

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

## **Trip Report**

Sub-award under 7200AA18CA00009

Produced by: Anne Hayes and Dr. Valerie Karr, Inclusive Development Partners (IDP)

Position: Chief Operating Officer and Chief Executive Officer

Arrival Date: Saturday, November 9, 2019

Departure Date: Friday, November 15, 2019

### **APPENDIX A – Meeting Summaries**

#### **DISCLAIMER**

The authors' 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 on what works to advance teaching and learning outcomes sustainably 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 and also to plan for new inclusive education programming globally.

## TRAVEL OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the inception trip included:

- 1) To better understand each of the activities currently underway, what activities are planned, what activities have already been accomplished, etc.
- 2) To obtain a detailed understanding of key stakeholders for activities and inclusive education programs and an understanding of what stakeholders 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 and adapting interventions, etc.
- 3) To acquire existing secondary data already collected under these activities and key reports/tools, including baseline EGRA data and tools, any KAPB surveys conducted, any classroom observation data already collected, screening tools, key reports, etc. (may require follow-up after the trip).
- 4) To finalized agreements with in-country partners (may require follow-up after the trip).
- 5) To understand the activity sample frame and the sample for the planned/already administered EGRAs.
- 6) To collect information related to the timeline for activities and when it makes the most sense to gather initial, midline, and endline data collection.
- 7) To better understand any in-country IRB requirements.

## TRIP SUMMARY

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

- 1) To better understand each of the activities currently underway, what activities are planned, what activities have already been accomplished, etc.** Through several meetings with HI and WEI, IDP has a better understanding of proposed activities and how the project has been revised based upon the delay in approval from the government. For example, IDP was able to get a better understanding of the reasons for the delay in programming, which were caused by delays from the government approval. Clarity was also provided on the different districts and how the IP will be doing interventions in two districts with other districts serving more as control. The IP will also be doing work in segregated settings or resource rooms as well as inclusive settings. Additional information was able to be obtained on their M&E data collection efforts, how and when EGRAs will be administered and the identification and referral process.

- 2) To obtain a detailed understanding of key stakeholders for activities and inclusive education programs and an understanding of what stakeholders 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 and adapting interventions, etc.** IDP met with several stakeholders in order to introduce them to the MCSIE project and to learn more about current challenges related to educating children with disabilities in Nepal. Information from these meetings will help inform the Nepal literature review and future tool development. IDP also gathered information about important stakeholders who should review key tools and provide input moving forward. For example, there needs to be high level of government involvement with not only the department involved in special education but also those working on EGRP and teacher training development at both the National and Local level. IDP also recommends having meetings with various disabled persons' organizations that will include the National Federation of Disabled Nepal, National Deaf Federation of Nepal, Association for the Blind, National Council for Independent Living, etc.
- 3) To acquire existing secondary data already collected under these activities and key reports/tools, including baseline EGRA data and tools, any KAPB surveys conducted, any classroom observation data already collected, screening tools, key reports, etc. (may require follow-up after the trip).** IDP has a better understanding of the data that RFA plans to collect, such as pre-post EGRA data, early detection administration, number of children screened, number of personnel trained in inclusive education, percent of children with IEPs, number of service providers trained, number of schools supported, and so on (See Nepal, RFA MEL Plan). As the MEL plan is still being finalized, gaps in data collection cannot be fully ascertained. The delay in implementation also allows the opportunity to add information to RFA's planned data collection tools, such as teacher training, pre and post-tests, etc.
- 4) To finalize agreements with in-country partners (may require follow-up after the trip).** IDP and KU discussed next step 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 KU.
- 5) To understand the activity sample frame and the sample for the planned/already administered EGRAs.** RFA will administer an EGRA as both a baseline and an endline. EGRA will be adapted for children who are blind, deaf, and/or have intellectual disability. The content of the EGRA have been changed to such an extent that the adapted EGRAs are no longer collecting the same information used within the non-adapted EGRAs. As expressed by HI and WEI, since these modifications significantly changed the information being collected, these tools can serve as models to demonstrate increase-in-learning outcomes but cannot serve as comparative data for students with and without disabilities. The baseline EGRA data collection has yet to be implemented. As the grouping of individuals currently classified as having an intellectual disability will include those who have learning disabilities and possibly physical disabilities<sup>1</sup>, IDP does not recommend adapting the EGRA for intellectual disability. This is also consistent with international

