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1. Executive Summary
Leonard Cheshire Disability (LCD) and its partner in the Philippines, Leonard Cheshire Disability Philippines Foundation, Inc. (LCDPFI) were provided with US$229,750 (total project cost including cost share: US$332,817) from USAID in 2011 to implement a project that delivered Inclusive Education (IE) to children with disabilities in three areas in the Philippines.

The goal of this project was to support children with disabilities in the Philippines to access quality statutory primary education in mainstream schools. The objective was to enable 600 children with disabilities to access quality statutory primary education, with an enhanced physical and learning environment.

This evaluation aimed to determine value and impact according to the OECD DAC Criteria, using a mixed method approach.

1.1 Results
LCD and LCDPFI have mostly delivered against the planned programme targets and outputs. The target of 600 children with disabilities being assessed, referred and enrolled in school was achieved in all project areas, although more than the original 20 schools were needed to reach the target.

Training teachers in IE has proven remarkably successful with both Special Education (SpEd) teachers and mainstream teachers coming forward for training. Some teachers had also been trained as trainers of other teachers, although this roll out training was only due to commence in quarter 4 of year 2. Both teachers and DepEd have identified that further training in additional methodologies for working with children with disabilities would be useful.

Parents groups were established in all project areas and attached to all the schools in the project. This aspect of the project has been significant for its efforts to tackle isolation, exclusion and stigma. Community involvement in the project appears to have been a key factor in the project design and theory of change. However it is not something that has been measured during the project.

Physical adaptations of schools have been slow to be implemented. This is partly because of the bureaucracy involved in undertaking what is effectively a capital project on a municipal-owned property. However part of the delay is down to project planning not being as effective as it could have been. The physical adaptations to schools should have happened at the start of the project, but some are yet to be completed and some only completed in October 2013.

In other instances LCD and LCDPFI have overachieved in terms of pure numbers enrolled in the project and numbers of trainings and lobbying meetings at local government level. However there have been no concrete policy changes, but there has been significant support for implementing Inclusive Education at both a local and a national level. LCDPFI is following a “bottom-up” approach to advocacy and policy change. Working in remote areas, it is more useful and effective to lobby local government (who has budgetary authority) than to focus only on central government. This means that it is the practices around inclusive education that have been easier to implement rather than policy change. LCDPFI admit that it
needs to improve working on policy makers at a national / congressional level. Working with relevant government agencies to lobby congress is seen as the best approach to getting policy change enacted. Thus the relationship with DepEd is crucial to achieving policy change in the long run.

An unintended positive consequence of this project has been the creation of a database of children with disabilities in the project areas that has been used and verified by central government departments to identify and support children with disabilities from other government funds.

### 1.2 Relevance

All stakeholders confirmed that children with disabilities had benefitted the most from this project. They also identified benefit to the parents of children with disabilities and the teachers and schools. However the benefit to the community of this project was largely overlooked and under-articulated by stakeholders.

Relevance was not fully taken into account in the project design. Supply of accessibility aids was not feasible in all areas and the demographics of the identified project areas would never have delivered the target of 600 children with disabilities enrolled in the original 20 schools.

The lack of pre-project research into the context in the Philippines for this project affected project delivery and raises concerns for any potential rollout or scalability of the project, both of which would require a redesign of the project and additional resources.

### 1.3 Effectiveness

The project has proven Inclusive Education to be very effective in elementary schools in the Philippines. In general though, the feedback in key informant interviews, focus group discussions and PRA exercises was that children with disabilities demonstrate increased self-confidence and greater socialisation.

LCDPFI has not however been as effective in delivering the project. LCDPFI spent much of the first year building up the partnerships it would need to deliver the project. It has been very successful in identifying and developing practical partnerships that can support the delivery of the project activities. However it has not made best use of its membership of the Disability Council to develop a coherent policy position amongst other disability NGOs in the Philippines, nor has it used its relationship with DepEd to pursue national policy changes. LCDPFI needs to use these partnerships to develop the policy agenda around Inclusive Education further.

LCDPFI has however managed to place itself at the heart of Inclusive Education in the Philippines through its partnerships with other organisations at both a strategic and operational level. LCDPFI’s approach to rolling out Inclusive Education at a local level can be considered incrementally innovative as it has taken a bottom-up approach to bring other stakeholders on board, but within a national framework set out by DepEd that has assured LCDPFI of DepEd’s engagement with the project. Although it has not articulated its distinctive offer for itself, this bottom-up approach within a national framework is possibly a strategy that LCDPFI can build on that will set it apart from the other players in the Philippines.
1.4 Efficiency
Budgetary control and an understanding of the costs of the project have been significant challenges for LCDPFI. LCDPFI has a poor understanding of the unit costs and cost drivers for this project. Cost control has at times been good, but at times overzealous, causing significant underspends in the first year of the project. This, together with poor planning, the high staff turnover and internal efficiency challenges have served to erode some of the effectiveness of the delivery of the project and undermined the integrity of the data and financial reporting. The lack of an executive post in the organisation is challenging for the sustainability and growth of the organisation and therefore of the project being evaluated.

1.5 Sustainability
Issues with efficiency and effectiveness have reduced the potential for sustainability of the project. However if LCDPFI and LCD were able to sustain some if not all of the activities, then the most effective activity to invest in would be the teacher training activity. Whilst this activity does have the highest unit cost, it also has the lowest resource and time input and the highest potential for reaching the broadest number of children with disabilities; and therefore longer-term impact is more likely. Some teachers believe that the project is already sustainable, because of the skills that they have learnt, which are retained and not reliant on a budget. While parents think that the project is not sustainable as the transport subsidies will come to an end, which they rely heavily upon. Some parent groups have been encouraged to become independent organisations so that they can attract their own funding locally, while some individual parents have received support from LCDPFI’s livelihoods programme to develop their own income and capacity.

Ultimately however, sustainability of this project is heavily reliant on LCDPFI’s ability to become sustainable itself. LCDPFI’s structural issues, lack of capacity and continued reliance on restricted funds to deliver all of its activities creates serious challenges for this fledgling NGO.

Setting up and running an inclusive education project in elementary schools has proven to be effective but time-intensive, with an initial high cost outlay. While investments will be recouped in terms of value creation amongst the beneficiary groups over time, this initial outlay emphasizes the sustainability challenges for this project at this time.

1.6 Conclusions and Lessons Learned
On paper this project looked reasonably straightforward; however the internal inefficiencies and organizational challenges for LCDPFI meant that the overall effectiveness of the project is not as high as it could have been. The project has delivered most the results that were intended and the key beneficiary groups have experienced some of the intended change in their lives. Sustainability however continues to be a challenge for the project and LCDPFI.

There is no doubting that Inclusive Education is needed in the Philippines and can be effective, however with proper research and understanding of the context in the Philippines, the project may have looked very different.

The beneficiary groups are split on whether the project is sustainable without further external funding. While funds and support have been leveraged at a local level for activities in individual schools and communities, sustainability of the whole project rests ultimately on whether LCDPFI can be made sustainable.
Normally on such a short project an evaluator would not be considering impact level reporting and containing the evaluation at outcome level reporting. However the feedback received during the focus group discussions and the PRA exercises suggest that impact is already being felt at an individual, family and school level.

The case study at appendix 7.1 highlights how impact and value is being created at a grassroots level. In time, it would be reasonable to expect to see such impact stories replicated across the project area and value creation to be increased as more families and teachers and schools integrate inclusive education.

Lessons learned
1. Planning: The project has suffered from a lack of appropriate planning and project control locally. This has led to delays in implementing the activities and a rush in year 2 to get the activities completed.

2. Capacity building of staff that implemented the project: Ensuring that the staff put in place to deliver the projects has the correct skills and sufficient capacity is essential. Otherwise delays to project activities are inevitable.

3. Correct monitoring tools required: A very good and efficient project-monitoring tool is being used to collect most quantitative data required for the project; however it does not collect data relating to change in condition or progress. This means that some of the indicators cannot be correctly reported on.

Best practices
1. Assessments of children with disabilities: This has been universally reported as being the most valuable and most beneficial process that has come out of the project. DepEd has especially valued these tools and LCDPFI has funded the dissemination of one tool and is funding the production of another.

2. Teacher training & implementing that training: DepEd report that they greatly value the teacher training and want to be able to roll it out across all schools and reach all 34,000 teachers. It is especially noteworthy that teachers also enjoy the training and have reported in participatory rapid assessment exercises that being able to put the training into practice is the most important factor in the project for them.

1.7 Recommendations
The Project
1. The project plan should be tailored to suit the context of the locations it is being implemented in, in order to ensure that the activities and targets are deliverable within a clearly constructed and relatable budget and time-period;

2. Pre-project period research and a baseline should be undertaken before the planned start of the activities. Where a baseline is a requirement of the donor the baseline period should be distinct from the project delivery period and the deliverables agreed for the project should take these two periods into account;

3. Community engagement is key to the success of an Inclusive Education project. However the community has not been considered to be a key beneficiary of the project, which it is and should be considered as such;

4. Indicators should be set for the project that can be measured; or, if indicators are set for which measurement tools do not exist, these should be set up before the start of the project;
5. Progress reported under the action plans of teachers implementing Inclusive Education should be shared with LCD and LCDPFI to ensure that educational development as an outcome of the project can be properly measured;
6. Child assessments should be universally free at the point of delivery to ensure that all children can be assessed ahead of starting school, to get the appropriate support and assistance necessary

Leonard Cheshire Disability
1. The relationship between LCD and LCDPFI was crucial to the success of this project. Mostly this relationship was about support and capacity building. There was however no formal capacity building plan in place for LCDPFI, which is essentially a new NGO with very few resources. LCD has a strong background in partnership working, which could have been brought to bear more proactively at the start and throughout the project period;
2. LCD should consider a longitudinal study of children in Inclusive Education in the Philippines to measure long-lasting impact and value creation as a result of this project.

