met with several stakeholders to introduce them to the MCSIE project and to learn more about

current challenges related to educating children with disabilities in Cambodia. One challenge was actually locating households of children with disabilities due to the varying understandings of what constitutes a disability. Additionally, implementing hearing screenings that required more high tech assessments is not sustainable due to the costs involved. Another barrier is that teachers do not currently have the capacity to support students with more significant disabilities in schools. Information from these meetings will help inform the Cambodia literature review and future tool development. IDP also gathered information about important stakeholders who should review key tools and provide input moving forward. Stakeholders include: parents of children with disabilities, teachers, administrators, and IE field officers who have been participating in the project in Kampong Thom Province. While the project is coming to a close in June 2021, USAID's focus in terms of a timeline was gather meaningful data as soon as possible so it can inform the design of the new program plan. Due to institutional review board (IRB) requirements in both the United States and Cambodia, the rough timeline is March/April 2020 initial data collection March/April 2020 household survey collection #1, October 2020 midline data collection with classroom observation in August or December 2020, May/June 2021 endline data collection, and TBD household survey collection #2.

3. **To gain a detailed understanding of key stakeholders for the activities and inclusive education programs and an understanding of what they hope to get out of the evaluation, how they will use the evaluation, what type of findings would be particularly useful for them in planning for and adapting interventions, etc.** Through in-depth conversations with USAID and RTI in particular, IDP was able to better understand what these partners want out of this evaluation, as well as their suggested timelines for baseline, midline, and endline data collection (see #2 above for the suggested estimated timeline). While the meeting minutes below reflect this further, key messages were around providing fast turnaround on findings over the next 12 months, and keeping recommendations practical and focused on sustainability in the local context. During the debriefing meeting with USAID prior to departure from the inception trip, the Deputy Office Director, John Collins, emphasized that he wanted information as quickly as possible from in-country IDP visits so the preliminary information can be passed on to his office to help with designing future USAID programs that can sustain the positive of the project and address the gaps. USAID emphasized wanting practical information rather than data that was not immediately applicable to their new programs.
4. **To acquire secondary data already collected under these activities and key reports/tools, including baseline EGRA data and tools, any Knowledge, Attitude, Practice, and Belief (KAPB) surveys conducted, any classroom observation data already collected, screening tools, key reports, etc.** IDP gained a better understanding of the data that ACR plans to collect, and received the Midterm EGRA report and the adapted EGRA report subsequent to the trip, which provided more clarity. As the MEL plan is still being updated, gaps in data collection cannot be fully ascertained.
5. **To finalize agreements with in-country partners.** IDP and CDPO discussed next steps to move forward with the in-country partnership. IDP will follow-up with Purdue to ensure they have the paperwork needed to develop a contract with CDPO.
6. **To gain a detailed understanding of the activity sample frame and the sample for the planned/already administered EGRAs.** IDP understands that EGRA tools have been modified by the project to accommodate learners with hearing and visual disabilities. Following the trip, we received the December 4 draft report entitled "Language and Literacy Assessment Tool Adaptation for Students who are Blind and Students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing," which provided detailed on the modified EGRA assessment administered to 89 students with hearing or vision impairment. The full-scale midline EGRA report was also provided subsequent to the trip, outlining the overall

project's findings on student learning outcomes to date.

7. **To gain a more detailed understanding of the timeline for activities and when it makes the most sense to gather baseline, midline, and endline data collection.** IDP was able to obtain a better understanding of the limited time remaining in the ACR project and discussed what makes the most sense in terms of data collection. This information will be used to develop a work plan on when to gather initial, midline and endline data in collaboration with CDPO (see responses to #2 and #3 above for more detailed information on what USAID would like to do with the limited time remaining in the project).
8. **To gain a better understanding of any in-country IRB requirements.** Local IRB will be obtained through the government and will be facilitated by IDP consultant Kanika Nguon who will help gain ethical clearance. This process in Cambodia is very involved, and is important that the application process begins as soon as possible. The government accepts applications every two months with December and February being the next windows for application submission.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS:**