---

<sup>1</sup> RFA is using the Washington Group CFM to determine possible functional limitation. For those who report challenges to vision or hearing, they are classified as possible disabilities in those two categories. All other possible limitations including challenges with movement, focus, etc. have been classified as falling under the category of intellectual disability. As identifying students with challenges with mobility and/or focus does not automatically signify that a student has an intellectual disability, this classification cannot be deemed as valid or accurate. As there are also significant stigmas and discriminatory practices related to having an intellectual disability in particular in Nepal, incorrect classification can have a negative impact on students. In the meeting, IDP pointed out this challenge, noting that administering the adapted EGRA with remediated responses to all students with functional limitation who are not blind would lead to poor data as most of these individuals would not require easier EGRA questions.

best practice, which recommends that only very few children should have adapted standardized tests in order to continuously promote a high level of achievement.

- 6) To collect information related to the timeline for activities and when it makes the most sense to gather initial, midline, and endline data collection.** IDP was able to obtain a better understanding of the newly revised timeline for the RFA project. This information will be used to develop a work plan on when to gather initial, midline, and endline data. While this was not written and seems to be in flux, IDP was informed of the following:
- Feb/March: Train-the-Trainers training (on early identification and inclusive education) will begin after the new year and primarily take place in March.
  - April: School year begins and early identification screening to take place. Due to our concerns over the Washington Group being used with new students (who are unknown to the teacher), this may be shifted to Feb/March (end of previous academic year).
  - April: EGRA implemented.
- 7) To better understand any in-country IRB requirements.** Local IRB will be obtained through KU and can go through the university to get required ethical clearance. This process is typically not onerous with clearance often being provided within two-to-three weeks upon submission of documents. These documents need to be presented in an almost finalized version and translated into Nepali. Slight changes can be made to the tools once field tested.

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

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

- Assess how the use of different understanding of terminology may impact program delivery. There is also a need to ensure that terminology is consistently used within the MCSIE evaluation to reduce further possible confusion. For example, this would include referring to the WG Child Functioning Module (CFM) instead of using the term “early detection tool”, and using the term “learning difficulties” instead of using the term “intellectual disability” to document those students who are captured using the CFM tool but do not have vision or hearing screenings.
- IDP recommends that RFA use the general EGRA for students with learning difficulties instead of providing them with a modified EGRA. IDP recommends providing students with additional time as needed, but does not recommend providing alternative questions or content for assessment. This process is consistent with the US No Child Left Behind legislation, which promotes that all students, regardless of disability status, take standardize tests. Research shows that this requirement results in higher expectations and for students with disabilities to receive the same curriculum as students without disabilities. As this has yet to begin, making this change before implementation will be more consistent with international standards and result in more reliable and valid data. Though RFA stated there will be other accommodations such as extended time, it is unclear what the full range of accommodations will be for this process.
- IDP would like to explore the tools being used by the mobile diagnostic team to ensure these tools are aligned with good practices and may not misdiagnose children inadvertently. This will also help with questions related to research question 2 on identification practices.
- Explore ways to support sign language in Nepal that goes beyond training or a refresher course in sign language. Sign language is a complex language, and RFA may want to ensure that the RFA team does not appear to suggest that sign language could be learned within a two-week period. Evidence shows that placing students who are deaf in learning environments where teachers are

not fluent in sign language does not lead to increased learning outcomes. IDP would like to review training materials used by RFA to assess if they are following best practices in this area.

- The MCSIE team will conduct a comparative solicitation review to see what is being asked across all three countries as well as the differences between what was required in the solicitation, what was proposed in the program description and being implemented in the annual work plans. This comparative data will also help us understanding similarities and differences in IP programming and help develop tools and prioritize questions that pertain to similar programming that is consistent in all three countries.