Leonard Cheshire Disability Philippines Foundation, Inc.
1. Short / immediate term: capacity building programme for staff needs to be put in place;
2. An executive post needs to be created to oversee the day-to-day operation of the organisation and to act as a link between the board and the organisational team;
3. Trustees need to articulate what information they want reported to them at their board meetings and push back at the staff team to deliver the information that the trustees need to fulfil their role as the guardians of the organisation;
4. A strategic plan for the organisation needs to be developed that outlines how the organisation will deliver its vision over the next three to five years, a budget that is required to fund the plan and a detailed fundraising strategy to identify how the funds needed to support the strategy will be raised;
5. Identify potential partnerships for delivering key activities, such as healthcare agencies / NGOs, etc.;
6. Fundraising strategy must identify how to build up the non-existent unrestricted reserves;
7. Identify a clear vision and mission for the organisation that expresses what the trustees want LCDPFI to be and aspire to.

2. Background
Leonard Cheshire Disability (LCD) and its partner in the Philippines, Leonard Cheshire Disability Philippines Foundation, Inc. (LCDPFI) had previously piloted a new approach to providing access to quality primary education for children with disabilities called Inclusive Education. LCD was provided with US$229,750 (total project cost including cost share: US$332,817) in 2011 to implement a follow-on project that delivered IE to children with disabilities in three areas in the Philippines.

2.1 Leonard Cheshire Disability
Originally starting out as a UK charity addressing the needs of people with disabilities in the UK, LCD has been supporting people with disabilities in more than 50 countries for over 50 years. Currently there are members of the Leonard
Cheshire Disability Alliance in 54 countries, including the UK. As at January 2013, there were LCD projects running in 22 countries, mainly in Asia and Africa.

In the Philippines, LCD has worked closely with its partners, PhilCOCHED and now LCDPFI to deliver services and support to people with disabilities.

LCD’s work outside of the UK is supported by its international department, which also acts as Secretariat for the network of Cheshire organisations around the world.

2.2 Leonard Cheshire Disabilities Philippines Foundation, Inc.

LCDPFI is a relatively new NGO in the Philippines. Previously LCD’s partner in the Philippines and the national representative body of the Cheshire Societies in the Philippines was an organisation called The Philippine Council of Cheshire Homes for the Disabled (PhilCOCHED). However problems with financial accountability at PhilCOCHED just before the start of this project meant that the relationship had to be severed. It was agreed that a local agency would need to be set up. LCDPFI was the result and the assets and responsibilities of PhilCOCHED were transferred to LCDPFI in 2010. LCDPFI is a much smaller organisation than its predecessor and very much in the start-up phase of its life.

LCDPFI runs three core programmes:
- Inclusive Education
- Livelihoods
- Young Voices (part of LCD’s global policy and campaigning programme)

Each funded through restricted funds from a third party donor.

LCDPFI is also a member of the Disability Council in the Philippines, which allows the organisation to network closely with other disability charities in the Philippines as well as government departments and agencies, such as the Department of Education (DepEd).

2.3 Inclusive Education

LCD’s approach called Inclusive Education (IE) was piloted in a series of projects up to 2011. It is one of two ways that LCD supports people with disabilities\(^1\) and has been a key theme for LCD since 2001.

---

\(^1\) The other being livelihoods

\(^2\) Although not shown as a key theme, LCD also have a research component in the form of the Inclusive Development Centre in collaboration with the Department of Epidemiology & Public Health at University College London
IE is defined as “Children learning together in the same classroom, using materials appropriate to their various needs, and participating in the same lessons and recreation.”

IE was developed in Kenya as a result of requests to Cheshire homes there to support children with disabilities (CWD) with transport to and from school. LCD was not convinced that a simple transport programme was the right solution and had already noticed that Cheshire Homes were being used as hostels by children with disabilities when their parents did not know how to care for and support them.

LCD consolidated the model in approximately 2006/07.

The paper entitled “Inclusive Education: An Introduction” (Shaw, D. 2012) has outlined learnings from the pilot projects and sets out the steps for setting up an IE project.

The key elements to an IE project are:
- Assessment, enrolment and assistive devices support
- Creating accessible school environments
- Working with parents
- Child-to-child activities
- Teacher training
- Working with government for policy change
- Working with communities

Schools that want to adopt IE face some significant challenges, such as physical adaptations to make the environment welcoming, training teachers to use IE and its tools in their lesson plans and classes, developing good relationships with parents and their Department for Education to ensure appropriate support and sustainability of the programme.

Ultimately however IE is seen as in important and significant approach to mainstreaming disability in society.

Currently IE is focused on primary education. However LCD is considering what happens next for those children moving from primary to secondary school, where IE is not yet implemented.

2.4 Access to Education for People with Disability in the Philippines

This USAID funded IE project in the Philippines has been implemented in three areas and across 20 schools:
- National Capital Region (CAMANAVA), 5 schools;
- Atimonan (Quezon province), 5 Schools; and
- General Santos City (South Cotobato, Mindanao), 10 Schools

The goal of this project was to support children with disabilities in the Philippines to access quality statutory primary education in mainstream schools.

The objective was to enable 600 children with disabilities to access quality statutory primary education, with an enhanced physical and learning environment.

---

To achieve the goal and objective set out above, LCD had identified a series of expected results, indicators for which would be measured during the lifetime of the project:

a. **Result 1:** 600 children with disabilities in project locations have been assessed (and referred onwards for rehabilitation services where appropriate), and enrolled in primary school;
b. **Result 2:** All project schools delivering Inclusive Education to enrol children with disabilities, with trained teachers using appropriate curriculum, materials and methodologies;
c. **Result 3:** Parents groups and communities in project areas provided ongoing support to children with disabilities;
d. **Result 4:** Targeted mainstream primary schools are adapted to make them physically accessible to children with disabilities; and
e. **Result 5:** Partnership working with the Department of Education will bring about positive changes to policy and practice around Inclusive Education.

3. **Methodology**

This evaluation used a mixed-method approach to determine value and impact.

The research and data collection has been based on the DAC criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability, which have been included in every element of the data collection process and will be considered during the analysis section.

3.1 **Key Informant Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews took place with a range of stakeholder representatives as agreed with LCD and LCDPFI in the UK, Bangkok and the Philippines. A list of key informant interviews is shown at appendix 7.5.
3.2 Focus Group Discussions
Structured focus group discussions took place in the Philippines with parents of children with disabilities and teachers that have been trained in Inclusive Education, and that have benefitted from the project. A list of the focus groups is shown at appendix 7.5.

3.3 Process Tracing
In order to determine outcomes and attribution of advocacy elements of the project (result 5), process-tracing exercises were undertaken with the LCDPFI team to determine links between outcomes claimed and activity that took place that may have contributed towards the outcome.

Process tracing is a technique that can be used to determine the pathway from the advocacy plan to policy change and can help to determine attribution of the policy change⁴.

3.4 Participatory Rapid Assessment (PRA)
PRA exercises have been developed in a response to the perceived limitations of quantitative survey tools such as the Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) survey tool. This approach has been developed to consider the beneficiary voice alongside data collected using standard quantitative tools⁵ and is therefore especially appropriate when considering the impact of the project on children with disabilities, their families, communities and their teachers. PRA exercises were conducted alongside the focus group discussions and had the same participants as the focus groups.⁶ An example of a PRA exercise report is shown at appendix 7.4.

3.5 Value for Money
LCD does not have a clear value for money approach for its international development work. As a result the 3E’s approach to Value for Money was used for this evaluation:

| Effectiveness: Successfully achieving the intended outcomes from an activity |
| Economy: Minimising the cost of resources used for an activity |
| Efficiency: Maximising output for a given input or minimizing input for a given output |

Figure 3: 3E’s Value for Money Approach

⁴ It is also used by large institutions such as the UK’s National Health Service to determine bottlenecks in process and identify potential efficiency savings.
⁶ It was not possible to do a PRA exercise with the teachers in NCR as planned as the group consisted of only two teachers, which is too small a sample for the PRA results to be representative.
3.6 Document Review
A review of all the appropriate and relevant project and organizational documents was undertaken. A list of the reviewed documents is shown at appendix 7.7.

4. Findings

4.1 Results
LCD and LCDPFI have mostly delivered against the planned programme targets and outputs (the indicator tracking table is at appendix 7.2).

Some of the physical adaptations to schools are incomplete however as this element was delayed and mostly took place in the second year of the project.

In other instances LCD and LCDPFI have overachieved in terms of pure numbers enrolled in the project and numbers of trainings and lobbying meetings at local government level. However there have been no concrete policy changes, but there has been significant support for implementing Inclusive Education at both a local and a national level.

Where the indicators relate to improvements in education level or behavioural change, the monitoring tools used have not measured actual change, rather just numbers of participants.

For example, the first indicator listed under the objective for the project is “Educational performance of 70% of CWD in all the 20 schools is improved as against the baseline.” However the data that is collected in support of this indicator refers only to the number of children enrolled in school (see appendix 7.2).

Enrolment and performance are two different things. However given that the baseline value for this indicator is zero it is likely that some improvement in education performance has taken place as some children have been put through to the next grade in year 2 of the project.

As children with disabilities are not assessed as regularly as non-disabled children (who get academically assessed once a month), it is not possible to say exactly what the change in educational performance is likely to be.

Where further assessments have been made on children with disabilities that have been included in mainstream classes under Inclusive Education, some appear to have made educational performance improvements. For example: a teacher at Cecilio Apostol Elementary School in NCR reported that a child with Asperger’s syndrome was properly identified and assessed under the project and then provided the right support whilst being mainstreamed. Further assessment was so successful that he was moved from grade 4 to grade 7, to reflect his improvement during the project period. This example suggests that educational performance may be improving, but to what degree performance is improving has not been measured.7

7 Key Informant Interview with Agnes Gabalelo, Special Education Teacher, Cecilio Apostol Elementary School, 8 October 2013
The indicators also did not track all the key activity for an Inclusive Education project. The child-to-child activities, for example, did not have their own indicator, but could have provided data to contribute towards a couple of the broader indicators and indeed contributed towards an assessment of a child’s overall educational performance.

4.1.1 Result 1: Target of 600 Children with disabilities in project locations will have been assessed (and referred onwards for rehabilitation services where appropriate) and enrolled in school

This result was articulated with a theory of change in the original project proposal.

This element of the project aimed to tackle the problem of the exclusion of children with disabilities from school. The reports of parents and teachers, and the data from the class registers suggests that exclusion has begun to be addressed. There are still instances where lack of accessibility means that some children with disabilities who have received assistive devices still cannot attend school as often as they would like (see the case study at appendix 7.1).

