

# Multi-Country Study on Inclusive Education (MCSIE)

## Overarching and Country-Level Results Framework

SUPPLEMENT TO AGREEMENT NO. 7200AA18CA00009 (LASER)

Produced by Inclusive Development Partners

Submitted January 6, 2020



## Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	3
<b>1. Overarching Results Framework</b>	4
<b>2. Country-Level Results Framework</b>	8
2.1 Cambodia Results Framework	9
2.2 Malawi Results Framework	13
2.3 Nepal Results Framework	17
<b>Annex A: Results Framework Common Terms</b>	21
<b>References</b>	24

## Abbreviations

All Children Reading Cambodia	ACR
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	CRPD
Disabled Persons' Organization	DPO
Early Detection	ED
Early Grade Reading	EGR
Early Grade Reading Assessment	EGRA
Education Response System	ERS
Humanity & Inclusion	HI
Implementing Partner	IP
Inclusive Development Partners	IDP
Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity	IDIQ
Intermediate Result	IR
Malawi Early Grade Reading Improvement Activity	MERIT
Ministry of Education, Science and Technology	MoEST
Monitoring and Evaluation	M&E
Multi-Country Study on Inclusive Education	MCSIE
National Early Grade Reading Program	NEGRP
National Institute of Special Education	NISE
Reading for All	RFA
Reading for All Malawi	REFAM
Teaching and learning materials	TLM
United States Agency for International Development	USAID
Washington Group Child Functioning Model	WG-CFM
Yesani Ophunzira "Assess the Learners"	YESA

# 1. Overarching Results Framework

The results framework (**Exhibit 1**) outlines IDP's expected evaluation results and is aligned with the following five evaluation questions and sub-questions described below.

1. What worked well/poorly in the process of setting up an efficient, effective, and sustainable system to focus on improving the quality of education for learners with disabilities? (Process)
2. What methods worked best to identify learners with disabilities? (Identification)
3. What training model(s) worked best to provide teachers with the resources and support they need to best meet the needs of learners with disabilities? (Training)
4. What instructional models worked best to improve classroom instruction and reading outcomes among learners with disabilities? (Instruction)
5. Were there any unintended consequences of the activity? What were they? (Consequences)

Each question includes the following sub-questions:

- How does the method/model work?
- Why does it work/not work?
- How costly is it?
- In which contexts is it likely to work best?
- How sustainable (both in terms of capacity and financial resources) is it?
- What is the impact on gender?

The methods used to achieve these results will range from primary data collection (including school and household-based surveys, observations of reading lessons and training events, key informant interviews and focus group discussions with varied stakeholders) to secondary data analysis and document review. The definitions of common key terms used in the results framework can be found in **Annex A**.

## Exhibit 1: MCSIE Results Framework

Strategic Objective: To identify what works to sustainably advance teaching and learning outcomes for children with disabilities in varying contexts and ultimately inform current and future USAID programming				
Process	Identification	Training	Instruction	Consequences
<b>IR-1: Identify effective processes for supporting government's efforts to set up inclusive education (IE) systems</b>  <i>Do the activity processes effectively contribute to supporting the govt's efforts to set up IE systems?</i>	<b>IR-2: Identify effective methods for successfully identifying children with disabilities</b>  <i>Do the chosen identification methods effectively screen and identify children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-3: Identify effective training models and resources for equipping teachers of children with disabilities</b>  <i>Do the training models/approaches improve teacher performance for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-4: Identify effective instructional models for improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities</b>  <i>Do the chosen instructional models improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-5: Identify unintended consequences of interventions</b>  <i>What are the unintended consequences (positive, neutral, negative) of the intervention?</i>
<b>Sub-IR 1.1: How do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work?</b>  USAID's chosen award mechanisms are assessed; decisions for project infrastructure (staffing, partnering, location, resource use), communication, and local capacity-building related to setting	<b>Sub-IR 2.1: How does the ID method work?</b>  Approach for determining identification method is evaluated;  Technical details related to use of ID method are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 3.1: How does the training model work?</b>  Approach for determining teacher training model/ resources is evaluated;  Technical details related to teacher training model/resources are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 4.1: How does the instructional model work?</b>  Approach for determining instructional model is evaluated;  Technical details related to content of instructional model are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 5.1: How did unintended consequences of interventions occur?</b>  Factors influencing unintended consequences of activities are identified