Next steps to the trip include:

- IDP will follow-up with KU about the contract to move forward with a partnership.
- IDP looks forward to receiving the final MEL plan as well as additional information from the RFA program.
- IDP will develop and send a commonly used terminology document to support RFA in using aligned terminology for the project.
- IDP will update stakeholder mapping with information obtained from the inception visit.
- IDP will conduct a comparative analysis of solicitations and solicitation versus PD and workplan for all three countries.
- IDP will ask for the KAP surveys and raw data
- IDP will translate the IEP module that will be used for RFA

## MEETINGS/WORK SESSIONS

The below table highlights meetings that took place between November 9-15, 2019. Appendix A provides a summary of the various meetings as well as contact information.

Date	Persons/Org Involved	Description
Sat., Nov 9	Anne Hayes, Valerie Karr, Padam Pariyar	Trip planning
Sun., Nov 10	Kathmandu University	Partnership planning
	National Deaf Federation of Nepal	Introductory meeting
Mon., Nov 11	Reading for All	Introductory meeting
	USAID	Introductory meeting
	Training Section, MOEST	Introductory meeting
	CDC, MOEST	Introductory meeting
Tues., Nov 12	National Federation of Disabled Nepal	Introductory meeting
	Inclusive Education Director, CEHRD, MOEST	Introductory meeting
	Nepal Association for the Welfare of the Blind	Introductory meeting
Tues., Nov 13	Reading for All, Technical Staff	Introductory meeting and technical question on program

	Education Review Office, MOEST	Introductory meeting
	Center for Independent Living	Introductory meeting
Thurs., Nov 14	RFA MEL Team	Meeting to receive additional information on planned MEL activities
	RTI EGRP	Introductory meeting
	USAID	Debrief

## APPENDIX A

### Kathmandu University (KU)

Name of person interviewed: Dr. Niraj Poudyal  
 Title: Assistant Professor  
 Organization: Kathmandu University  
 Tel/E-mail: 977-015251294; niraj.poudyal@ku.edu.np

Name of person interviewed: Dr. Mahesh Banksota  
 Title: Professor  
 Organization: Kathmandu University  
 Tel/E-mail: 977-9801210007; mbanksota@ku.edu.np

Name of person interviewed: Dipesh Khadka  
 Title: Lecturer  
 Organization: Kathmandu University  
 Tel/E-mail: 977-9841518436; kdkadipesh@gmail.com

IDP will be working with KU's Disability Research Center which was established a few years ago with the support of UNICEF. The Disability Research Center has completed work related to inclusive EMIS, including advocating for the WG questions to be used in the 2021 Census in Nepal. The center also conducted a study with Atlas Nepal related to the impact of the earthquake on persons with disabilities. For the majority of the meeting, KU and IDP discussed MCSIE and how to work together to gather data. IDP reviewed the different data collection points and the purpose of the study, and IDP also discussed their role with Purdue who they will report to and be responsible for financial reporting. IRB was also discussed and Lastly, KU said they are able to obtain local IRB through the university, which is not too challenging and can be obtained usually within a period of two weeks.

#### Next steps include:

- IDP will follow-up on the status of their contract materials with Purdue and submit the budget and SOW to Purdue.
- IDP will create a drop box to share data and information.
- IDP will share with Purdue the five districts in which they will collect data once they have more discussion with HI during the week.

### 1. National Deaf Federation of Nepal (NDFN)

Name of person interviewed: KP Adhikari  
 Title: Chair  
 Organization: NDFN

Tel/E-mail: 977-9860032030; nfdh2052@gmail.com

NDFN provided an overview of the challenges of students who are deaf in Nepal: most students do not attend school and are often placed in resource centers where teachers have limited capacities to use sign language and, therefore, are unable to provide effective instruction. The Constitution of Nepal, however, states that all children who are deaf have the right to receive an education through sign language, yet there is no effective practice to teach students in sign language. In Nepal, there are 169 resources classes for students who are deaf and 19 schools for the deaf. NDFN stated they were approached by HI during the Reading for All proposal phase, and HI asked them to be full partners with input on the design and implementation of the project. Since then, NDFN stated their involvement has been reduced by HI. HI has asked them to prepare a 15-day sign language course for 20 teachers in two districts. For this work, they would be paid 800,000 Nepalese rupees. NDFN has serious concerns with this approach, as an individual cannot learn sign language within 15 days, and this approach would risk the continuing misperception that children who are deaf can learn in a non-sign-language-rich environment. NDFN has decided they will not implement such a program as it would be “pouring water into sand.”