The theory of change above highlights the importance of setting up two crucial processes: assessments and referrals, from which the rest of the theory of change flows.

The assessment processes introduced during the project have proven to be the most popular and most highly regarded element of the project. In the Philippines it
can be expensive to get your child assessed for any kind of medical or neuro-developmental condition. Similar assessments conducted in the project were free at the point of delivery for the families. This meant that the assessments could be done widely in the community and the project was able to reach a higher number of children than planned (1170 children or 146% of the target for the project). It is important to note that although educational assessments are conducted by teachers in schools, there are a limited number of educational assessment tools available.

Different key informants suggested that either the assessment process or the referral process were key elements that made the project successful. In inclusive education methodology, both are seen as crucial and the testimony from different key informants appears to support that the theory of change as envisaged by LCD / LCDPFI has mostly delivered on this result.

The theory of change is complete when the training and enrolment boosts children with disabilities’ confidence. This result was verified in the PRA sessions with both the parents and the teachers.

The parents in the PRA exercise agreed that the most important part of the project was getting their children with disabilities enrolled in school. They explained that education was the most important factor for improving your life and that the project had given them hope that their children would now have a better future.

The indicator table reports that 614 children were enrolled in the project. However LCDPFI provided data that suggested that 630 children are participating in the project. This may be due to reporting timeframes, however no reasoning behind the variation has been provided. The data provided is incomplete, not all the ages and disabilities have been recorded on the electronic database. Data is collected in hard

---


9 Key informant interview with the SpEd Coordinator at Tonsuya Elementary School, NCR, 8 October 2013; Key informant interview with Principal at Inalig Elementary School, Atimonan, 10 October 2013

10 PRA exercise with Parents at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (10 women); PRA exercise with Teachers at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (3 men, 11 women). See also Graph 1: PRA results for the question “How has being in a mainstream school benefitted children with disabilities?” on page 15

11 PRA exercise with Parents at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (10 women)
copy and LCDPFI relies on volunteers to input the data electronically. This slows down the data analysis and impacts on project management decisions and eventually strategic decisions for the programme and the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Region</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>mean(Age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atimonan</td>
<td>Chronic Illness</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive/Learning</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Disability</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psycho-Social</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Santos City</td>
<td>Chronic Illness</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive/Learning</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Disability</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psycho-Social</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Chronic Illness</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive/Learning</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Disability</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psycho-Social</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of Disabilities by Gender and Mean Age

The target of 600 children with disabilities enrolled in school in this result was achieved. However in order to do so, LCD / LCDPFI expanded the project to include an additional 14 schools. This means that in the original 20 schools in the project LCDPFI identified 573 children with disabilities and in the additional schools (all in General Santos City) LCDPFI identified 57 children with disabilities (using the data on the 630 children provided during the evaluation). The decision to expand the programme reflected what the project team found on the ground in the project...
areas: that the schools initially selected for this project and proposed to USAID did not have large enough catchment areas to deliver on a target of 600 children with disabilities. I would suggest that this is a project design issue rather than a quality or project delivery issue, which is taken up in more detail under section 4.2

Relevance.

Atimonan – 146
General Santos City – 233
NCR – 251

Graph 2: Distribution of Disabilities by Region

Not all types of disability are present in all project areas. Cognitive/Learning disabilities (160) and Sensory disabilities (124) were the most common disabilities identified in the project.

Graph 3: Distribution of Age of Children with Disabilities

The majority of the children with disabilities in the project were between the ages of seven and nine. Older people with disabilities who had never attended school had also been identified and some enrolled in school. Graph 3 highlights that young people and adults between 18 and 36 have also been included in the project. This appears to have been handled successfully; for example the 27-year old was participating in the child-to-child activities during this evaluation and was well integrated into the group. He was accepted fully and participated fully. This highlights the success of identifying people with disabilities in the community and of activities such as child-to-child activities in tackling discrimination. While including young people and adults in the project has pushed the average age up, the average age of the children with disabilities in the project is approximately 10.5, which is still within the traditional age group for elementary education.
The theory of change for this result also points towards policy implications through training provided to the DepEd team. In interview, the key informants at DepEd confirmed that the assessments delivered in the project were one of the two main areas that they considered to be a success. LCDPFI had worked with DepEd to publish an assessment tool on Education and Psycho-Diagnostic Screening and is currently working with DepEd on producing and publishing an assessment tool on Emotional Behaviour assessments. Training the DepEd team appears to have been central to their understanding and adoption of the methodologies and the key informants stressed the need for further assessment tools and methodologies in the future.

4.1.2 Result 2: All project schools delivering IE to enrol children with disabilities, with trained teachers using appropriate curriculum, materials and methodologies

In conversation with the key informants at the DepEd, they emphasized how successful they felt the teacher training had been. Initially introduced to SpEd teachers only, the Inclusive Education training had been extended to “receiving” teachers, that is general teaching staff, in mainstream schools. The DepEd key informants cited examples of responses from teachers in the training that suggested the teachers had related strongly with the training materials and were able to relate the training to real life examples.

This was verified by the teachers in their focus group discussions and PRA exercises:

![Graph 4: Teachers' PRA Responses to the Question "Which was the most important part of the project for you?"

In the PRA exercise in Atimonan the teachers agreed that implementing the training had been the most important aspect of the project for them and that it was important to put into practice what you had been taught. However in General Santos City, the teachers highlighted the training as being the most important element of the training because it was the point at which they became aware of the

---

12 Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
13 Ibid
14 Ibid
needs of children with disabilities and the training effectively changed the way they approached disability\textsuperscript{15}. Different teachers had different opinions on the impact of the additional lesson planning and action planning that Inclusive Education brought with it. In single grade schools (that is a school where the classroom consists of children all in the same grade), the additional lesson planning and action planning is not seen as a significant amount of extra work.\textsuperscript{16} While in multi-grade schools (schools where the classroom consists of children in two or more grades having lessons from the same teacher side by side) the additional lesson planning and action planning was a significant addition to the workload.\textsuperscript{17}

The theory of change for this result also highlights how the relationship that LCDPFI has developed with the DepEd can benefit the teacher training.

The theory of change emphasizes working with the teacher training institutions to deliver the training. This is made easier through the DepEd relationship, where DepEd has facilitated the training and can provide endorsement to LCDPFI, which can be crucial to delivering project activities.\textsuperscript{18}

Developing an Inclusive Education module for in-service teacher training has not been successful however, with only 50\% of the target achieved.

\textsuperscript{15} PRA exercise with Teachers at JP Laurel Elementary School, 14 October 2013 (11 women, 14 men)
\textsuperscript{16} Key informant interview with Lorna Luna, teacher at Maligaya Elementary School, 10 October 2013
\textsuperscript{17} Key informant interview with Principal at Inalig Elementary School, 10 October 2013. In addition to a multi-grade classroom, pupils are also streamed according to academic ability within the grade in three different streams. Each stream needs its own lesson and action plan. Where a teacher is teaching two grades simultaneously, this can be six sets of lesson and action plans before Inclusive Education is taken into account.
\textsuperscript{18} Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
Similarly the training of teachers as trainers of other teachers only commenced in
the 4th quarter of year 2. Rolling out this training has also helped to measure the
skills and retained knowledge of the teachers who were trained in the main teacher-
training programme. Training teachers as trainers is also intended to facilitate
promoting Inclusive Education after the project has been completed.

Teachers highlighted that the curriculum materials that had been provided through
the project were a significant resource and improved the quality of the education
they were able to deliver. Additionally these resources also indirectly supported the
parents as the parents no longer needed to purchase these materials for their
children. 19

One final point on the teacher training results is the impact on the teachers
themselves of the training.

In the PRA exercises the teachers expressed that there were equally important
outcomes from the training that had led to real impact in their work.

![Graph 5: Teachers' PRA Responses to the Question: "What has the project helped you to
achieve?"

Significantly, teachers reported that they had seen the benefit of using Inclusive
Education techniques with non-disabled children too. They had reported that they
had developed more patience with the children with disabilities, which had also
improved their relationships with the non-disabled children. 20

Besides feeling that they are better teachers and that their relationship with the
parents of children with disabilities had improved, teachers scored awareness
raising of disability in the community the highest, something reported in detail in the
case study at appendix 7.1.

4.1.3 Result 3: Parents groups and communities in project areas
provided on-going tangible support to children with disabilities

Although not rated as highly as other aspects of the project (see graph 1 on page
12), the parents did report that the parents groups formed in the project have been
valuable in providing them with peer support and assistance. 21

---

19 Key informant interview with Mina Valdez and another Special Education Teacher at
Tonsuya Elementary School, NCR, 8 October 2013
20 PRA exercise with Teachers at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (3 men, 11
women).
21 Focus group with Parents at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (10 women)
The parents reported that they had learnt to support and provide for their children with disabilities better as a result of the training that they had received. Although the parents had confirmed during the evaluation that they had received training, the indicator tracking table did not provide up to date data on the parents’ project meetings (where that training had been delivered) that had taken place in year 2.

In year 1 no parents’ project meetings had taken place. This was due to the delayed start in project activities, the focus on the baseline and setting up the project.

Most of the parents that have participated in the parents groups were mothers. This is because childcare is still often seen as the responsibility of the mother in the Philippines. While most of the mothers who participated in the parents groups were married, there were some single mothers. There is currently no data available on how many of the parents in the parents groups are single mothers.

In the PRA exercises with parents they felt that there were outcomes that were mostly of equal importance to them:

![Graph 6: Parents’ PRA Responses to the Question: “What has the project helped you to achieve?”](image)

Importantly some of the parents felt that they were able to spend more time working to support their children now that the children were in school. Some of the parents have benefitted from LCDPFI’s livelihoods programme that has been running in tandem with the Inclusive Education project. There has been an intentional crossover between those families benefitting from the Inclusive Education project and the livelihoods programme. This is seen as a way to provide families that now have the additional costs associated with sending their children to school (stationary, uniforms, etc.) with some additional income. It is envisaged that this additional income will sustain some of the outcomes of the Inclusive Education project after the end of the project period. This sustainability however is dependent on the families’ ability to generate an income sufficient to support these additional costs. It is possible therefore that some families will not be able to support further education for their children, while others will.