up IE systems are evaluated				
<b>Sub-IR 1.2: <i>Why do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work/not work?</i></b>  Effectiveness of processes related to infrastructure, communication, and capacity building in support of gov't efforts to set up IE systems is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 2.2: <i>Why does the ID method work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for determining effectiveness of ID method is evaluated; Effectiveness of ID method is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 3.2: <i>Why does the training model work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for determining effectiveness of teacher training model/resource is evaluated; Effectiveness of training model/resources is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 4.2: <i>Why does the instructional model work/not work?</i></b>  IP approach for determining effectiveness of instructional model is evaluated; Teacher implementation of instructional model is evaluated; Effectiveness of instructional model is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 5.2: <i>Why did unintended consequences occur?</i></b>  Factors causing (reasons for) unintended consequences of activities are identified
<b>Sub-IR 1.3: <i>What was the process for determining cost, and what was the cost?</i><sup>1</sup></b>  Process for estimating costs is examined	<b>Sub-IR 2.3: <i>What was the cost of the ID method; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>  Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of ID method is examined	<b>Sub-IR 3.3: <i>What was the cost of the training model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>  Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of training model is examined	<b>Sub-IR 4.3: <i>What was the cost of the instructional model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>  Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of instructional model is examined	<b>Sub-IR 5.3: <i>What is the potential unforeseen cost as a result of the interventions?</i></b>  Potential costs associated with unintended consequences of activities are examined
<b>Sub-IR 1.4: <i>Do processes account for context?</i></b>  Alignment between the	<b>Sub-IR 2.4: <i>Is ID method suitable for context?</i></b>  Approach for determining	<b>Sub-IR 3.4: <i>Is training model suitable for context?</i></b>  Approach for determining	<b>Sub-IR 4.4: <i>Is instructional model suitable for context?</i></b>  Approach for determining	<b>Sub-IR 5.4: <i>What contextual factors contributed to unintended consequences?</i></b>

<sup>1</sup> For all cost-related questions, IDP will review implementation cost data that is available from Activities.

chosen project scope and country context is assessed; Contextual suitability of IE processes in support of govt's efforts to set up IE systems is evaluated	contextual suitability of ID method is evaluated; Contextual suitability of ID method is evaluated	contextual suitability of training model/resources is evaluated; Contextual suitability of training model/resources is evaluated	contextual suitability of instructional model is evaluated; Contextual suitability of instructional model is evaluated	Contextual factors related to unintended consequences of activities are identified
<b>Sub-IR 1.5: Do processes promote sustainability?</b>  Processes for promoting sustainability of project activities related to supporting govt efforts to set up IE systems are evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 2.5: Is ID method sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of ID method is evaluated; Sustainability of ID method is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 4.5: Are training models/resources sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of training model/resources is evaluated; Sustainability of training model/resources is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 4.5.: Is instructional model sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of instructional model is evaluated; Sustainability of instructional model is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 5.5: How will unintended consequences be sustained or have continued impact?</b>  Sustainability of positive unintended consequences and continued impact of negative consequences of activities is assessed
<b>Sub IR 1.6: How is gender equity promoted in processes?</b>  Processes for promoting and tracking gender equity are evaluated  Role of gender or considerations of gender within each of the programs is documented/evaluated.	<b>Sub IR 2.6: Is gender equity promoted in ID tools and data use?</b>  ID tools and process are reviewed for gender equality  Use of sex disaggregated ID data is evaluated	<b>Sub IR 3.6: Is gender equity promoted in training content?</b>  Treatment of gender equity and inclusion in training content is evaluated	<b>Sub IR 4.6: Is gender equity promoted in instructional model and materials, and data use?</b>  Use of sex disaggregated learning outcomes data is evaluated;  Treatment of gender in instructional materials is evaluated using USAID's Gender Principles.	<b>Sub IR 5.6: How does gender factor into unintended consequences?</b>  Gender considerations associated with unintended consequences of activities are identified

## 2. Country-Level Results Framework

The country-specific results frameworks follow the design and structure of the overall MCSIE results framework and, accordingly, align with the MCSIE evaluation questions and subquestions. IDP's M&E team, in collaboration with the three country teams, have tailored each results framework to the particulars of the respective programs, using various documentation and information provided by USAID and the implementing partners, including work plans, quarterly and annual reports, and details gleaned from IDP's inception trips. Given that, in the case of many activities, implementation is planned but has not yet begun (for example, training classroom teachers, implementing at the school level, and utilizing screening or early detection tools in the field), IDP's ability as the evaluator to achieve a given result that is outlined in the framework will depend on the implementers' actions going forward.