## 2. Reading for All Team

Names of person interviewed: Subekshya Karki  
Title: Technical  
Organization: Humanity and Inclusion  
E-mail: s.karki@hi.org

Names of person interviewed: Seema Acharya  
Title: Technical In charge  
Organization: World Education  
E-mail: seema\_acharya@np.worlded.org  
Other Attendees:

1. Amina Bomzan, Head of Operation, Humanity and Inclusion
2. Shiv Shanker Chaudhary, Project Manager, Humanity and Inclusion
3. Upendra Joshi, Senior MEL Officer, Humanity and Inclusion
4. Reena Shakya, MEL Officer, Humanity and Inclusion
5. Ramlal Dhami, Project Officer, Humanity and Inclusion
6. Helen Sherpa, Country Director, World Education
7. Sachin Khadka, M and E Officer, World Education

IDP met with key staff from HI and World Education Inc. (WEI), which provides a comprehensive overview of the project to date. HI serves as the prime stakeholder and brings together the technical expertise on disability inclusion while WEI brings technical knowledge on literacy. A few areas that RFA clarified included:

- The team discussed the reasons for the delay with the government. RFA has two technical advisors embedded within the MOEST. However in reality, the Technical Advisor spends approximately 50% of her time with the MOEST. There is also a designated space within the MOEST which allows for 4-8 spots for individuals from RFA.
- The team reviewed the different models of intervention which includes three models (Annex A):
  - Model A: Resource Classrooms (15 RCs in Banke and Surkhet)
  - Model B: Core Intervention (all 6,775 schools in 16 EGRP districts)
  - Model C: Core Plus Intervention Model (240 Schools, 780 Classroom in Banke and Surkhet)

- RFA will do two EGRAs baseline and endline that will track a child's progress and not serve as comparable data, as the EGRAs for blind, deaf, and intellectual disability have been modified to such an extent they are no longer comparable.
- RFA is using DPOs as enumerators and referral agencies in the 16 districts. Budget and time has been adjusted to build their capacity to do this work, and in districts where there were no qualified DPOs that applied, they are using NGOs.
- RFA proposed a ten-day training in two districts on sign language instruction and approaches to deaf education. It remains unclear whether those teachers already have sign language knowledge and if this information will be new or a refresher course.
- RFA is currently developing teacher instruction trainings on how to educate children with different types of disabilities.

### 3. USAID Meeting

Name: Laura Parrott Title: Education Specialist Organization: USAID E-mail: lparrott@usaid.gov
---

USAID mentioned a few technical issues such as the fact that IDP and their partners should not pay for VAT and that USAID must approve all sub-partners not part of the initial award. In addition, USAID reported that USAID and RFA have a very close relationship. USAID has also not approved the MEL plan yet as this needs to be based on a new work plan and shifted to a shorter implementation period.

### 4. National Centre for Education Development (NCED) Training Section, MOEST

Name of person interviewed: Palhad Aryal Title: Director Organization: National Centre for Education, Training Office Tel: 977-6638152
---

HI introduced the project and remained in the meeting when IDP introduced the MCSIE project. The Director provided an overview of the center and stated there used to be 24 Teacher Training Centers and now there are only seven across the country. Teachers must receive a month of in-service training within a five-year period. Because there are many challenges with the move to the federal system, the department is still figuring out how to conduct teacher training. In addition, a lot of shifts within the teacher training system have impacted institutional memory. The department lacks the ability to train teachers on working with students who may have sensory disabilities. However, they do provide some training on how to support students with hearing and vision disabilities, such as modifying the classroom and material supports.

### 5. Curriculum Development Center, MOEST

Name of person interviewed: Tukraj Adhikari Title: EGRP Director Organization: Center Development of Curriculum Tel: 977-16630088
--



Name of person interviewed: Anil Mishra  
Title: Director, Inclusive Education Section  
Organization: Curriculum Development Center  
Tel: 977-16630088

IDP and HI met with two individuals from CDC—one who works on EGRP and the other who works on inclusive education. As both have only been in the position for six months, they were not as familiar with the RFA project. IDP introduced their organization and the MCSIE project. CDC said they did an audit of materials and found very few available for children with disabilities. They are interested in expanding Daisy books for students with intellectual disability and autism<sup>2</sup>. EGRP focuses on grades 1-3, but there has been little focus on improving literacy for children with disabilities. CDC mentioned the KAP survey that will be implemented in six districts in Nepal with a final report going to USAID in November. IDP plans to review the survey and assess what information obtained can be used as secondary data for the evaluation.