Perhaps most crucially, the parents now believe that it is possible for their children to succeed at school and be a valuable member of the community, where previously

---

22 Ibid, Focus group discussion with Parents at Tonsuya Elementary School, 8 October 2013 (7 women)
23 All but one of the parents that I either interviewed or was introduced to were mothers
24 Key informant interview with the Project team, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013
they believed their children with disabilities would have no future other than staying at home and being a drain on resources. 25

By contrast, communities appear to have less focus on them during the project, unlike the theory of change for this element of the project might suggest (see figure 6 below). This may also be the result of no indicators for the community have been included in this element of the project.

**Figure 6: Theory of Change for Working with Parents and Communities**

What is clear however is that the support network created by parents and the community is crucial to the success of the project and long term behaviour change. Community involvement and support has been part of this project, but in a less than obvious way. Mostly the community has been discussed in relation to whether they have accepted or discriminated against children with disabilities. Graph 8: PRA responses to the question “Who has benefitted from the project?” on page 24

---

25 Focus group with Parents at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (10 women)
highlights the ambivalent approach to the community as a beneficiary of this project, despite the obvious broader benefits of physical adaptations that have taken place as part of the project (the case study at appendix 7.1 highlights this further). During the PRA exercises, the participants mostly reported that the project was “very valuable” to the community:

![Graph 7: PRA Responses to the Question: "How valuable is the project to the community?"

This value however was expressed in terms of the children with disabilities as beneficiaries being able to contribute more fully to the community, rather than the community itself gaining from the project. In General Santos City, participants were clearer in their concerns that the community had not fully internalized the awareness raising and this was reflected in their responses to the PRA exercise. In discussion with various key informants, this attitude may be the result of the Filipino approach to community, which is to put family and self first, ahead of the broader community.

4.1.4 Result 4: Targeted mainstream primary schools are adapted to make them physically accessible to children with disabilities

This is the least successful element of the project. The level of bureaucracy surrounding the accessibility audit that needs to be carried out before the physical adaptations can be put in place is significant and crippling. In addition the team found the requirements of the planning process for the physical adaptations, such as getting 3 quotes from every supplier, challenging to implement. Other challenges in achieving results for this part of the project included delays in schools submitting proposals; long internal processes for securing approval of proposals (particularly in year 1); and weather and natural disasters such as storms, typhoons and flooding in the project areas and the Philippines more broadly during the last quarter of Year 2 project implementation.
Every school that was reviewed as part of this evaluation showed some degree of physical adaptation, mostly pathways, pavements and ramps. However handrails on the ramps were all missing and LCDPFI acknowledged that these were yet to be included. In one case, Tonsuya Elementary School, the adaptations included internal changes and upgrades to the classroom environment in the SpEd class.

The remaining physical adaptations are on-going and funding has been allocated to the final few projects. LCDPFI hope to have all of these projects completed by December 2013.

At no point however did any of the key informants, focus groups, or PRA participants suggest that the delay in getting the physical adaptations completed on time had prevented their children with disabilities from attending school or participating in the class.

Although not part of this result, it is important to note that part of creating a welcoming environment in schools were the child-to-child activities that provided a challenge to existing notions of disability. While not directly about adaptations to schools, these activities would not have been possible had physical adaptations not taken place to create a physically welcoming environment in the schools.

---

26 Although not taken up with the team during the evaluation, the angle of the ramps appeared steep by comparison to legal requirements in the UK. As this could be the result of a number of reasons outside of LCDPFI’s control, this issue has not been pursued at this time.
4.1.5 Result 5: Partnership with DepEd will bring about positive changes to policy and practices around inclusive education

As with other areas of this project, policy change had a dedicated theory of change:

![Theory of Change for Policy Change](image)

While some of the activities in the theory of change have taken place, active policy change advocacy at a national level has not taken place. Developing the relationship with DepEd and the practical adoption of Inclusive Education assessment tools and materials appears to have been the main focus for LCDPFI during the lifetime of the project.

**Policy Change**

The relationship between LCDPFI and DepEd is enhanced because LCDPFI follows the DepEd order on Inclusive Education, which identified inclusive education as the second programme option for providing children with disabilities with access to education. The order also highlights the role of special education (SpEd) teachers and classes, but does provide the possibility of fully integrated classes where SpEd classes do not exist.\(^{27}\) There are other NGOs doing Inclusive Education in the Philippines, but if an NGO is not following the department order then DepEd is unlikely to support it.\(^{28}\) LCDPFI always consult DepEd on activities and DepEd

---

\(^{27}\) DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009. The order frames inclusive education within DepEd’s approach to special education: SpEd teachers were trained first and then other teachers. Where SpEd classes exist, inclusive education is considered part of that programme rather than a replacement for it; Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013

\(^{28}\) Key informant interview with Hazel Borja, Programmes Manager, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013
works together with LCDPFI to deliver training (providing venues and catering), attending training and participating in delivering the training. This relationship helps to cut through red tape and is based greatly on personal relationships and friendships formed long ago.

LCDPFI admit that they need to improve working on policy makers at a national / congressional level. However working with relevant government agencies to lobby congress is also seen as the best approach to getting policy change enacted. Thus the relationship with DepEd is crucial in that aspect too. There are some significant obstacles in affecting national policy change. Congress is notoriously slow to vote on bills laid before it. For example, the Special Education bill has still not been passed and has been circulating Congress for 15 years (the lifetime of 5 Congresses).

Additionally it is perceived as unlikely that Congress would accept evidence from the pilot phase and the two-year USAID-funded project as the timeframe of the activities on the ground is considered to be too short to have generated meaningful data. In reality, the Special Education Bill does make reference to Inclusive Education and if passed, would make it harder to roll out Inclusive Education nationally, even with the endorsement of DepEd.

LCDPFI has not made best use of its membership of the Disability Council to develop a coherent response to Inclusive Education amongst other Disability NGOs, which would enhance the policy change message alongside the relationship with DepEd.

**Change in Practice**

The relationship between LCDPFI and DepEd National Office is crucial and very successful in enabling the roll out of the Inclusive Education project. The endorsement from the National Office is very important and valuable in helping LCDPFI to progress project activities that need both national office and local government endorsement.

Most extensive change in practice is at the local government level, where local governments have budgetary authority to determine what will receive funding and what does not. Local authorities (especially at Barangay/Village level) have shown to be very supportive of Inclusive Education where they have been made aware of it, including facilitating information dissemination, making funding or other support

---

29 Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
30 Both DepEd and LCDPFI confirmed that key individuals in both organisations have known each other for longer than the project period or indeed employment by LCDPFI. This is a crucial element to doing business in the Philippines that appears to have the potential to make or break a project.
31 Key informant interview with Hazel Borja, Programmes Manager, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013
32 Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
available to continue the project where LCD / LCDPFI exits the project. This success is not reflected in equal measure across all local governments. There is no trend within the project data that suggests that local governments in one project area are more or less supportive than local governments in another project area.

The training of teachers is strongly supported by DepEd and they want to roll the training out across all schools and to reach all 34,000 teachers. Generally teacher training has been one of the most successful elements of the project. DepEd have participated in the training and have helped with the logistics of providing the training. DepEd highlighted the need for more training on methodologies and tools for working with children with different kinds of disabilities.

DepEd and LCDPFI have worked closely on the publication of an existing assessment tool, The Education and Psycho-Assessment Tool. This assessment tool was already developed, but had not been published, nor training on use of the tool given to teachers. LCDPFI supported both the publication and training related to this tool as part of this project. In addition LCDPFI and DepEd are currently working together on developing an Emotional Behaviour Assessment Tool, to improve on the current checklist that DepEd use for this purpose. DepEd’s adoption of the assessment tools and participation in the Inclusive Education training suggests that change in practice is easier to achieve than change in policy. After all, the Special Education Bill has not been passed, but DepEd rolled out the contents of the Bill anyway. This would suggest that if sufficiently incentivised, DepEd may take a similar approach to Inclusive Education.

4.2 Relevance
This evaluation has considered how relevant the project delivered by LCDPFI was to the beneficiary groups it intended to help.

Teachers and parents were asked who they thought the beneficiaries of the project were and to what degree (i.e. did one group benefit more than another).

![Graph 8: PRA Responses to the Question: "Who has benefitted from this project?"

All the groups confirmed that children with disabilities were the main beneficiary group. However teachers and parents then displayed a bias towards their own beneficiary group rather than any other. This resulted in the two groups (parents and teachers) receiving very similar score. This probably reflects the reality of the

33 Key informant interview with Hazel Borja, Programmes Manager, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013; Key informant interview with the Project team, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013
34 Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
36 Ibid
project delivery experience, with the majority of the project focus being on the children and their immediate support network.

While both groups are clear that the children are the greatest beneficiaries, the teachers did acknowledge the overall benefit to the community of this project more than the parents. Likely reasons for this are that teachers as semi-public figures come into contact with a wider variety of people than parents may do. In general however the rights-based elements of this project were less emphasized in the results than the practical application of solutions to physical problems such as enrolment, assistive devices, physical adaptations to schools, etc. This may be as a result of the perceived Philippine culture of putting family and self first and an overall lower community awareness, rather than a general lack of awareness of rights-based activities.

That no group suggested that the community benefitted significantly from this project was unusual given the nature of part of the project. Physical adaptations to schools have included level pavements, road works, clean water, upgraded toilet blocks, etc. that all the children without disabilities at the schools as well as those communities surrounding the schools (when we consider the impact of resurfaced pavements) have derived some benefit from. In addition, teachers and parents would refer to the community only in terms of the children with disabilities and the perceived future role these children could now play in the community. In other words, parents and teachers saw that the benefit that the community received from the project was the future role that children with disabilities could play in the community, now that they were regularly attending school and were being treated in the same way as other children. All this may be true, but it diminishes the actual benefit to the community (as is ably described in the case study at appendix 7.1).

Relevance was not however fully taken into account in the project design. It was noticeable during the field visit that some of the project areas were incredibly remote, with one school, Inalig Elementary School, accessible only on a single-track railway. This has made the delivery of some assistive aids such as wheel chairs to some of the project areas impossible, and therefore the accessibility element of the project could not always be delivered as successfully as possible.