## 2.1 Cambodia Results Framework

Process	Identification	Training	Instruction	Consequences
<b>IR-1: Identify effective processes for supporting government's efforts to set up inclusive education (IE) systems in Cambodia</b>  <i>Do the processes undertaken by the IE activities effectively contribute to supporting the govt's efforts to set up IE systems?</i>	<b>IR-2: Identify effective methods for successfully identifying children with disabilities in Cambodia</b>  <i>Do the chosen identification methods effectively screen and identify children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-3: Identify effective training models and resources for equipping teachers of children with disabilities in Cambodia</b>  <i>Do the training models/approaches improve teacher performance for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-4: Identify effective instructional models for improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities in Cambodia</b>  <i>Do the chosen instructional models improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-5: Identify unintended consequences of interventions in Cambodia</b>  <i>What are the unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the intervention?</i>
<b>Sub-IR 1.1: How does the process to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work?</b>  USAID's chosen award mechanism (contract under IDIQ) is assessed.  Decisions for project infrastructure (staffing, partnering, location, resource use), communication, and local capacity-building related to supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 2.1: How does the ID method work?</b>  Approach for selecting screening tools for vision and hearing (the Lea Symbols Chart, a noise test, a hearing questionnaire for parents) are evaluated.  Approach for developing a referral process is evaluated.  Approach for developing teacher training on	<b>Sub-IR 3.1: How does the training model work?</b>  Approach for developing 2 training streams and accompanying training resources is evaluated:  1. Training of trainers 2. Teachers/NISE Teachers	<b>Sub-IR 4.1: How does the instructional model work?</b>  Approach for evaluating existing literacy instructional models in Cambodia and modifying or developing instructional model is evaluated, including:  1. Incorporate IE instruction into teacher guide, training and coaching/mentoring	<b>Sub-IR 5.1: How did unintended consequences of interventions occur?</b>  Factors influencing unintended consequences of activities are identified.

	screening and referral is evaluated.		2. Adapt student TLMs for vision and hearing disabilities 3. Bridge Program (raising Deaf Sign Language profile, integrated classes)	
<b>Sub-IR 1.2: <i>Why do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work/not work?</i></b>  Effectiveness of processes related to infrastructure, communication, and capacity building in support of gov't's efforts to set up IE systems are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 2.2: <i>Why does the ID method work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for testing screening tools is evaluated.  Effectiveness of screening tools in identifying children with disabilities is evaluated.  Effectiveness of teacher-led screening is evaluated.  Effectiveness of referral process in securing support for children with disabilities is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 3.2: <i>Why does the training model work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for determining effectiveness of training models and resources is evaluated.  Effectiveness of training models and resources for improving literacy instruction for children with disabilities is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 4.2: <i>Why does the instructional model work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for testing literacy instructional model is evaluated.  Effectiveness of literacy instructional model for improving reading outcomes of children with disabilities is evaluated (including TLMs, coaching, Bridge Program)	<b>Sub-IR 5.2: <i>Why did unintended consequences occur?</i></b>  Factors causing (reasons for) unintended consequences of activities are identified.
<b>Sub-IR 1.3: <i>What was the process for determining cost, and what was the cost?</i><sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Sub-IR 2.3: <i>What was the cost of the ID method; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 3.3: <i>What was the cost of the training model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 4.3: <i>What was the cost of the instructional model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 5.3: <i>What is the potential unforeseen cost as a result of the interventions?</i></b>  Potential costs associated with unintended

<sup>2</sup> For all cost-related questions, IDP will review implementation cost data that is available from Activities.

Process for estimating costs is examined.	Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of screening tools and teacher-led screening is examined.	Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of training models and resources is examined.	Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of instructional model is examined (including IE field staff/capacity, TLMs, coaching, Bridge Program).	consequences of activities are examined.
<b>Sub-IR 1.4: Do processes account for context?</b>  Alignment between the project scope and the Cambodia country context is assessed.  Contextual suitability of processes for supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 2.4: Is ID method suitable for context?</b>  Approach for determining contextual suitability of screening tools and teacher-led screening for use in Cambodia is evaluated.  Contextual suitability of referral process for use in Cambodia is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 3.4: Is training model suitable for context?</b>  Approach for determining contextual suitability of training models and resources is evaluated.  Contextual suitability of training models and resources is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 4.4: Is instructional model suitable for context?</b>  Approach for determining contextual suitability of instructional model is evaluated.  Contextual suitability of instructional model is evaluated (including TLMs, coaching, Bridge Program).	<b>Sub-IR 5.4: What contextual factors contributed to unintended consequences?</b>  Contextual factors related to unintended consequences of activities are identified.
<b>Sub-IR 1.5: Do processes promote sustainability?</b>  Processes for promoting sustainability of project activities related to supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 2.5: Is the ID method sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of teacher training, monitoring and support related to screening and referral is evaluated.  Sustainability of ACR-Cambodia vision and	<b>Sub-IR 3.5: Are training models/resources sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of training models and resources is evaluated.  Sustainability of training models and resources is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 4.5: Is instructional model sustainable?</b>  Approach for determining sustainability of instructional model is evaluated.  Sustainability of instructional model is evaluated (including IE field staff/capacity, TLMs,	<b>Sub-IR 5.5: How will unintended consequences be sustained or have continued impact?</b>  Sustainability of positive unintended consequences and continued impact of negative consequences of activities is assessed.