## 6. National Federation of Disabled Nepal

Organization: National Federation of the Disabled Nepal (NFDN)  
E-mail: mitralalsharmanfdnpresident@gmail.com

Other attendees and organizations:

1. Rames Lama, Senior Vice President, NFDN
2. Krishna Prasad Gautam, Board Member, NFDN
3. Devkala Parajuli, Board Member, NFDN
4. Chandra Kanta Paudel, Board Member, NFDN
5. Sita Subedhi, Board Member, NFDN

The NFDN provided an overview of the challenges related to inclusive education in Nepal. There is a general lack of resource materials and lack of accessible infrastructure. Resource rooms, which were intended to be an area of support, have turned into a place where students are segregated. Teachers in resource rooms are also not trained. For example, the last training on sign language occurred 15 years ago, and most teachers have not received any training and do not know sign language. There are no standards in the resource rooms or standards for resource rooms for students with intellectual disability. Some rooms have students spanning ages from 7 to 54 years and no materials or ways to graduate. NFDN is aware of RFA but is not actively engaged. However, they are supportive of their engagement of DPOs on the local level.

## 7. Centre for Education and Human Resource Development, CEHRD, MOEST

Name of person interviewed: Bishnu Adhikari  
Title: Deputy Director General, Inclusive Education  
Organization: Centre for Education and Human Resources Development (CEHRD)  
Tel: 977-1-6631075, 6633027

Other attendees:

1. Keshav Dahal, Chief, Education Review Office

---

<sup>2</sup> Typically, audio books are provided to students who are blind and can be supplementary materials for students with intellectual disability and autism, but both of these categories of disabilities can also acquire traditional literacy skills.

2. Naradh Prasad Dhamala, Section Officer, Inclusive Education Department
3. Mira Rawal, Officer, CEHRD
4. Ramlal Dhimi, Senior Partnership Officer, Humanity and Inclusion
5. Shiv Shanker Chaudhary, Project Manager, Humanity and Inclusion
6. Sachin Khadka, M and E Officer, World Education
7. Padam Bahadur Pariyar, Coordinator, Nepal, Inclusive Development Partner
8. Anne Hayes, COO, Inclusive Development Partners
9. Valerie Karr, CEO, Inclusive Development Partners
10. Laura Parrott, USAID

Upon introducing IDP and the MCSIE project, the government representative discussed its role in the RFA project. USAID and HI also joined the meeting. The Director of Inclusive Education stated they are working in collaboration with HI to implement the RFA project. Jointly, the GoN and HI are currently supporting the KAP project in six districts to help determine a conceptual understanding of inclusive education. The GoN expressed interest in screening due to the perception that only teachers can support students who have diagnoses in the classroom. The GoN stated that HI will counsel parents upon their children receiving diagnoses. The GoN is also working with HI to review the four Individual Education Plan (IEP) modules, or different options for IEP to be used in Nepal, and is selecting which can be used for this project. Representatives in the meeting expressed some concerns about teacher training as Nepal law recognizes 10 types of disabilities but RFA is only working with students who are blind, deaf, or have intellectual disability. One representative questioned how this project can be reading for “all” if they only focus on three types of disabilities. The GoN stated that 2.8% of students in Nepal are out of school, and they assume that most of these students have disabilities. In the future, they would like to focus on how to bring these children into the education system. They also stated the government provides training for a thousand teachers per year, but teachers don't get adequate training sessions on inclusive education. Hence, the dedicated training course on inclusive education needs to be included in the teachers' regular in-service training course, and this inclusion will be more sustainable in the future. Similarly, they stated RFA activities also help to achieve the School Sector Development Plan (SSDP) of the government of Nepal.