The demographics of the catchment areas around the original 20 schools were not researched fully before the project was implemented. As a result LCDPFI was not aware at the start of the project that those catchment areas would not provide the targeted 600 children with disabilities. To achieve the target, LCDPFI was able to roll out the project to an additional 14 schools (mostly in General Santos City). This issue was also not raised during the Baseline study.

Further, LCDPFI have considered the costs to the parents and family units of enrolling their children with disabilities into school. While this is an important positive step for the whole family unit, there are some additional costs, such as transport, stationary, etc. that would need to be covered that were only partly covered by the project design and as such were inherently unsustainable by the families once the project came to an end. Some of the parents have participated in the livelihoods programme run by LCDPFI separately from this project. The parents have considered this support as vital and such an addition to the project design at the beginning may have contributed to better sustainability results at the end of the project.
The lack of pre-project research does raise some significant issues for any potential roll out or scalability of the project. In its current form (target of 600 children with disabilities across 3 project areas from 20 schools, but delivered through 34 schools) the project has been delivered with some difficulty by the existing project team. To deliver a larger project will not simply be a case of increasing the number of schools that are included in the project. Successful project delivery is likely to require a significant increase in resources and inputs. The ratio of project team to communities should be maintained as part of a scale up, meaning that additional remote and/or central project team members would be required to increase delivery of the project in schools. This may not be feasible for LCDPFI and LCD and in section 4.4 on Efficiency this report considers which of the project components could be retained and rolled out to have the largest impact or success.

4.3 Effectiveness
The project has proven Inclusive Education to be very effective in elementary schools in the Philippines.

In general, the feedback in key informant interviews and focus group discussions was that children with disabilities demonstrate increased self-confidence and greater socialisation, a result verified by the PRA exercise conducted with both parents and teachers.

Graph 9: PRA Responses for the Question: “How has being in a mainstream school benefitted children with disabilities?”

This result also underlines how effective the child-to-child activities have been in creating a welcoming environment in the schools, challenging notions of disability amongst children without disability and amongst the teachers.

Graphs 4 and 5 in the Results section have also underlined how effective the teacher training has been, which was also supported by DepEd.37

However effectiveness is not only about the results of the project, but also how well the project was delivered by LCDPFI and LCD.

LCDPFI spent much of the first year building up the partnerships that it would need to implement the project. It has been very successful in identifying and developing

37 Key informant interview with Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education and Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department for Education, 7 October 2013
practical partnerships that can support the delivery of the project activities, such as with schools, local government units, and DepEd (to support teacher training). However it has not made best use of its membership of the Disability Council to develop a coherent policy position amongst other disability NGOs in the Philippines, nor has it used its relationship with DepEd to pursue national policy changes. LCDPFI has proven that it can develop and maintain partnerships and has a good reputation amongst the schools, local government and the DepEd. It is time for the organisation to use those partnerships to develop the policy agenda around Inclusive Education further.

However to do this, LCDPFI does need to improve its monitoring capacity and tools. LCDPFI project staff did develop tools to use internally for reporting purposes and to capture the data needed for reporting to LCD and USAID. As a result the project has a very good quantitative monitoring tool that can capture most of the data at an output level that it requires. Although there is no tool in place for capturing the qualitative data that LCDPFI will rely on to prove the development in educational ability that is a crucial measure of the impact that Inclusive Education has on children with disabilities. The data that is recorded is mostly recorded in hard copy and then transferred into electronic format (only when necessary) by volunteers in the LCDPFI offices. Outcome and impact data is not recorded.

Data is reviewed by LCDPFI and reported upwards to LCD’s East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) and if necessary sent back to LCDPFI for revision before being forwarded from EAPRO to LCD in the UK. This double and triple checking of data suggests an inherent distrust in the reliability of monitoring data. This evaluation process has seen for example how data provided on the number of children with disabilities that were enrolled in school can be different between the indicator tracking table (official data tracking table) and the data being collected at school level that forms LCDPFI’s database. It is essential that data collection and analysis is improved and standardized so that the best possible outcomes and impacts can be effectively tracked and that as issues arise within project delivery, they can be quickly identified and resolved.

It is very clear however from the evidence collected during this evaluation that despite the delays and set backs experienced in the past two years, LCDPFI has delivered on most of its targets and the project is considered successful by its beneficiaries. The effectiveness with which it delivered the project results could have been further enhanced if the internal and organizational challenges had been resolved more quickly.

LCDPFI has managed to place itself at the heart of Inclusive Education in the Philippines through its partnerships with other organisations at both a strategic and operational level. Although Inclusive Education as a concept has been around for a while, LCDPFI’s approach to rolling out Inclusive Education at a local level can be considered incrementally innovative as it has taken a bottom-up approach to bring other stakeholders on board, but within a national framework set out by DepEd that has assured LCDPFI of DepEd’s engagement with the project.

Although it has not articulated its distinctive offer for itself, this bottom-up approach within a national framework is possibly a strategy that LCDPFI can build on that will set it apart from the other players in the Philippines.
4.4  Efficiency
This evaluation has also considered how efficient LCDPFI has been in delivering the project. This section also takes into account the value for money assessment results for “economy” and “efficiency” of the 3Es approach that was used.

Efficiency has been LCDPFI’s greatest challenge during this project. Some of the issues described in this section are broader than just this project, but do however have implications for any scale up or roll out of the Inclusive Education project in the future.

Economy
Budgetary control and an understanding of the costs of the project have been significant challenges for LCDPFI. Initially the board at LCDPFI controlled spend in the project tightly in order to be properly accountable to the donor on the funds spent. However this meant in reality incurring a significant underspend in the funds in comparison to what had been agreed.

As a result of intervention by LCD and the support of an external consultant, LCDPFI started spending more funds in year 2 in an effort to catch up to where they should have been in the budget. Graph 10 below highlights how in year 2 the spend in some of the categories (most notably program activities) increased significantly.

![Graph 10: Trend in Expenditure Rates from Year 1 to Year 2](image)

This underspend in the budget is also reflected in the program activities for year 1, where less is recorded as happening than was anticipated.

The knock-on effect of the board policies in year 1 can be seen in the consolidated project budget below. Despite the additional activity in year two, program activities remains underspent by just over $20,000, while other costs such as technical support show an overspend, highlighting the unanticipated costs of providing additional support to LCDPFI in year 1. The underspend is clawed back through additional expenditure on equipment and rolling out the project to additional schools in General Santos City.
If we consider the unit costs derived from direct costs only for reaching three of the beneficiary groups in the project we see that reaching the children with disabilities appears to have the lowest unit costs associated with those activities. Interestingly enrolment does not have a specific budget line attached to it. This might be because the activity of enrolling a child in school is a pre-existing activity that is covered by the school’s costs. However it would be worth knowing what the financial impact of taking on additional children in a school would be, apart from those costs associated with this project that have been paid for by the project (such as electricity, food – where provided, etc.).

### Table 2: Consolidated Budget for the Inclusive Education Project Delivered by LCDPFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippines IE, USAID</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET (REVISED) YEAR 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 2 Total</th>
<th>Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Staff Costs Sub-total</td>
<td>$65,061.00</td>
<td>$24,465.11</td>
<td>$41,607.35</td>
<td>$66,072.46</td>
<td>-$1,011.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Per Diem Sub-total</td>
<td>$31,189.00</td>
<td>$5,113.27</td>
<td>$17,512.14</td>
<td>$22,625.41</td>
<td>$8,563.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip &amp; Supplies Sub-total</td>
<td>$14,073.00</td>
<td>$3,088.21</td>
<td>$16,109.93</td>
<td>$19,189.14</td>
<td>-$5,125.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical &amp; Other Support Sub-total</td>
<td>$35,215.00</td>
<td>$15,226.43</td>
<td>$25,305.49</td>
<td>$40,531.92</td>
<td>-$5,316.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Activities Sub-total</td>
<td>$161,367.00</td>
<td>$24,594.74</td>
<td>$116,426.75</td>
<td>$141,021.48</td>
<td>$20,345.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs Sub-total</td>
<td>$14,322.00</td>
<td>$9,051.92</td>
<td>$9,774.28</td>
<td>$18,826.20</td>
<td>-$4,504.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 New budget lines added

| 1 Roll out of IE to new schools | $0.00 | $2,784.09 | $2,784.09 | -$2,784.09 |
| 2 Purchase of educational materials | $0.00 | $4,957.62 | $4,957.62 | -$4,957.62 |
| 3 Partner’s Conference | $0.00 | $4,100.00 | $4,100.00 | -$4,100.00 |

Sub-total $0.00 $0.00 $11,841.70 $11,841.70 $11,841.70

Total: $321,227.00 $81,539.68 $238,577.65 $320,117.32 $1,109.68

Grand total: $332,818.00 $87,660.10 $244,773.18 $332,433.28 $384.72

If we consider the unit costs derived from direct costs only for reaching three of the beneficiary groups in the project we see that reaching the children with disabilities appears to have the lowest unit costs associated with those activities. Interestingly enrolment does not have a specific budget line attached to it. This might be because the activity of enrolling a child in school is a pre-existing activity that is covered by the school’s costs. However it would be worth knowing what the financial impact of taking on additional children in a school would be, apart from those costs associated with this project that have been paid for by the project (such as electricity, food – where provided, etc.).

### Children with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified and Assessed</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>$5.32</td>
<td>$6,228.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-to-Child Activities</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>$14.03</td>
<td>$8,616.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>$13.68</td>
<td>$8,616.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

38 Normally indirect costs would also be included in calculating unit costs. However to do this properly would require a comprehensive understanding of how staff time is allocated in LCDPFI, which is not known at this time. Hence indirect costs have not been included in this calculation. If LCDPFI want to get a full handle on its’ unit costs, it would need to better understand its’ indirect (and hidden) costs that contribute to the delivery of its programmes.

39 In all likelihood the unit costs of running the school would come down, which should make inclusive education financially attractive to most schools.

40 There is no budget line for enrolment, however that does not mean there is no cost associated with this activity. Even if there is no cost to LCDPFI, enrolment will incur costs for the parents and families (both one-off and recurring). These costs are partly addressed by LCDPFI through its livelihoods programme that has been run at the same time as Inclusive Education.
As there are two conflicting sources of data on the number of children with disabilities that have participated in this project, two unit costs per activity have been calculated where appropriate. The difference between the unit costs is not substantial.