	hearing screening and referral is evaluated.		coaching, Bridge Program).	
<p><b>Sub IR 1.6: <i>How is gender equity promoted in processes?</i></b></p> <p>Processes for promoting and tracking gender equity are evaluated.</p> <p>Role of gender or considerations of gender within activities is documented/evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 2.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in training content?</i></b></p> <p>Use of gender disaggregated training data is evaluated.</p> <p>Gender equity of training processes is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 3.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in training content?</i></b></p> <p>Treatment of gender in training content is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 4.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in instructional models, materials, and data use?</i></b></p> <p>Use of gender disaggregated learning outcomes data is evaluated.</p> <p>Treatment of gender in instructional model (including TLMS, coaching, Bridge Program) is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 5.6: <i>How does gender factor into unintended consequences?</i></b></p> <p>Gender considerations associated with unintended consequences of activities are identified.</p>

## 2.2 Malawi Results Framework

Process	Identification	Training	Instruction	Consequences
<b>IR-1: Identify effective processes for supporting government's efforts to set up inclusive education (IE) systems in Malawi</b>  <i>Do the processes undertaken by the IE activities effectively contribute to supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems?</i>	<b>IR-2: Identify effective methods for successfully identifying children with disabilities in Malawi</b>  <i>Do the chosen identification methods effectively screen and identify children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-3: Identify effective training models and resources for equipping teachers of children with disabilities in Malawi</b>  <i>Do the training models/approaches improve teacher performance for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-4: Identify effective instructional models for improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities in Malawi</b>  <i>Do the chosen instructional models improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-5: Identify unintended consequences of interventions in Malawi</b>  <i>What are the unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the intervention?</i>
<b>Sub-IR 1.1: How do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work?</b>  USAID's chosen award mechanism is assessed;  Decisions for project infrastructure (staffing, partnering, location, resource use), and local capacity-building related to supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems are evaluated;  Approach for training families on supporting	<b>Sub-IR 2.1: How does the ID method work?</b>  Approach for adapting, strengthening, and validating existing EGRA tools for specific disabilities (visual impairments, hearing impairments, learning disabilities) is evaluated;  Approach for developing identification tools is evaluated;	<b>Sub-IR 3.1: How does the training model work?</b>  Approach for developing 2 training streams and accompanying training resources is evaluated  1. Training of trainers 2. Training of administrators/teachers	<b>Sub-IR 4.1: How does the instructional model work?</b>  Approach for evaluating existing EGRA tools and approach for developing guidance on EGRA delivery is evaluated;  Approach for evaluating existing literacy instructional models in Malawi (incl. materials from MERIT, YESA, and Save the Children) and modifying or developing the instructional model is evaluated;	<b>Sub-IR 5.1: How did unintended consequences of interventions occur?</b>  Factors influencing unintended consequences of activities are identified.

learners with disabilities is evaluated.	Approach for training service providers is evaluated.		Approach for developing guidance on accommodation delivery/UDL and for TLMs is evaluated;  Approach for coaching RC teachers is evaluated.	
<b>Sub-IR 1.2: <i>Why do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work/not work?</i></b>  Effectiveness of processes related to infrastructure, communication, and capacity building are evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 2.2: <i>Why does the ID method work/not work?</i></b>  Protocols for leveraging a multidisciplinary team to identify children with disabilities is evaluated;  Approach for training MoEST Desk Officers on data collection protocols for children with disabilities is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 3.2: <i>Why does the training model work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for determining effectiveness of training models and resources is evaluated;  Effectiveness of training models and resources for improving literacy instruction for children with disabilities is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 4.2: <i>Why does the instructional model work/not work?</i></b>  Approach for testing REFAM literacy instructional model is evaluated;  Effectiveness of literacy instructional model for improving reading outcomes of children with disabilities is evaluated;  Effectiveness of coaching model for instructing children with disabilities is evaluated.	<b>Sub-IR 5.2: <i>Why did unintended consequences occur?</i></b>  Factors causing (reasons for) unintended consequences of activities are identified
<b>Sub-IR 1.3: <i>What was the process for</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 2.3: <i>What was the cost of the ID method; was it determined to be cost</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 3.3: <i>What was the cost of the training model; was it determined to be cost effective; and</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 4.3: <i>What was the cost of the instructional model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b>	<b>Sub-IR 5.3: <i>What is the potential unforeseen cost as a result of the interventions?</i></b>