Based on the initial meetings, IDP considers the need to continue observing and documenting through the MCSIE evaluation the following trends or questions:

- Monitor the comparative impact of inclusive education programming between Kampong Thom, which has the inclusive education field staff, and additional provinces newly beginning the program without field staff.
- Look critically at the sustainability and effectiveness of the Bridge Program, and if it has actually served the needs of deaf students.
- Understand whether collaboration with local health service providers helps to increase the capacity to sustain hearing and vision screenings
- Understand the impact of limited dedicated time afforded to issues of inclusion in teacher training activities.
- Document and better understand the benefits afforded to embedding inclusive practice into all project components, as opposed to treating disability and inclusion as a separate topic.
- Document and better understand the benefits afforded to the refusal to label students with 'intellectual disability,' and rather to focus on 'struggling learners' to promote inclusive education.
- Understand whether the lack of collaboration with UNICEF in shared regions represents a missed opportunity.
- Conduct USAID debriefing meetings with IDP at the end of each trip that are focused on immediately sharing identified successes and challenges so the new program plan can incorporate suggestions immediately rather than waiting for an official USAID report after the project officially ends in 2021.

The following recommendations consider a systemic scale that is broader than the ACR project itself, but have been flagged as future aspirations to be considered by USAID or follow-on projects:

- Supporting the Primary Education Department of the MoEYS to increase their capacity to support inclusive education so they are not as dependent on NGOs for sustainability and implementation. This would entail supporting the Primary Education Department in developing a more robust pre-

and in-service training program that focuses on all teachers teaching all students. This could also involve the Special Education Department (SED), although their capacity is more limited.

- Following more closely with the Deaf Development Programme (DDP) perspective, where education of students who are deaf should ensure that a child who is deaf becomes fluent in the sign language of their region, and then leverage that fluency into a command of the written language. The goal of deaf education should always be to develop native fluency in sign language as well as in reading and writing the majoritarian spoken language, in other words, to help the child who is deaf to become bilingual. However, having children Signing Exact Khmer (similar to Signing Exact English) within the ACR program is not in alignment with the perspective of best practices for deaf education of DDP.

Next steps following the trip include:

- Completing the Cambodia inception report by the end of November (Brent, Kanika, Hayley);
- A revision of stakeholder maps;
- A summary, analysis/critique of inclusive policies and training manuals;
- Creating a budget and contract for CDPO; and
- Develop regular contact (e.g., two times/month) between IDP Cambodia team.

## DELIVERABLES

Key deliverables include:

- Inception visit trip report;
- Production of an inception report;
- Providing input to initial, midline, and endline data collection tools, and household surveys; and
- Support in developing an IRB both in the US and in Cambodia.

## MEETINGS/WORK SESSIONS

### APPENDIX A – Meeting Minutes from meetings from November 4-8

#### I. Trip Overview

Date	Time	Organization
Monday, November 4	9:00am	RTI
	2:00pm	National Institute of Special Education
	4:00pm	USAID
Tuesday, November 5	2:00pm	Krousar Thmey
	4:00pm	Primary Education Department, MoEYS
Wednesday, November 6	9:00am (all day)	CDPO
Thursday, November 7	9:00am	RTI
	2:00pm	Early Childhood Development Officer Education Section, UNICEF
	4:00pm	Save the Children
Friday, November 8	9:00am	USAID
	11:00am	Deaf Development Program
	2:00pm	Special Education Department, MoEYS

## 2. Meeting Notes

### 2.1 RTI

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Claire Wyatt	Chief of Party	RTI	<a href="mailto:cwyatt@rit.org">cwyatt@rit.org</a>
Wykia Macon	Advisor	RTI	<a href="mailto:wmacon@rti.org">wmacon@rti.org</a>
Sokhim Ou	Director	RTI	<a href="mailto:sou@rti.org">sou@rti.org</a>

RTI partners provided a detailed description of the way in which the reading program was designed to embed inclusive principles throughout, very intentionally not allowing disability to become an ‘add-on.’ RTI expressed their gratitude to USAID in valuing quality over scale: “We’ve tried to do things with quality, that were responsible and ethical. And this has meant moving from a bigger to a smaller scale but we feel good about that, because these are kids’ lives.” The team discussed their process for identifying learners with hearing and vision difficulty in detail, as well as the rationale to not identify learners with other disabilities because of the disservice it would be in producing more stigma and exclusion, without provision of appropriate or available services in communities.