While the parents’ groups appear to have a high unit cost, each group has an average of 30 members, which would mean that the unit cost of each group member in relation to the cost of establishing and maintaining the group is $7.61.

This means that the most expensive beneficiary group to reach is the teachers at $62.02 per teacher over the two years that the project has been running. Some might argue that the value generated by the teachers as a result of their new skills outweighs this high cost and that is most likely correct. It has not been possible during this evaluation to attach financial proxies to the outcomes identified by the teachers during the PRA exercise, which would give some indication of value created by the training that they had received, however the case study on page 38 does indicate the potential financial value the project has generated through training one teacher who went on to secure a financial commitment from her local mayor.

LCDPFI is not however fully aware of the cost drivers of this project. Internal financial reporting is poor and although the organisation has good control over its cash position, it does not yet have the capacity to do any sort of financial analysis to understand where expenditure could be reviewed or controlled. This situation led to the false economy approach that we saw in year one of this project.

Significantly, disability aids such as wheel chairs and hearing aids have been a significant cost driver in the project, perhaps more than LCDPFI anticipated.
Understanding and analysing these costs may help LCDPFI to identify other suppliers or solutions to this provision that can reduce the overall cost of supplying these crucial pieces of equipment. There is also the potential to partner with manufacturers to reduce the cost of supplying these and other aids that may be identified in the future.

**Efficiency**

Planning has been the main challenge for LCDPFI in delivering this project. With almost no member of staff being in post from the beginning of the project, there is no record on how the project plan was devised, how the target schools and locations were chosen and how the budget was allocated.

There is no clear relationship between the project plan and the context of the Philippines. For example, the target for children with disabilities being enrolled and remaining in education was 600. However the communities served by the original 20 schools identified did not appear to have the numbers of children with disabilities to support such a target. Therefore the additional schools were included later on into the project plan. Additionally wheelchair provision in some areas is logistically impossible and there are significant constraints to involving paediatricians in the project in some areas.\(^{41}\)

The project has suffered significantly from inefficiencies in LCDPFI’s organizational structure and its procedures. For example, the process for signing off expenditure was subject to delays as supporting documentation was always requested and not always available. The different levels of sign-off authority also increased delays in approving expenditure. This process has been reviewed and standardized to ensure a more efficient approach to expenditure sign-off.

Staff retention within LCDPFI has been difficult and the project team has only had a full compliment of staff from January 2013. This meant extra pressure on other members of staff to deliver activities in a schedule that was already delayed. Communication between the team members was also difficult until a consultant was brought in to support some organizational development earlier in 2013.\(^{42}\) The lack of communication had meant that there had been poor project management up to that point, with resources being poorly allocated to tasks and a lack of confidence in the reporting of activities from the field. With clearer communication within the team, project management has begun to improve.

A significant issue however is the capacity within LCDPFI for clear, accurate financial reporting and analysis. There is sufficient distrust of the figures being reported internally that other members of staff retain their own financial reports and files. This is causing confusion and increased lack of clarity. In addition the financial report available to the board of trustees is a cash management report only. In an organisation that is wholly reliant on restricted donor funding for income, a lack of financial capacity is potentially damaging as the trustees do not have the right quality of information to enable them to take appropriate strategic decisions for the organisation’s future.

---

\(^{41}\) Key informant interview with Lorraine Wapling, Inclusive Education Consultant, 14 October 2013

\(^{42}\) Ibid
The lack of an executive position within the LCDPFI structure is challenging for the sustainability and growth of the organisation. Such a position would provide day-to-day oversight and direction to the organisation and its activities and provide the trustees with support to ensure that the board is able to operate effectively as a board and not as managers. This post would also focus reporting and analysis to ensure that data was being correctly used within the organisation and that financial reporting was to a higher standard. The executive post should also be focused on fundraising and developing a pot of unrestricted reserves, which the organisation currently does not have. This puts LCDPFI into an extremely vulnerable position and could risk future plans as the trustees will not have the flexibility to respond to changes in donor funding for the organisation in either the immediate or medium term.

It must be noted that much of what has been outlined here has already been identified by the trustees and some work to correct some of the difficulties that the organisation has experienced is taking place.

4.5 Sustainability

One of the key measures of success is whether and how sustainable a project is when it comes to the end of the external funding period.

The issues with efficiency and effectiveness described in section 4.4 have definitely reduced the potential for sustainability of the entire project. However some of the findings from this evaluation suggest that if LCDPFI and LCD were in a position to sustain some of the activities, then the most effective activity to sustain would be the teacher training activities. Whilst this activity does have the highest unit cost (direct costs only), it also has the lowest resource and time input in comparison to the activities that take place locally in the schools and communities. It also has the highest potential for reaching the broadest number of children with disabilities and therefore longer-term impact is more likely.

Some teachers believe that the project is already sustainable, because of the skills that they have learnt, which are retained and not reliant on a budget. Teachers have demonstrated during this evaluation that they use the learning from this training in their daily activities with children with disabilities and with children without disabilities. Teachers have also demonstrated that they are able to leverage funding or support from local government units to develop Inclusive Education activities in their schools and communities. Being able to leverage funding from other sources as a result of the activities of this project is a key indicator that sustainability is possible. While this is only beginning to happen and the partnerships that LCDPFI have developed with local government are key to this process, it is still too early to say for certain that all aspects of the project will be sustained into the future.

43 Focus group discussion with teachers at JP Laurie Elementary School, 14 October 2013 (11 women, 4 men)
44 Key Informant Interview with Agnes Gabalelo, Special Education Teacher, Cecilio Apostol Elementary School, 8 October 2013; PRA exercise with Teachers at Rizel Elementary School, 9 October 2013 (3 men, 11 women).
45 See the case study at appendix 7.1
The parents however think that the project is not sustainable as the transport subsidies will come to an end, which they rely heavily upon. Their perception of sustainability is very different from that of the teachers. Some of the parents groups are being encouraged to become independent organisations so that they can apply for funding from local groups such as Rotary clubs in their communities. This however is a very recent initiative and there is no capacity building support in place for these groups once they become independent organisations.

Those parents who have also participated in the livelihoods programme run by LCDPFI have seen their own income and capacity increase. This will contribute to their own ability to support and care for their children with disabilities and keep them in school longer. However where parents or family units do not have similar income or capacity, there is likely to be a degree of drop-off in attendance at school.

Ultimately however, sustainability of this project is heavily reliant on LCDPFI’s ability to become sustainable itself. LCD have reported that it has some funds that could be used as bridging funds for the six months immediately following the end of the funding period, which could support the project while new restricted funding is sought to keep the project going in the longer term. However this will not solve LCDPFI’s structural issues and continue to make the NGO reliant on restricted funds to deliver all of its activities.

If LCDPFI and LCD wanted to roll out the project to a larger area, then considerably more investment would be needed to support such a roll out and sustain it over a longer period. This would include increased staff resources to input into an expanded programme as it is highly unlikely that simply expanding the number of schools and project regions to be delivered with the same team would be successful. Setting up and running an inclusive education project in elementary schools has proven to be effective but time-intensive, with an initial high cost outlay (teacher training and physical adaptations to schools). While investments will be recouped in terms of value creation amongst the beneficiary groups over time, this initial outlay emphasizes the sustainability challenges for this project at this time.

5. Conclusions and lessons learnt

On paper this project looked reasonably straightforward, however the internal inefficiencies and organizational challenges for LCDPFI meant that the overall effectiveness of the project is not as high as it could have been. The project has delivered most the results that were intended and the key beneficiary groups have experienced some of the intended change in their lives. Sustainability however continues to be a challenge for the project and LCDPFI.

While the participants in the focus groups and the PRA exercises have told us that the right beneficiary groups were involved in the project and that they were regularly asked their opinion on the project progress, it is clear that the project design did not

---

46 Focus group discussion with Parents at Tonsuya Elementary School, 8 October 2013 (7 women); PRA exercise with parents, LCDPFI Office, General Santos City, 14 October 2013 (14 women, 1 man)
47 Key informant interview with the Project team, LCDPFI, 7 October 2013
48 Key informant interview with Lorraine Wapling, Inclusive Education Consultant, 14 October 2013
take the Philippine context sufficiently into account. We have also seen how not all the communities and target schools could have met the targets for the project without the aid of the additional schools included in year 2. There is no doubting that Inclusive Education is needed in the Philippines, however with proper research and understanding of the context in the Philippines, the project may have looked very different.

While most of the targets have been surpassed and the project is within budget, LCDPFI have been most effective in establishing partnerships at many levels from the local community through to the Department for Education Central Office. Developing these partnerships should be a core part of LCDPFI’s strategy going forward. In addition the key elements of Inclusive Education have been effectively implemented within the project, although project management and planning have been LCDPFI’s weakest points and the organisation has received considerable support from LCD and an external consultant during the project period to address these weaknesses.

It has been LCDPFI’s internal inefficiencies that have held the project back from achieving greater results. Organisational structure, staff turnover, poor internal communication, low capacity and unreliable data all need to be addressed if LCDPFI is to grow and be sustainable in the future.

There is no question that the project has achieved most of the results that were intended. The physical adaptations are not all complete and some of the adaptations are still on-going at the time of writing this report (October 2013). The project has resulted in tangible changes to the lives of the children with disabilities that are enrolled in school, along with their parents, their teachers and the schools that are participating in the activities. However the lifetime of the project was too short to properly consider longer-term impacts. Most of the data to support the results has been collected at an output level, whereas the indicators are set at an outcome and impact level.

An unintended outcome of the project has been the quantitative data being collected on children with disabilities that can be turned into a unique database that does not exist in other formats in the Philippines. This database has already been accessed by the Department for Social Welfare and Development to determine which children with disabilities it could support in Atimonan.

The beneficiary groups are split on whether the project is sustainable without further external funding. While funds and support have been leveraged at a local level for activities in individual schools and communities, sustainability of the whole project rests ultimately on whether LCDPFI can be made sustainable. LCDPFI currently has no coherent fundraising strategy and no unrestricted funding at all. That means when the USAID-funded project comes to an end, one third of its activities would come to an end (without the bridge funding available from LCD). That would be a significant impact on the organisation. The trustees of LCDPFI do not appear to have a clear strategy for addressing this change beyond short term fixes to maintain staff levels and some of the lower cost activities through ad hoc donations.