#### **8. Nepal Association for the Welfare of the Blind**

Name of person interviewed: Pawan Ghimire

Title: General Secretary

Organization: National Association for the Welfare of the Blind (NAWB)

Tel/E-mail: 977-9851140969; nawbnepal@gmail.com

Name of person interviewed: Ratna Kaji Dangol

Title: Program Officer

Organization: NAWB

Tel/E-mail: 977-14260583; nawbnepal@gmail.com

Established in 1985, NAWB is an NGO working to support persons who are blind with a focus on education. The organization provides services to 79 schools for students who are blind (of which one is a segregated school for the blind but most are resource rooms for persons who are blind). The organization promotes the concept of inclusive education. Within RFA, they will support teacher training and provide education materials for children who are blind or have low vision. There are few braille books in Nepal, and most students use the slate and stylus and do not have access to braille. NAWB has already developed a 12-day training that they will utilize in the RFA

trainings in two districts; they also have training modules based on 7 days and 21 days of training. They stated that they were involved in the project design phase of the program with most activities being proposed by HI. They look forward to working with RFA but do not yet have a contract.

#### **9. Reading for All, Technical Team**

Name of person interviewed: Reena Shakya  
Title: MEL Manager  
Organization: Humanity and Inclusion  
E-mail: r.shakya@hi.org

Other attendees:

1. Sachin Khadka, M and E Officer, World Education

IDP had an additional meeting with many of the same individuals in the first meeting with RFA in order to obtain more information about RFA's proposed approach. During this meeting, additional information was provided on the proposed cascade of training modules, the different models of intervention, and the testing that was used to develop the EGRA. In addition, a few issues related to different terminologies were identified. For example, for adapted EGRA, these were not officially validated but instead use this term to show the tools were approved by the government. HI referred to the UNICEF/WG Child Functioning Modules (CFM), and the term "intellectual disability" was used to capture all students identified through the CFM who do not have a vision- or hearing-related disability. RFA is also doing additional vision and hearing screenings and recognizes the challenges of using the Tumbling E-chart, though it remains unclear which tool they will be using instead. Those identified with a possible intellectual disability are referred to a mobile diagnostic unit with a psychologist who identifies additional disabilities; however, it was unclear what tools are being used for this identification. RFA clarified that parent engagement will take place in model C with supported reading clubs and operational guidelines.

#### **10. Education Review Office, MOEST**

Name of person interviewed: Uttar Parajuli  
Title: NASA Director (former ERO)  
Organization: National Assessment of Student Achievements (NASA)  
Tel/E-mail: 977-1-6634362; info@ero.gov.np

IDP met with the individual who used to support EGRA development for the EGRP but has since moved to a new department within the ministry. EGRP does not currently address children with disabilities, which is problematic as those with the most need are often left behind. EGRP are currently doing EGRA on a sample basis to test fluency and other key issues. EGRA is important as it gives feedback at a policy level while additional tools can be used to support feedback for teaching at a classroom level. He suggested that RFA should have a common workshop to inform the government, key stakeholders, and the media of the objectives of RFA.

#### **11. Center for Independent Living**

Name of person interviewed: Bhojraj Shrestha  
Title: President  
Organization: Independent Living Center Lalitpur

Tel: 9851027067

Name of person interviewed: Krishna Gautam

Title: Secretary General

Organization: Independent Living Center Lalitpur

Tel/E-mail: 977-9851224522; gautamkrishna1978@gmail.com

Various members presented an overview of many of the challenges related to inclusive education in Nepal. Many children continue to be denied an education, and when they are allowed to go to school, there are very high dropout rates. Children with severe disabilities—intellectual disability, multiple disabilities, autism—are out of school. Children with disabilities or who do not achieve high scores in school are often neglected by teachers. Parents of children with disabilities often do not send their children to school as it is a burden to get them there, while others are hesitant to send their children to school due to concerns about their safety. Most students lack assistive devices, and schools are inaccessible, with transportation to and from school being very challenging for students with physical disabilities. Attendees also expressed concerns about the lack of referral opportunities for students who may be identified as having a disability.