In terms of training, monthly inclusive education professional development is planned to begin this schoolyear. In terms of instructional models, a primary focus is on making the curriculum accessible to the majority of learners, with teachers being provided further strategies for differentiated instruction once they demonstrate general mastery. The Bridge program focuses on students ages 4-8 who are deaf, although the project has struggled in finding adults with sign language fluency in communities. There was some pride demonstrated about the Bridge program in that parents have discovered for the first time that their (formerly out of school) children can learn.

In terms of unintended consequences of the project, the team progressively realized the gaps present in the national system that they weren’t originally aware of. Additionally, the Bridge program had difficulty finding qualified volunteers, none of whom are deaf. In the process of preparing for the Bridge program, the project identified children with a range of disabilities, but those with heart conditions, CP (or anything besides deafness or blindness) was not followed up by the project. In positive terms, the project has raised awareness and the profile around sign language, including signs used in mainstream school games.

### 2.2. National Institute of Special Education (NISE)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Phalla Neang	Director	National Institute of Special Education	<a href="mailto:Phallaneang.nise@gmail.com">Phallaneang.nise@gmail.com</a> Tel. 012 906 626

Ms. Neang provided a detailed narrative of Krousar Thmey’s origins over the past 3 decades, including a prominent reputation it has enjoyed with the Prime Minister, who has helped to boost its reputation. She explained that Krousar Thmey special schools transitioned to the newly formed NISE in 2018, which earlier than the expected date of 2020. NISE is therefore in a period of transition, starting up some of its new operations in addition to the running of special schools. Ms. Neang focused heavily on hearing and vision impairment, although she indicated intellectual disability was another area served by NISE. NISE (formerly Krousar Thmey) provides 1-year training to current teachers to become experts in deaf or blind

education. They also provide teacher training across regional TTCs. There are no partnerships between NISE and universities in training teachers. NISE is also involved with ACR in materials revision, and monitoring programming related to those who are deaf or blind.

### 2.3. USAID

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
John Collins	Deputy Director	USAID	<a href="mailto:jcollins@usaid.gov">jcollins@usaid.gov</a> tel. 023 728 349/012 817 752
Sereisatya Ros	Education Project Management Specialist	USAID	<a href="mailto:sros@usaid.gov">sros@usaid.gov</a> tel. 023 728 381/012 817 752

As for ACR, USAID seemed intimately aware of the successes and challenges of the project to date. In terms of the identification process of children with disabilities, they echoed RTI's comment: if we're screening but there's no referral system and there's no services, what is the benefit of the screening? ...Are we just creating more stigma and putting these kids to the side? ... Setting kids up for failure, is it really fair? It's this horrible dilemma.

USAID described the Bridge program as a success, but expressed concerns about how it can sustain itself into the future, and more broadly how inclusive education in the country would be sustained if USAID funding were not to continue after the project ends in 2021. They were aware of the limited institutional or community expertise on inclusion. One noted success has been convincing the Ministry to integrate inclusion into the program design, as they were originally resistant. They discussed the importance of USAID providing a more explicit funding commitment globally to issues of inclusive education.