Normally on such a short project an evaluator would not be considering impact level reporting and containing the evaluation at outcome level reporting. However the feedback received during the focus group discussions and the PRA exercises suggest that impact is already being felt at an individual, family and school level.
We have seen in Graph 9: PRA results for the question “How has being in a mainstream school benefitted children with disabilities?” on page 26 that all respondents indicated that children with disabilities enrolled in school under Inclusive Education were displaying increased confidence. We have also seen in Graph 6 (parents) on page 18 and Graph 5 (teachers) on page 17 that parents and teachers have been able to identify real changes in either their lives in the case of parents or in their working relationships with children and the children’s parents, in the case of teachers, that have already happened and can be ascribed to the project.

There have also been reports of parents bringing their children forward for assessment rather than LCDPFI having to go into the community to identify children with disabilities.49

The schools have benefitted from the physical upgrades that LCDPFI has supported, which have improved the appearance of the schools and improved some of the facilities. Where the physical adaptations have included items such as water towers and refurbished accessible toilet blocks, the whole school is experiencing an impact in terms of health and sanitation.50 Some focus group participants also reported that the status of the school had been enhanced by participating in the Inclusive Education project and as a result enrolment of children with disabilities had increased in general.51

The case study at appendix 7.1 highlights how impact and value is being created at a grassroots level. In time, it would be reasonable to expect to see such impact stories replicated across the project area and value creation to be increased as more families and teachers and schools integrate inclusive education.

Lessons learned
1. Planning: The project has suffered from a lack of appropriate planning and project control locally. This has led to delays in implementing the activities and a rush in year 2 to get the activities completed. The baseline period was included in the project lifetime, which I would argue is an unnecessary delay. Baselines are not project activity, but pre-project activity. A pre-project period should be built into the project cycle in order to manage expectations and better manage activities over the lifetime of the project.
2. Capacity building of staff that implemented the project: This is a general point that has already been discussed with the LCDPFI board. However ensuring that the staff put in place to deliver the projects has the correct skills and sufficient capacity is essential. Otherwise delays to project activities are inevitable.
3. Correct monitoring tools required: A very good and efficient project monitoring tool is being used to collect most quantitative data required for the project, however it does not collect data relating to change in condition or progress. This means that some of the indicators cannot be correctly reported on. While the team felt that they did not have all the monitoring tools that they needed (and have not demonstrated that they could adapt any other existing tool to fill this gap – this could also be a work load issue as well as a capacity issue), they

49 Key informant interview with Principal at Inalig Elementary School, 10 October 2013
50 Ibid, PRA exercise with parents, LCDPFI Office, General Santos City, 14 October 2013
51 Focus group discussion with teachers at JP Laurie Elementary School, 14 October 2013 (11 women, 4 men)
implied that tools should be provided to them from elsewhere.

Best practices
1. Assessments of children with disabilities: This has been universally reported as being the most valuable and most beneficial process that has come out of the project. DepEd has especially valued these tools and LCDPFI has funded the dissemination of one tool and is funding the production of another. These tools will raise standards of assessment generally and the ready use of them in the education system is a measure of how much the schools and the education policy makers value this approach. However outside of this project, assessments are not free at the point of delivery and exiting the project means that future assessments may carry a cost that most low-income families cannot afford. Making assessments free at the point of delivery should be included in any future policy change activity.

2. Teacher training & implementing that training: DepEd report that they greatly value the teacher training and want to be able to roll it out across all schools and reach all 34,000 teachers. It is especially noteworthy that teachers also enjoy the training and have reported in participatory rapid assessment exercises that being able to put the training into practice is the most important factor in the project for them. This is evidenced in their action plans and lesson plans, which also include indicators that they have to report against. Currently the progress reported against the indicators in the teachers’ action plans is not collected under this project, but could provide a future opportunity to measure change achieved under Inclusive Education.

6. Recommendations

The recommendations for this project have been separated into three parts: the project, LCD, LCDPFI.

The Project
1. The project plan, based on the standard key elements of Inclusive Education, should be tailored to suit the context of the locations it is being implemented in, in order to ensure that the activities and targets are deliverable within a clearly constructed and relatable budget and time-period;

2. Pre-project period research and a baseline should be undertaken before the planned start of the activities. Where a baseline is a requirement of the donor (as was the case here) the baseline period should be distinct from the project delivery period and the deliverables agreed for the project should take these two periods into account;

3. Community engagement is key to the success of an Inclusive Education project. While this has happened to a degree in the project areas, the community has not been considered to be a key beneficiary of the project, which it is and should be considered as such;

4. Indicators should be set for the project that can be measured; or, if indicators are set for which measurement tools do not exist, these should be set up before the start of the project

5. Progress reported under the action plans of teachers implementing Inclusive Education should be shared with LCD and LCDPFI to ensure that educational development as an outcome of the project can be properly measured;
6. Child assessments should be universally free at the point of delivery to ensure that all children can be assessed ahead of starting school, to get the appropriate support and assistance necessary

Leonard Cheshire Disability
1. The relationship between LCD and LCDPFI was crucial to the success of this project. Mostly this relationship was about support and capacity building. There was however no formal capacity building plan in place for LCDPFI, which is essentially a new NGO with very few resources. LCD has a strong background in partnership working, which could have been brought to bear more proactively at the start and throughout the project period;
2. LCD should consider a longitudinal study of children in Inclusive Education in the Philippines to measure long-lasting impact and value creation as a result of this project.

Leonard Cheshire Disability Philippines Foundation, Inc.
1. Short / immediate term: capacity building programme for staff, especially for the finance manager. This programme needs to be clearly defined with SMART targets and a very clear time-frame;
2. An executive post needs to be created to oversee the day-to-day operation of the organisation and to act as a link between the board and the organisational team. This role should have delegated authorities from the board to run the organisation effectively and efficiently, and should work with the trustees to develop their vision and strategy for the organisation. This post should work with the staff team to implement the operational plan agreed with the trustees that will deliver the strategy agreed with the trustees;
3. Trustees need to articulate what information they want reported to them at their board meetings and push back at the staff team to deliver the information that the trustees need to fulfil their role as the guardians of the organisation. This may be challenging for the staff team and require that they think differently and find different solutions, however trustees are clear that although they get reports, they don’t always know what is going on in the organisation, or how to promote the organisation effectively to their networks;
4. A strategic plan for the organisation needs to be developed that outlines how the organisation will deliver its vision over the next three to five years, a budget that is required to fund the plan and a detailed fundraising strategy to identify how the funds needed to support the strategy will be raised;
   a. Suggested areas of activity to deliver a vision:
      i. Education
      ii. Economic Empowerment
      iii. Accessibility
      iv. Young Voices (PWD engagement in advocating for their rights)
      v. Policy development (working to create the appropriate policy environment that advances the 4 areas above)
5. Identify potential partnerships for delivering key activities, such as healthcare agencies / NGOs, etc.
6. Fundraising strategy must identify how to build up the non-existent unrestricted reserves;
7. Identify a clear vision and mission for the organisation that expresses what the trustees want LCDPFI to be and aspire to.
7. Appendices

7.1 Case Study on Impact & Value Creation

Michael is fourteen years old. He has cerebral palsy. He lives in a slum optimistically named Fuji, outside of Atimonan in Quezon Province in the Philippines. Michael lives with his parents, his deaf brother and blind grandfather next to the tile-making factory where his father works shifts. But until a few months ago, Michael did not go to school.

A lot of children with disabilities in the Philippines do not go to school. Often their parents are ashamed that their children have a disability, or do not know how to support their children. Sometimes just getting to school can be a challenge with roads, busses, pavements and school buildings being inaccessible to all but the most able and independent children. Parents also do not believe that their children will be accepted in a school full of able-bodied children and that there is no future for their child that includes education and a right to determine their own lives.

So Leonard Cheshire Disability Philippines Foundation, Inc. (LCDPFI), supported by USAID embarked on a program of Inclusive Education. To identify, assess, support and enrol children with disabilities into their local mainstream schools alongside children without disabilities. To get this right, LCDPFI also trained teachers in Inclusive Education, to provide them with the tools and methodologies to be able to work with children with disabilities alongside their non-disabled classmates.

It was during the identification phase of the program that a teacher, Lorna Luna from the local school identified Michael in his parents’ two-roomed home deep in the forest slum of Fuji. Lorna had been trained in Inclusive Education by LCDPFI. To get to Michael Lorna had to leave the main road, walk down a long rough dirt road, passed the stream flowing in front of the tile-making factory and up a steep, muddy pathway into the forest to eventually reach the small house that Michael and his family call home.

Michael was assessed through LCDPFI for his cerebral palsy. Normally such an assessment would be far outside of the reach of a poor family like Michael’s. But LCDPFI did not charge the families to be assessed, which made it possible to reach significantly more people than would otherwise be assessed for their disability needs. It was a god-send to Michael’s parents to be told eventually what was wrong with their son, who at that time could not feed himself, sit upright or engage with the world around him. The two rooms in the home were small and crowded with a family coping with three different disabilities and filled with the smells of Michael’s mother’s cooking and Michael often never left the house for days at a time.
Michael’s mother became a member of the parents group that LCDPFI started in the area and she received training from LCDPFI and support from other parents who also had children with disabilities. Michael’s mother now had the skills to begin to support her son. The assessment had referred Michael for provision of a wheelchair to help him to get to school and the day the chair arrived was a turning point for the fourteen-year old and his parents. Until they tried to use the chair on the steep, muddy pathway and the dirt road. Unless Michael’s father was able to take Michael and his chair to the main tarred road and then push Michael in his chair to school, it was not possible for Michael to attend the school every day. Michael’s father works shifts at the tile factory, which means that he can only take Michael to school two days a week. So although he is now attending school, his education is severely interrupted. To make sure that Michael could practice in his wheelchair, the family agreed to remove the central partition in their home so that the two rooms became one larger room. This is a significant adjustment for the family to make.

Lorna and her fellow teachers found ways to get to Michael regularly to teach him at home so that he did not fall too far behind his classmates. But this was not a real solution. So Lorna decided to take matters into her own hands. Having been trained in advocacy for children with disabilities by LCDPFI as part of the Inclusive Education program, Lorna went to lobby the Mayor’s office for funding for a tarmac road and a refurbished cement pathway from Michael’s house to the new road. Lorna also had to get the local community onside to support this change.