## **12. Reading for All, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Team**

Name of person interviewed: Reena Shakya

Title: Monitoring Evaluation Accountability Learning Manager

Organization: HI

E-mail: r.shakya@hi.org

IDP met with a smaller team from RFA that works on monitoring and evaluation along with Laura Parrott from USAID. During this meeting, attendees went through a draft MEL plan and answered some general questions. For example, EGRAs will be implemented in April and May, though it's unclear when students will be identified in order to provide an adapted EGRA. RFA also developed a modified EGRA for students with intellectual disability, which IDP suggested was not best practice and may provide challenging for those students who do not need adapted EGRA but are captured under the category of intellectual disability. A few indicators included the number of IEP implemented, teachers trained, tools approved, children screened, and children who showed improvement from EGRA scores.

## **13. Research Triangle Institute (RTI), Early Grade Reading Program**

Name of person interviewed: Dr. Wendi Ralaingita

Title: Senior Reading Advisor

Organization: Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International, Early Grade Reading Program

E-mail: wralaingita@rti.org

RTI is implementing the EGRP that will end in June 2020. The current training has a few mentions of inclusive education but does not provide detail. They are doing slightly more on inclusion with their partner Plan International, which is working on community mobilization. In the original solicitation for RFA, collaboration was mentioned, but interaction to date has been minimal. RTI materials have already been developed, so it would be challenging to adapt materials at this time to be more inclusive. Ideally, these two projects would have been

designed together with complementary work plans, but given the staggering scope of implementation, that was not possible.

#### 14. USAID Debrief

Name: Laura Parrott  
Title: Education Specialist  
Organization: USAID  
E-mail: lparrot@usaid.gov

Name: Shannon Taylor  
Title: Director Education Development Office  
Organization: USAID  
E-mail: sjtaylor@usaid.gov

Upon completion of the study, IDP met with Shannon Taylor and Laura Parrott from USAID to discuss the summary of meetings and next steps. During this meeting, IDP also shared that programming may have challenges due to confusion with terminology, such as using the term “intellectual disability” for students without vision or hearing disabilities and using the term “early detection” for the CFM. This is something RFA may want to clarify before beginning implementation to ensure appropriate terminology. IDP also provided an overview of next steps for the MCSIE project and will share these annually.

**Annex A: Reading for All Intervention Models<sup>3</sup>**

	<b>Model B: Core Interventions</b> (all 6,775 schools in sixteen EGRP districts)	<b>Model C: Core Plus in 4 Focal</b> <b>GPs/NPs in Banke &amp; Surkhet</b> (estimated 240 schools/780 classrooms)	<b>Model A: Resource Classes</b> (15 RCs in Banke and Surkhet)
<b>Rationale</b>	In order to begin to institutionalize detection of disability and response, Reading for All will integrate core interventions into the NEGRP in all sixteen EGRP working districts. The primary objectives of the core package are early detection at scale and the introduction of disability issues to existing EGRP initiatives. The core interventions rely heavily on the leadership of Head Teachers and linkages with existing government structures/initiatives (e.g. Local Disability Committees) and DPOs. Given the scale, ongoing support for classroom teachers will be minimal.	In two focal districts (Banke & Surkhet), Reading for All will select four municipalities ( <i>gaun palika</i> / <i>nagar palika</i> ) to test a more intensive intervention package to determine which support activities above and beyond the core package may impact the learning of children with disabilities.	There are 91 Resource Classes of three types (for children who are blind/low vision, deaf/hard of hearing, and with intellectual disabilities) within the sixteen EGRP districts. Reading for All will focus on RCs for children who are blind/low vision and deaf/hard of hearing in Banke and Surkhet to explore ways to make classrooms more inclusive and to strengthen the government's existing Resource Class strategy. Given the small number of RCs in Banke and Surkhet, RC teachers from surrounding districts will be included in training, while follow-up and community activities will be more intensive in Banke and Surkhet. In addition to this, four resource classes with intellectual disabilities will be provided with support through trained HTs and resource persons through coaching and mentoring of teachers so as to improve early learning, communication, pre-literacy and literacy skills (day-to-day activity support) of children enrolled in the classes.
<b>Early detection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School level: HTs lead team of teachers, with support from DPOs, health, FCHVs, PTAs and SMCs</li> <li>Overall leadership: GP Disability committees, DPOs, and RPs</li> </ul>	Same as core, with additional support from mobile assessment team at GP/NP level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14 non-focal districts: Same as core</li> <li>Banke &amp; Surkhet: access to mobile assessment team</li> </ul>