USAID also expressed some initial concerns about the MCSIE design in terms of its practicality to generate evidence about meaningful change over such a short period of time, indicating it would strongly prefer a case study approach for Cambodia. As for suggestions about how the MCSIE reports could help them:

- Less interested in a report that tells them they're meeting their objectives, and more interested in practical suggestions for improvement.
- Are there areas where we have blind spots and we need to be more cognizant for a redesign of follow-on programming?
- How to sustain success and adjust gaps?
- Reiterating the desire to do the work well even if it means having to do it slowly
- We don't want to be the one off, we don't want to be "the disability project."
- We're all trying to figure out what's a viable option...we're more concerned with sustainability and impact.

### 2.4. Krousar Thmey

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Darong Chour	Executive Director	Krousar Thmey	<a href="mailto:executiveassistance@krousar-thmey.org">executiveassistance@krousar-thmey.org</a>

Mr. Chour explained that Krousar Thmey (KT) only worked with RTI for 9 months in 2018, at which point KT decided to discontinue their collaboration with the project. KT attributes this divergence to ACR's attempt to pilot reading materials in the special schools for students who are deaf, despite KT's assertion that textbooks needed to be specially customized for those who communicate in sign language. KT claimed that ACR was unwilling to take a few years to do this, and so went around KT by working directly

with the SED to test the materials anyway in these schools. KT claimed they felt RTI wasn't listening to them, that they lacked disability expertise and a willingness to use the expertise afforded by KT (which is no longer present as key staff have transitioned to NISE).

## 2.5. Primary Education Department (PED)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Kann Puthy	Deputy Director	Primary Education Department,	<a href="mailto:Puthy_kann@yahoo.com">Puthy_kann@yahoo.com</a> Tel. 012 625 538

Mr. Puthy demonstrated a strong awareness of the ACR program's design and its technical programming in terms of literacy instruction. He explained that the PED is aiming to reduce NGOs' tendencies to produce their own independent materials, and instead to streamline the approach, using the ACR/Ministry package as its core. He explained his resistance to modifying the official government textbook, because lost instructional time due to poor systems management was not a sufficient excuse to shorten the length of books. Instead, the ACR materials were produced as supplementary resources to augment the official textbook. Mr. Puthy described a relationship with RTI that has strengthened progressively over time. He was also able to list clearly the elements of the program which embed inclusive design.

## 2.6. RTI (Chief of Party)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Claire Wyatt	Chief of Party	RTI	<a href="mailto:cwyatt@rit.org">cwyatt@rit.org</a>

Claire discussed the planned MCSIE project timeline, including agreement to conduct initial data collection February/March 2020. We discussed Kampong Thom (Kampong Svay and Stueng Sen districts) was the only province which has IE field staff and therefore the full IE package, while other provinces receive teaching and learning materials but not screening or field support for IE. We also discussed Kampot province as a useful comparison in terms of inclusive education without field supports. Claire suggested conducting classroom observations prior to midline training observations in October 2020. We discussed an endline around May-June 2021 would be most appropriate for the project. As for household surveys, we discussed using the special schools, the Bridge program children, those who received glasses through the screening process, as well as additional children without disabilities. We discussed that a letter of support must come from USAID to PED to provincial levels to district levels, at which point we could consider conducting an orientation meeting with school directors, as well as communities/village chiefs. Additionally, we continued our interview questions on the project generally, learning more about the process of setting up the project's partnerships and working groups, and the difficulties encountered in engaging with SED. As for identification, Claire explained the four different strategies planned for screening new cohorts of children in Kampong Thom. A detailed explanation was provided about the delivery of teacher training with associated partners, although we were surprised to learn that the time afforded to inclusive education is only 90 minutes or 1/2 day (although it is embedded throughout the curriculum). In terms of unintended consequences, Claire continued to emphasize the strategy behind embedding inclusion into all project components as opposed to focusing on standalone disability training as other donors are doing. She also mentioned the challenges of engaging with Krousar Thmey, as well as concern that Deaf Development Program doesn't benefit from greater national prominence since they offer a more coherent approach to deaf education.