It took a few months, but Lorna’s persistence has paid off and the Mayor’s office has agreed to pay for the materials for the new road and pathway and the community has agreed to lay the road and pathway. This will mean that in 2014, when the road and pathway will be put in, Michael will be able to get to school even on the days that his father is working.

In the meantime, Michael has also improved and can now sit up on his own, feed himself and is showing increased confidence.

Inclusive education is often described as “Children learning together in the same classroom, using materials appropriate to their various needs, and participating in the same lessons and recreation.” It is actually about far more than that. Assessments, referrals for support, making physical adaptations to school buildings, roads, pathways and advocating for the inclusion of people with disabilities in every aspect of daily life; together with training teachers and supporting parents to provide the best opportunities for their children will provide long and sustained positive changes for communities across the Philippines.

---

After all, because one fourteen-year old boy with cerebral palsy had been given a wheelchair, a whole community will benefit from a new road and pathway that will forever improve their access to the rest of the world.

NOTE: This case study encapsulates all the key elements of Inclusive Education:
• Assessment, enrolment and assistive devices support
• Creating accessible school environments
• Working with parents
• Child-to-child activities
• Teacher training
• Working with government for policy change
• Working with communities
### Indicator Performance Tracking Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>LOP</th>
<th>Year 1 Target</th>
<th>Year 1 Actual</th>
<th>Year 2 Target</th>
<th>Year 2 Quarter 1</th>
<th>Year 2 Quarter 2</th>
<th>Year 2 Quarter 3</th>
<th>Year 2 Quarter 4</th>
<th>Year 2 Actual</th>
<th>Total Y1 &amp; Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational performance of 70% of CWD in all the 20 schools is improved as against the baseline</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the teachers in the 20 schools and the relevant DepEd authorities have demonstrated commitment to implement IE</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of communities and families of 600 CWD in supporting IE is increased against baseline</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased engagement of CWD and their peers in advocating for their rights</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objective:
By the end of Year Two, 600 children with disabilities across 20 schools in 3 project locations (National Capital Region, Luzon and Mindanao) will have accessed quality statutory primary education within an enhanced physical and learning environment.

#### Expected Result 1:
Target of 600 children with disabilities in project location will have been assessed (and referred onwards for rehabilitation services where appropriate), and enrolled in primary school.

- Number of children assessed from target village: 600
- Number of children attending minimum of three school sessions per week between enrolment and project end: 400
- Number of identified children with disabilities enrolled in primary school: 200

#### Expected Result 2:
All project schools delivering IE to enrol children with disabilities, with trained teachers using appropriate curriculum, materials and methodologies.

- Number of teachers trained in IE: 120
- % of trained teacher using adapted curriculum, materials, methodologies and teaching aids: 60
- Develop IE module for in-service teachers training curriculum: 3

#### Expected Result 3:
Parents groups and communities in project areas provided ongoing tangible support to children with disabilities.

- Number of parents groups established: 2
- % of parents in each group sending children with disabilities to school: 1
- % of parents in each group attending a minimum of four project meetings per year: 0.5
- Number of actions taken by the parents to promote IE: 0

#### Expected Result 4:
Targeted mainstream primary schools are adapted to make them physically accessible to children with disabilities.

- % of target primary schools against baseline in three regions physically adapted to provide accessible education by end of the project: 1

#### Expected Result 5:
Partnership working with DepEd will bring about positive changes to policy and practice around Inclusive Education.

- Number of DepEd officials engaging in training or awareness raising: 2
7.3 Inception Report

See separate document

7.4 Data Collection Tools

Example of the semi-structured Focus Group Discussion format used:

| Access to Education for People with Disabilities in the Philippines |
| Focus Group Discussion |
| October 2013 |

A. Focus Group details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Focus Group held:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder group type:</td>
<td>Teachers who have been trained in IE, working in schools that have been adapted, teaching children with disabilities that have benefitted from the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of women:</td>
<td>No. of men:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Areas of Research & Discussion

- Relevance of the project to the needs of the children with disabilities, their parents and the community;
- Effectiveness of LCDPFI and the project in engaging with teachers and other education leaders in the project areas;
- Involving teachers, school administrators and others in determining which activities have the greatest benefit and where activities could be changed or scaled back (efficiency, value and cost savings);
- The success and challenges of the programme (results); and
- What happens next (sustainability).

C. Questions (these are suggestions only and on the day questions can be rephrased or re-ordered to suit the group dynamic and the thread of the discussion)

1. Did LCDPFI talk to you about the project before it started?
2. Were you involved in working out what would happen in the project?
3. How often does LCDPFI ask you for your opinion on how the project is going? How is that done?
4. Do you think the right people are benefitting from the project? Why?
5. What lessons do you think you have learned about running a project like this?
6. What are the important factors to get right in such a project?
7. How effective has the involvement of parent groups and the wider community been?
8. Was the project successful in targeting children with disabilities in your community?
9. How effective was the training on inclusive education?
10. How have you been able to implement inclusive education in your classes?
11. What was more successful in the project? Why?
12. What was less successful in the project? Why?
Example of the PRA Exercise undertaken with Parents and Teachers in Atimonan and General Santos City:

Access to Education for People with Disabilities in the Philippines
Participatory Rapid Assessment (PRA) Report
October 2013

A. PRA details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date PRA held:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group type:</th>
<th>Parents of children with disabilities that have benefitted from the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of women:</td>
<td>No. of men:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Quantified results of PRA group’s opinions

Fill in the quantified results of the matrix scoring exercises using the 20-bean method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which was the most important part of the project for you?</th>
<th>Enrolling my child in school</th>
<th>Referring my child for assistance</th>
<th>Meeting regularly with the teachers and school</th>
<th>Participating in the parent groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has benefitted from the project?</th>
<th>Children with Disabilities</th>
<th>Their parents</th>
<th>The teachers and schools</th>
<th>The whole community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How valuable is the project to Children with Disabilities?</th>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>A little valuable</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Very valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How valuable is the project to their parents?</th>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>A little valuable</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Very valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How valuable is the project to the teachers and schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>A little valuable</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Very valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How valuable is the project to the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>A little valuable</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Very valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How has being in a mainstream school benefitted children with disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They have more confidence</th>
<th>They have more friends</th>
<th>The differences between children with disabilities and other children are more obvious</th>
<th>They are learning more than they would have before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How wisely has the money been spent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat wisely</th>
<th>Wisely</th>
<th>Very wisely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What has the project helped you to achieve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I understand my child's needs better</th>
<th>I expect that my child may achieve at school</th>
<th>I have more time to work now that my child is in school</th>
<th>I believe that my child has a better future now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 List of people and organisations interviewed & Focus Group Discussions / PRA exercises

Key Informant Interviews
1. Sunanda Mavillapalli, Head of Programmes, Asia
2. Aimee Long, International Programme Officer, LCD
3. Claude Cheta, Learning, Impact and Quality Manager, LCD
4. Georgina Gaskell, International Project Funding Officer, LCD
5. Barhka Henry, Programme Manager, East Asia and Pacific Regional Office, LCD
6. Revathy K S, Regional Representative for LCD in Asia
7. Lourdes Reyes, Founder Chair, LCDPFI
8. Eduardo Lorenzo, Project Officer, LCDPFI
9. Andy Manzanade, Project Coordinator NCR, LCDPFI
10. Hazel Joy Borja, Programmes Manager, LCDPFI
11. Anges Gabaleo, Special Education Teacher, Cecilio Apostol Elementary
School
12. Mirla Olores Chief Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, DepEd
13. Ms Chit Singayan, Senior Programme Specialist, Special Education Division, Bureau of Elementary Education, DepEd
14. Richard Cepeda, Financial Manager, LCDPFI
15. Mina Valdez, Teacher, Tonsuya Elementary School
16. Teacher, Tonsuya Elementary School
17. Lisa Ramirez, Special Education Coordinator, Tonsuya School
18. Atty Jose Racela, President, LCDPFI
19. Fred Restubog, Trustee, Auditor, LCDPFI
20. Alex Babst, Vice-President, LCDPFI
21. Mary Ann Lee, Treasurer, LCDPFI
22. Teresita Paunil, Principal, Magsaysay Elementary School
23. Abigail Cecilia Salumbides, Principal, Inalig Elementary School
24. Lorna Luna, teacher, Maligaya Elementary School
25. Nancy Ebuenga, USAID Philippines
26. Lorraine Wapling, Inclusive Education Consultant
27. Rizalen Coco, Project Coordinator Atimonan, LCDPFI

Focus Group Discussions / PRA Exercises
1. FGD with Parents at Tonsuya Elementary School 7F
2. FGD with Teachers at Tonsuya Elementary School 2F
3. FGD/PRA with Parents at Rizal Elementary School 10F
4. FGD/PRA with Teachers at Rizal Elementary School 9F 3M
5. FGD / PRA exercise with Teachers at JP Laurel Elementary School, 11F 4M 14 October 2013
6. FGD / PRA exercise with Parents at LCDPFI Office, General Santos City, 14 October 2013

7.6 DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009
See separate document

7.7 List of reviewed documentation

1. Final Proposal, “Access to Education for People with Disabilities in the Philippines” USAID/Philippines APS #492-10-001
7. LCDisability USAID Philippines Full Budget – April 2011
8. LCDisability USAID Philippines Logframe Final
9. M and E Plan draft RL edit 25 1 12
10. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, January 2012
11. Monitoring Form, September 2013
12. Monitoring Form NCR1, August 2013
13. Performance Report, Year 1
14. Project Highlights Yr1
15. Performance report Y2Q1
16. Performance report Y2Q2
17. Performance report Y2Q3
18. Philippines visit report TB, March 2012
19. Project activity tracking updates, June 2013
20. USAID Philippines Agreement
21. USAID Philippines KPI achievement
22. Activity Tracking Telecon Notes July 2013
23. Activity Tracking Telecon Notes June 2013
25. Profiling and Baseline Study, September 2012
26. Summary of Meeting with DepEd, May 2013
27. Summary of Meeting with DepEd, March 2013
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7.9 Management response to findings

See separate document / to be included after submission to LCD.