<p><b>determining cost, and what was the cost?<sup>3</sup></b></p> <p>Process for estimating costs is examined.</p>	<p><b>effective; and how was this determined?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of adapted EGRA tools and MoEST Desk Officer training is examined.</p>	<p><b>how was this determined?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining cost of training models and resources is examined;</p> <p>Cost of training models and resources for improving literacy instruction for children with disabilities is examined.</p>	<p>Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of REFAM instructional model is examined.</p>	<p>Potential costs associated with unintended consequences of activities are examined</p>
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.4: Do processes account for context?</b></p> <p>Alignment between the project scope and the Malawi country context is assessed;</p> <p>Contextual suitability of activity processes for supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.4: Is the ID method suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of adapted EGRA tools for use in Malawi is evaluated;</p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of adapted TLM's for use in Malawi is evaluated;</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 3.4: Is the training model suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of training models and resources (including TLMs/Toolkit) is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.4: Is the instructional model suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of instructional model and supports is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.4: What contextual factors contributed to unintended consequences?</b></p> <p>Contextual factors related to unintended consequences of activities are identified</p>
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.5: Do processes promote sustainability?</b></p> <p>Processes for promoting sustainability of project activities are evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.5: Is ID method sustainable?</b></p> <p>Process for communicating and disseminating</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.5: Are training models/resources sustainable?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining sustainability of training</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.5.: Is instructional model sustainable?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining sustainability of instructional model is evaluated;</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.5: How will unintended consequences be sustained or have continued impact?</b></p> <p>Sustainability of positive unintended consequences</p>

<sup>3</sup> For all cost-related questions, IDP will review implementation cost data that is available from Activities.

	<p>identification tools is evaluated;</p> <p>Approach for training MoEST Desk Officers on data collection is evaluated;</p> <p>Sustainability of adapted EGRA tools is evaluated.</p>	<p>models and resources are evaluated;</p> <p>Sustainability of training models and resources are evaluated.</p>	<p>Sustainability of instructional model (including TLMs/Toolkit) is evaluated;</p> <p>Approach for determining sustainability of REFAM coaching model is evaluated;</p> <p>Sustainability of coaching model is evaluated.</p>	<p>and future impact of negative consequences of activities is assessed.</p>
<p><b>Sub IR 1.6: <i>How is gender equity promoted in processes?</i></b></p> <p>Processes for promoting and tracking gender equity are evaluated;</p> <p>Role of gender or gender considerations is documented/evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 2.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in ID tools and data use?</i></b></p> <p>Use of gender disaggregated data is evaluated;</p> <p>Gender equity of identification tool and process is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 3.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in training content?</i></b></p> <p>Attention to gender equity in training models and resources is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 4.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in instructional model and materials, and data use?</i></b></p> <p>Equity in gender representation within instructional model is evaluated;</p> <p>Equity in gender representation within instructional model and materials is evaluated</p> <p>Use of gender disaggregated learning outcomes data is evaluated.</p>	<p><b>Sub IR 5.6: <i>How does gender factor into unintended consequences?</i></b></p> <p>Gender considerations associated with unintended consequences are identified.</p>