## 2.7. UNICEF

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact



Davy Chhean	Early Childhood Development Officer Education Section	UNICEF	<a href="mailto:dchhean@unicef.org">dchhean@unicef.org</a>
Rim Ream	Education Officer, Education Section	UNICEF	<a href="mailto:rream@unicef.org">rream@unicef.org</a>

UNICEF described its support to inclusive education nationally, including awareness-raising, capacity-building to NISE and SED, in-service teacher training, and pre-service teacher training. UNICEF was involved in developing the 28-hour course on inclusive education delivered in 2-year teacher training colleges, although this curriculum appears to focus more on disability categories and labels than instructional practices. The same curriculum is used by the Ministry of Education in its in-service programs. UNICEF are adapting this material into a 20-hour version for pre-service training of secondary school teachers. Plans are also underway for inclusive education training for pre-school teachers. NISE also supports the training conducted at NISE for up to 10 trainees on blind education and 10 on deaf education. Some trends observed that require further attention include:

- Generally, respondents focused heavily on the categories of hearing, visual, and intellectual disability, and demonstrated limited consideration of other forms of disability.
- UNICEF does not have current or recent relationships with DPOs in its work.
- They have also advocated for the use of Washington Group questions to identify children with disabilities.
- UNICEF has not collaborated with the ACR project, despite the fact that both groups operate in Kampong Thom province. This may represent a missed opportunity by ACR for improved collaboration.

## 2.8. Save the Children

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Sakem Kong	Senior Education Advisor (technical support to field teams)	Save the Children	<a href="mailto:sakem.kong@savethechildren.org">sakem.kong@savethechildren.org</a>
Sarang Out	Education Program Manager (ECD and primary)	Save the Children	<a href="mailto:sarang.out@savethechildren.org">sarang.out@savethechildren.org</a>
Yinsieng Someth	Education Thematic Specialist	Save the Children	<a href="mailto:someth.yinsieng@savethechildren.org">someth.yinsieng@savethechildren.org</a>

Save the Children has had some involvement in the survey design, training of trainers, and teaching and learning materials for Khmer instruction. They volunteered to pilot the early grade reading package Grade I in 20 schools in Kampong Chhnang. They feel well engaged by RTI in the training schedule and other opportunities for collaboration.

Participants provided a detailed narrative of Save the Children's historical involvement in inclusive education in its own programming. They have been involved in producing many of their own materials including a 'disability screening checklist' and manuals for teachers in supporting children with specific disability categories. Save the Children has also been producing a 21 unit video series on Cambodian Sign Language in collaboration with Krousar Thmey. The intent is for these videos to be used in mainstream schools to support children who don't have qualified sign language teachers. There is no plan for these

videos to be rolled out in concert with any other comprehensive support to children who are deaf in mainstream schools.

## 2.9. USAID (debrief)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
John Collins	Deputy Director	USAID	<a href="mailto:jcollins@usaid.gov">jcollins@usaid.gov</a> tel. 023 728 349/012 817 752
Sereisatya Ros	Education Project Management Specialist	USAID	<a href="mailto:sros@usaid.gov">sros@usaid.gov</a> tel. 023 728 381/012 817 752

- USAID expressed initial concerns about the condensed timeline presented for the evaluation, and frustration in the investment of its funds given the current design.
- USAID needs to solicit a follow-on design of the ACR project by September 2020, so is particularly motivated by feedback prior to then.
- When asked what feedback they would like to receive from the MCSIE study, they identified an interest in the following:
  - How to get kids into local schools in a way that works
  - NISE and 5 special schools – how can we improve the services in these institutions?
  - What really works for kids who are deaf or blind?
  - What does “limited capacity” of NISE really mean and how can we fill those gaps?
  - Need to understand the tension between doing something now for these kids and the ongoing development needed
  - In terms of the mix of support, what’s the resource envelope to do this well? Either we’re providing a band aid for temporary fixes, or USAID needs to see itself as having a longer-term responsibility for bigger improvements
  - How to evaluate the comparative benefits of bridge program, versus screening investments, versus training versus building systems, versus speech pathology or specialist services? Is there a better way to focus our energies?
  - Where do we put our focus – community, school, system?
  - We need some critical reflections in bringing on best practices. Need to be practical – theory doesn’t work here.
  - Good for our research to look at karma and whether it’s a barrier for acceptance
  - Use household studies to understand whether perspectives change in community level. People don’t know what they don’t know.
  - What happens after third grade? What about retention?
  - USAID Cambodia really doesn’t want a standalone disability program and report recommendations should look at this.