	<b>Model B: Core Interventions</b> (all 6,775 schools in sixteen EGRP districts)	<b>Model C: Core Plus in 4 Focal</b> <b>GPs/NPs in Banke &amp; Surkhet</b> (estimated 240 schools/780 classrooms)	<b>Model A: Resource Classes</b> (15 RCs in Banke and Surkhet)
<b>Referrals</b>	Supported by GP/NP, DPOs, links to health sector	Support from mobile assessment team and project staff, DPOs, GP/NPs and health sector Referrals and linkages to USAID STRIDE project	Banke & Surkhet: Support from mobile assessment team and project staff, DPOs, GP/NPs Referrals and linkages to USAID STRIDE project and other rehabilitation services
<b>Teacher training</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RPs: trained through ToMT to support GP/NP-level leadership</li> <li>HTs: all trained through project to lead early detection and support teacher/learning activities</li> <li>G1-3 classroom teachers: supported by HTs; Disability topics added to existing/planned EGRP /TPD activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RPs and HTs: receive the same level of training as the core package.</li> <li>All G1-3 teachers get 3 days of teacher training on EGR strategies for children with disabilities to supplement basic 15 days EGR training already received through EGRP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Braille: 20 RC teachers: approx. 2 weeks training on teaching reading to build on existing experience/training teaching braille</li> <li>NSL: 20 NSL RC teachers: approx. 2 weeks training on teaching reading to build on existing experience/training teaching NSL</li> <li>Intellectual disability RC teachers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Banke &amp; Surkhet: same as core and additional support by HTs and RPs to support early learning and pre-literacy skills needed by children with intellectual disabilities</li> <li>Additional coaching and mentoring support to HTs and RPs will be provided</li> <li>Three-day workshop to support RC teachers</li> <li>Other districts: same as core</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Ongoing support/coaching</b>	Minimal; provided by HTs, RPs with support from partner DPOs	Continuous support/coaching from project staff; 1 mobilizer per 10 schools Mobile/cluster meetings or community of practice groups via Facebook or social media	Continuous support/coaching from project staff and partner DPOs; Community of Practice groups via Facebook or social media

<sup>3</sup> See RFA Program Description for a clearer chart.

	<b>Model B: Core Interventions</b> (all 6,775 schools in sixteen EGRP districts)	<b>Model C: Core Plus in 4 Focal</b> <b>GP's/NPs in Banke &amp; Surkhet</b> (estimated 240 schools/780 classrooms)	<b>Model A: Resource Classes</b> (15 RCs in Banke and Surkhet)
Support for IEPs	Support from HTs, DPOs, and RPs	Core plus additional support to teachers & HTs from DPOs and project staff	Core plus additional support from DPOs and project staff
Materials	EGRP provided materials HTs provide support for locally made materials	Pilot testing of additional materials supplemental to EGRP core package for children with disabilities	Banke & Surkhet (and other selected RC engaged in pre-testing EGR materials): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Braille: supplemental braille materials</li> <li>• NSL: supplemental NSL materials</li> <li>• Intellectual: core plus</li> </ul>
Parent/ community engagement	Linked to existing/planned EGRP community engagement activities with support from DPOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent &amp; community awareness raising activities supported by project</li> <li>• Project support to engage parents in IEP development and tracking</li> <li>• Parent-teacher classroom interactions supported by DPOs and project staff</li> <li>• Reading Melas (fairs)</li> </ul>	NSL & braille RCs: Reading clubs, buddy system, community volunteers including mainstream teachers of grade one to three Engagement of parents in RC in IEP development whenever possible (e.g. at holiday pickup for students in hostels)
School management /governance	Trained HTs work with SMCs and PTAs; link to planned/existing activities under EGRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PTAs and SMCs supported by project staff from DPO to include disability related goals and activities in School Improvement Plan (SIPs) and implement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PTAs and SMCs supported by project staff from DPO to include disability-related goals and activities in School Improvement Plan (SIPs) and implement</li> </ul>