## 2.3 Nepal Results Framework

Process	Identification	Training	Instruction	Consequences
<b>IR-1: Identify effective processes for supporting government's efforts to set up inclusive education systems in Nepal</b>  <i>Do the processes undertaken by the IE activities effectively contribute to supporting the govt's efforts to set up IE systems?</i>	<b>IR-2: Identify effective methods for successfully identifying children with disabilities in Nepal</b>  <i>Do the chosen identification methods effectively screen and identify children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-3: Identify effective training models and resources for equipping teachers of children with disabilities in Nepal</b>  <i>Do the training models/approaches improve teacher performance for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-4: Identify effective instructional models for improving reading outcomes for children with disabilities in Nepal</b>  <i>Do the chosen instructional models improve reading outcomes for children with disabilities?</i>	<b>IR-5: Identify unintended consequences of interventions in Nepal</b>  <i>What are the unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the intervention?</i>
<b>Sub-IR 1.1: How do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work?</b>  USAID's chosen award mechanism (cooperative agreement) is assessed;  Decisions for project infrastructure (staffing, partnering, location, resource use), communication, and local capacity-building are evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 2.1: How does the ID method work?</b>  Approach for selecting and adapting WG-CFM as early screening (ED) tool is evaluated;  Approach for developing Mobile Education Assessment Team training is evaluated;  Approach for developing Education Response System	<b>Sub-IR 3.1: How does the training model work?</b>  Approach for developing 3 training streams and accompanying training resources is evaluated  1. Training of trainers 2. Head teachers 3. EGR teachers	<b>Sub-IR 4.1: How does the instructional model work?</b>  Approach for evaluating existing IEP model being used in Nepal and approach for developing new IEP models is evaluated;  Approach for evaluating existing literacy instructional models in Nepal (incl. materials from NEGRP, HI, and World Education) and modifying or developing instructional model is evaluated	<b>Sub-IR 5.1: How did unintended consequences of interventions occur?</b>  Factors influencing unintended consequences of activities are identified

	(ERS) Flowchart is evaluated			
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.2: <i>Why do the processes to support gov't efforts to set up IE systems work/not work?</i></b></p> <p>Effectiveness of processes related to infrastructure, communication, and capacity building is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.2: <i>Why does the ID method work/not work?</i></b></p> <p>Approach for testing ED tool is evaluated;</p> <p>Effectiveness of ED tool in identifying children with disabilities is evaluated;</p> <p>Effectiveness of Mobile Education Assessment Teams is evaluated;</p> <p>Effectiveness of ERS Flowchart in securing support for children with disabilities is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 3.2: <i>Why does the training model work/not work?</i></b></p> <p>Approach for determining effectiveness of training models and resources is evaluated;</p> <p>Effectiveness of training models and resources for improving literacy instruction for children with disabilities is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.2: <i>Why does the instructional model work/not work?</i></b></p> <p>Approach for testing RFA-Nepal literacy instructional model is evaluated;</p> <p>Effectiveness of literacy instructional model for improving reading outcomes of children with disabilities is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.2: <i>Why did unintended consequences occur?</i></b></p> <p>Factors causing (reasons for) unintended consequences of activities are identified</p>
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.3: <i>What was the process for</i></b></p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.3: <i>What was the cost of the ID method; was it determined to be cost</i></b></p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 3.3: <i>What was the cost of the training model; was it determined to be cost effective; and</i></b></p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.3: <i>What was the cost of the instructional model; was it determined to be cost effective; and how was this determined?</i></b></p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.3: <i>What is the potential unforeseen cost as a result of the interventions?</i></b></p>

<p><b>determining cost, and what was the cost?<sup>4</sup></b></p> <p>Process for estimating costs is examined</p>	<p><b>effective; and how was this determined?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of ED tool and Mobile Ed. Assessment Teams is examined</p>	<p><b>how was this determined?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of training models and resources is examined</p>	<p>Approach for determining/ensuring cost effectiveness of RFA-Nepal instructional model is examined</p>	<p>Potential costs associated with unintended consequences of activities are examined</p>
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.4: Do processes account for context?</b></p> <p>Alignment between the project scope and the Nepal country context is assessed;</p> <p>Contextual suitability of IE processes for supporting govt's efforts to set up IE systems is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.4: Is ID method suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of ED tool for use in Nepal is evaluated;</p> <p>Contextual suitability of Mobile Ed. Assessment Teams is evaluated</p> <p>Contextual suitability of ED tool and ERS Flowchart for use in Nepal is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 3.4: Is training model suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of training models and resources is evaluated;</p> <p>Contextual suitability of training models and resources is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.4: Is instructional model suitable for context?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining contextual suitability of RFA-Nepal instructional model is evaluated;</p> <p>Contextual suitability of instructional model is evaluated</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.4: What contextual factors contributed to unintended consequences?</b></p> <p>Contextual factors related to unintended consequences of activities are identified</p>
<p><b>Sub-IR 1.5: Do processes promote sustainability?</b></p> <p>Processes for promoting sustainability of project activities related to supporting govt's efforts</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 2.5: Is ID method sustainable?</b></p> <p>Approach for training Mobile Education Assessment Teams is evaluated;</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.5: Are training models/resources sustainable?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining sustainability of training</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 4.5.: Is instructional model sustainable?</b></p> <p>Approach for determining sustainability of RFA-Nepal</p>	<p><b>Sub-IR 5.5: How will unintended consequences be sustained or have continued impact?</b></p> <p>Sustainability of positive unintended consequences</p>