## 2.10. Deaf Development Program (DDP)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Sokly Keat	Deputy Director	Deaf Development Program	Tel. 012 763 77

DDP receives funding from Catholic groups and other non-government donors, and has been operational in Cambodia for 20 years. They provide basic education people who are deaf, but this is nonformal and is only for youth and adults. They also provide sign language interpretation, and are responsible for having trained all interpreters in Cambodia (there are only 10). They focus on deaf culture using a social model, and are expressly opposed to Krousar Thmey and others' goal to standardize sign language nationally. DDP is involved in a full-time sign language committee at NISE in collaboration with Krousar Thmey, where DDP continue to oppose the attempts to standardize the language. DDP is interested in documenting the language that is already in use, while Krousar Thmey has a history of applying American Sign Language into its education system but coded into Khmer. "We don't want the deaf community to be the victim of our decisions." The committee is supported by 5 DDP (all deaf), Krousar Thmey staff (6 deaf and a few hearing).

DDP works with 500-1,000 deaf people, but discusses challenges with the deaf population being quite scattered. They expressed concerns that deaf education in mainstream schools is not meaningfully educational at present, and there is a continued need for special education for children who are deaf. DDP expressed regret that they weren't more involved with ACR.

#### 2.11. Special Education Department (SED)

Name of person interviewed	Title	Organization	Contact
Sahen Tim	Deputy Director	Special Education Department, MoEYS	Tel. 016 707 318
Saren Hen	Chief of Special Education Office	Special Education Department, MoEYS	

Interviewees did not demonstrate any technical knowledge related to inclusive education, and expressed preference for most students with disabilities to attend special schools. They were unable to explain the application of the UNCRPD to their work. They expressed an interest in having their own staff being invited for international conferences on multiple occasions, instead of identifying priorities for improvement within their system.

They discussed that all of their work is driven by policy guidelines for inclusive education and an accompanying plan of action for the period of 2019-2023. They spoke favorably about the collaborative process with RTI and ACR.

### APPENDIX B – Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation (CDPO) Meeting Agenda

#### CDPO Meeting Agenda 6 November 2019 9:00am-4:00pm

- I. 9:00-9:30- Introductions (30 minutes)**
  - a. Why CDPO
- II. 9:30-9:45- Multi-Country Study on Inclusive Education (MCSIE) overview (15 minutes)**
- III. 9:45-10:05- Technical Overview (20 minutes)**
  - a. Institutional Review Board (IRB)
  - b. Input to Reporting
  - c. Field Testing/Feedback
  - d. Initial (qualitative interviews, focus groups)
  - e. Household Survey- 300 households

- f. Midline (classroom and training observations, KAPB Survey)
- g. Endline (qualitative interviews, focus groups, optional additions)
- h. Household Survey 2- 300 households

**IV. 10:05-10:35- Feedback/Discussion on Technical Overview (30 minutes)**

**V. 10:35-10:55- Logistics Overview (20 minutes)**

- a. Purdue University set-up
- b. Junior and Senior Research Pairs- consulting fees/day
- c. 5 Districts?
- d. Travel and transport costs
- e. Kobo data collection and tablets
- f. Budgets, receipts

**VI. 10:55-11:25-Logistics Feedback/Overview (30 minutes)**

**VII. 11:25-12:00 Begin Work Plan (35 minutes)**

**VIII. 12:00-2:00 Lunch/Break (2 hours)**

**IX. 2:00-4:00 Work Plan (2 hours)**