<sup>4</sup> For all cost-related questions, IDP will review implementation cost data that is available from Activities.

to set up IE systems are evaluated	Sustainability of ED tool and ERS Flowchart is evaluated	models and resources is evaluated;  Sustainability of training models and resources is evaluated	instructional model is evaluated;  Sustainability of instructional model is evaluated	and continued impact of negative consequences of activities is assessed
<b>Sub IR 1.6: <i>How is gender equity promoted in process?</i></b>  Processes for promoting and tracking gender equity are evaluated	<b>Sub IR 2.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in ID tools and data use?</i></b>  Use of gender disaggregated ED data is evaluated;  Gender equity of ED tool and referral/support process is evaluated.	<b>Sub IR 3.6: <i>Is equity promoted in training content?</i></b>  Treatment of gender equity in training models and resources is evaluated	<b>Sub IR 4.6: <i>Is gender equity promoted in instructional model and materials, and data use?</i></b>  Equity in gender representation within instructional model and materials is evaluated;  Use of gender disaggregated learning outcomes data is evaluated	<b>Sub IR 5.6: <i>How does gender factor into unintended consequences?</i></b>  Gender considerations associated with unintended consequences of activities are identified

## Annex A: Results Framework Common Terms

In order to evaluate USAID's inclusive education projects in Cambodia, Nepal and Malawi, it is important that IDP's evaluation team, local partners, and enumerators understand key terms often used in the results framework. Definitions were developed from a program evaluation lens and include:

**Context:** The program's contextual factors (e.g. policies; institutional, linguistic, and socio-economic factors; stakeholder technical and operational capacity) that affect users or deliverers of the program. Context is traditionally understood as factors that are external to and operate outside of a program's control but may influence the implementation of the program. Considering the impact of context also increases understanding of how unforeseen and unplanned contingencies can affect program mechanisms, resources and expected outcomes. Sample questions: Does the program fit the local needs identified by stakeholders? What are the environmental barriers to accessing program services? **Contextual suitability** is evaluated as the extent to which contextual factors are considered in program design and planning, especially those related to local system and stakeholder technical and operational capacity.

**Effectiveness:** Ability of the implementing partner to achieve stated goals or objectives, judged in terms of both output and initial impact. Put simply, is the program achieving the goals and objectives it had intended to accomplish? If not, why not? As an example, when evaluating "effectiveness of IP processes related to infrastructure", we would assume that when making decisions about positions on the project (both the creation of positions and the filling of them with individual staff), partnerships (with gov't, with DPOs, etc.) and office needs (location, proximity to stakeholders), the IP was considering the organizational staffing structure, personnel, partnership terms, and office scenario would best facilitate their own project goals/outcomes, including timeline.

**Inclusive Education:** Inclusive education is a term that describes a learning environment wherein students with disabilities are educated in age-appropriate, local school classrooms with their peers without disabilities to the fullest extent possible<sup>5</sup>. Inclusive education is not only about 'placing' children with disabilities in mainstream schools; it also concerns education systems themselves. Inclusive education requires a profound cultural shift at the early childhood, primary, secondary and post-secondary levels, and having one system of education for all students with the provision of supports inclusive of learners with disabilities. Inclusive Education embraces "Universal Design for Learning" and ensures school systems are equipped with skills, knowledge and resources to teach all children in accessible environments. Specifically, inclusive education means formal education systems respond to the needs of all children, rather than the creation of separate systems to serve some children. The road towards this kind of change is long and, thus, the suggested approach involves defining the ultimate goal of inclusion and finding a strategic

---

<sup>5</sup> For students who are deaf and hard of hearing inclusion signifies being educated in a sign language rich environment where they can directly communicate with their peers, teachers, administrators and staff. Therefore, this may not be currently feasible in many local schools but the selection of the schools should be done by the students and families with full information regarding potential ramifications of their decision on language access and child development (WFD, 2014).



pathway that leads towards meeting this goal. Processes and aims may shift as student demographics and teacher capabilities vary, but what is most important is shared commitment toward the goal.

The **inclusive education system** can be defined as the policies, programs, and resources dedicated to ensuring that children with disabilities are fully included in the formal education system as defined by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). While Article 24 of CRPD (United Nations, 2006) proclaims the right to inclusive education for persons with disabilities as a human rights standard, states may choose how they will achieve this goal, considering local variations and institutional arrangements. According to Article 4, Section 2 of the CRPD, “Each State must take measures to realize economic, social and cultural rights progressively, using the greatest amount of available resources to do so. This obligation, commonly referred to as progressive realization, acknowledges that it often takes time to realize many of these rights fully, for example, when social-security or health-care systems must be created or improved” (Hayes, Elder, & Bulat, 2020, p. 6). It is thus useful to expand on what this means in applied settings.

Article 24 of the CRPD stipulates that ‘States Parties shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and lifelong learning.’

- Article 24 (2)(a) requires States Parties to ensure that ‘children with disabilities are not excluded from free and compulsory primary education on the basis of disability’;
- Article 24 (2)(b) requires that ‘persons with disabilities can access inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live’;
- Article 24(2)(c) requires States Parties to ensure that ‘reasonable accommodation of the individual’s requirements is provided.’ This refers to individualized measures that enable a child with a disability to be educated in mainstream schools.
- Article 24(4) requires that teachers be trained in the use of appropriate educational techniques and materials to support persons with disabilities. Training on issues related to disability must be incorporated into teacher education programs.
- Article 8 of the CRPD also indicates that States foster respect for the rights of persons with disabilities; thus, the promotion of positive imagery of children with disabilities must be included in educational materials and school environments.

Article 24’s goals are high and aspirational. Most countries do not have a model of how this can be achieved but will likely have existing practices that can be leveraged in order to move toward realizing the CRPD. A universal design approach does not mean the same strategies must be adopted universally. Rather, CRPD is about a combination of global commitment and local innovation, most commonly called “progressive realization”. Article 24 of the CRPD is subject to progressive realization and States must take steps to achieve inclusive education to the maximum extent possible, given available resources. While delays can occur, States are required to move as expeditiously and effectively as possible towards full realization by setting priorities that are most relevant to states’ needs and capacities. Many States face particular challenges in



progressively realizing the right to inclusive education under CRPD. Resources (costs) have often been cited as a barrier that limits inclusive education, but research has found that segregated education systems are more costly (McConkey & Bradley, 2010), and that funds once used to support segregated schooling can be applied to support children with disabilities in regular classrooms (Johnstone, Lazarus, Lazetic, & Nikolic, 2019).

The literature suggests (de Beco, 2016) that a gradual approach is required to move towards inclusive education. This can be done through the adoption of national human rights action plans and the use of human rights indicators, and educational tools like the characteristics of inclusion outlined in the USAID UDL toolkit. These plans allow States to define priorities through a series of budgeted and time-framed measures. Indicators can and should include acts such as school accessibility, support for children with disabilities, accessible and adapted educational materials and curricula, and teacher training in inclusive education techniques. As noted above, the most important predictor of inclusive education success is a commitment to the process. Progressive realization cannot occur overnight, but will never occur without policy, resource, and capacity-building commitments from States' Parties.

**Sustainability:** The ability to maintain program activities and benefits over time. Specifically, this means plans for the continuance of activities beyond the termination of the initial support (project funding) that has been used to deliver the program. Detailed definition: Having the human, financial, technological, and organizational resources to provide services to meet needs and attain results towards a stated goal on an ongoing basis; and requiring the organizational and programmatic infrastructure to carry out core functions independent of individuals or one-time opportunities. Donor related: The act of decreasing dependence on one source of funding and shifting financial support for program implementation to an ongoing funding stream.



## References

- De Beco, G. (2016). Transition to Inclusive Education Systems According to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*, 34(1), 40-59.
- Hayes, A. M., Elder, B., & Bulat, J. (2020). *Assessment as a service not a place: Transitioning assessment centers to school-based identification systems*. RTI Press. RTI Press Publication No. OP-0064-2004 <https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2020.op.0064.2004>
- Johnstone, C., Lazarus, S., Lazetic, P., & Nikolic, G. (2019). Resourcing Inclusion: Introducing Finance Perspectives to Inclusive Education Policy Rhetoric. *Prospects (Paris)*, 47(4), 339-359.
- McConkey, R., & Bradley, A. (2010). Promoting inclusive education in low income countries. In V. Timmons & P. N. Walsh (Eds.), *A long walk to school: International research on inclusive education across the life-span* (pp. 7–26). The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>
- World Federation of the Deaf (2014). “WFD Statement Delivered by Dr. Joseph Murray at the Opening of the 11th Session of the CRPD Committee.” Retrieved from: <https://wfdeaf.org/news/wfd-statement-to-be-delivered-by-dr-joseph-murray-at-the-opening-of-the-11th-session-of-the-crpd-committee-31-march-2014/>



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**P PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY®

