Project Report

YEAR 0

School Improvement Project

April 2016 - March 2017
To demonstrate a replicable and sustainable model of schools with better teaching-learning practices, higher student outcomes and increased student engagement by driving system capacity building and collective action.
1 Current Reality

Education Landscape

Learning Outcomes and Enrolment

The Education Gap in Maharashtra can be better understood through these statistics.¹

¹ Source: ASER data set
The following data points can be interpreted from Images 1, 2 & 3:

1) **Year on year reduction in enrolment over time**: We can infer from image 1, Enrolment in Government schools in Maharashtra has been falling over time. From 2006 to 2016 the enrolment in Government schools has fallen by almost 19%. Between 2014 and 2016 alone enrolment overall in Government schools has fallen by 1.5%.

2) **Drop in math learning levels over time**: Image 2 indicates that the proportion of kids who know nothing has gone up over the years. Even though between the years 2014 and 2016 learning levels have increased incrementally (except for number recognition 1-9), overall learning levels remain extremely low. Even in 2016, only 35.80% of all students between the grades of 2-8 can recognize numbers between 1-100.

3) **Drop in reading levels over time**: In Image 3 we see the drastic drop in learning levels over time. Even though in the years of 2014 to 2016, we see a rise in higher level skill of paragraph reading and the % of kids who know nothing has fallen, we see a drop in all other skills such as word paragraph and story reading skills. Also, overall learning levels remain low.

The situation in Pune is very similar to that of Maharashtra.
Secondary Analysis

The only skills that seem to have improved in kids over a 7 year period are skills of learning by rote: ‘letters’ and ‘number recognition’. Other skills that require a competent teacher in the classroom such as reading ‘words’, ‘paragraphs’, ‘subtraction’ and ‘division’ have gone down. This can be then attributed to multiple issues, but more importantly a lack of teachers/teacher skill sets and mindsets.

The Education Gap in Pune Municipal Corporation Schools

The situation in Pune is not very different from the one playing out in the state of Maharashtra as evident from the following data, which gives a snapshot of enrolment in the last 2 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>66,546</td>
<td>57,509</td>
<td>- 9,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16,186</td>
<td>18,245</td>
<td>+2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>- 849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL 1-5</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7,827</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.33% Enrolment reduced as during last year in PMC Primary classes and 6.74% Enrolment reduced in the same period in Upper Primary classes.

Further, an Educational Initiatives study of 35,000 Class 2, 4 and 6 students in 300 municipal schools in 30 towns of 5 states, indicated that more than two thirds of Class 4 children were unable to divide the number 20 by 5. More than half of Class 2 students could not match an alphabet letter with its sound a skill mastered by most children attending an average private preprimary school.

As evident from all the available data the need of the hour is to tackle the crisis facing municipal schools in the country and more so for Pune city, namely low quality education leading to decreasing student enrolments and closure of schools.
The Intervention Gap

Types of Interventions in the Maharashtra Landscape:

Type 1: Student Level Interventions

There are many student level interventions in Maharashtra function in a way that external teachers/school staff are provided by organizations to teach children. In such scenarios, these interventions provide all the financial and skill based support that is required by these external staff members, as also they maintain continuity of intervention when there is turnover of staff. replacement for such staff members when some move out.

System Level Concerns:

In such a scenario, multiple issues need to be looked at from a systemic viewpoint:

1. **Scaling**: Such interventions are usually financially dependant in nature. This does not make them the prime candidates for scaling as it would require government level financial strength to scale (between 1000 to 10,000 times the financial capability most NGOs have as of today)

2. **Sustainability**: Sustainability of such interventions is circumspect as the implementers are not government employees and keep changing over time. Therefore a teacher skilling cost for external teachers/school staff might only give returns for a couple of years, where as the same money spent on a government teacher gives a higher guarantee returns for a 20-30 year period
Type 2: Specific School Staff Interventions

Specific school staff Interventions in Maharashtra, as the name suggests, work on a small subset of stakeholders. An example would be a teacher training organization that works on teacher up-skilling and mindsets, but does not work with other stakeholders that impact a student’s education (school principals, communities, school support staff, etc).

System Level Concerns

In such a scenario, multiple issues need to be looked at from a systemic viewpoint:

1. Interconnectedness of Stakeholders: Most Education researchers agree that to create sustainable impact, it is necessary to involve the key stakeholders in the education process. Many such interventions do not consider the systemic view of supporting school systems.

2. Hygiene Factors: Such an intervention also does not focus on changing hygiene factors the impact teacher motivation and thus learning outcomes. Applying Herzbergs’s two-factor theory, it is difficult to see long term sustainable impact without working on factors such as compensation, organizational politics, working conditions, quality of leadership, and relationships between supervisors, subordinates, and peers.
Type 3: Whole School Interventions

Whole School Interventions usually run in such a way that an organization takes over the support for a whole school. Though there are multiple variations to this model most such implementations work at least with the school headmaster and teachers.

System Level Concerns:

In such a scenario, multiple issues need to be looked at from a systemic viewpoint:

1. **Organizational Skill Level**: It is very difficult for organizations to build skills to work on multiple factors simultaneously. They could be really good on a couple of school level parameters but could be subpar on others

2. **Systemic Integration**: Such interventions are also usually built as experiments/proof of concept without keeping in mind system complexities or difficulties for scaling and replicability
In the spirit of promoting collective work, prominent companies in Pune joined forces along with the local government to support solving some of the pressing social issues of the city. Two of the leading corporates, Thermax Foundation and Forbes Marshall, have taken the ownership of improving the quality of learning in public schools – one of the five social issues taken up. This collective action model showcases the benefits to be gained by collaborating at a deeper and meaningful level. The collective funding pool, both in terms of treasure and talent, is much larger than individual contributions and this as a result has a multiplier effect on the impact and scale of operations. The Pune City Connect (PCC) was thus formed as a collective action organization to facilitate implementation of the project and bring all stakeholders together. PCC’s role was critical as the backbone organization to drive the collective agenda for improving public education outcomes. As of 2017, the Pune City Connect education track is supported by 7 prominent corporate foundations and works closely with 8 NGO partners. The SIP project works with 15 schools, 190 teachers directly impacting around 5200 students.
Intervention Type of the School Improvement Project

Collective Action Whilst Leveraging Government Resources at Scale

The model for the PMC-PCC School improvement project is built to try and absolve the system level concerns with the other types of models to ensure that the project can be scaled easily. The key tenets of the model are as follows:

**Academic Partners:** The project has 7 academic partners who work with government school teachers and other staff. The partners have gone through a rigorous vetting process that not only looks at past outcomes but also evaluates their current offering to be customized for a systemic project like the school improvement project. PCC has also put up structures to help the partners collaborate so as to magnify their impact

**Project Costing:** The costing for the project has been split in such a way that PCC only bears the cost of quality resources like partners on the project and the government bears the cost of project resources such as infrastructure, teaching resources and other resource persons required in the school. As of this year, PCC is estimated only around 7-8% 3% of the overall cost of school functioning

**Central M & E:** The monitoring and evaluation of the project is managed by PCC project team. This is done to reduce load on our partners as well as to ensure that any bias in impact measurement is taken out of play. As of Year 0 PCC will be implementing 1 RCT, 1 longitudinal study and 3 rubric based study to measure impact in terms of student outcomes and upskilling of school staff

**Sustainability and Scaling Built In:** The project is also designed in such a way that sustainability and scaling is built in. SUSTAINABILITY: As there are no direct student level implementations by PCC or partners, all implementations going on in SIP schools are run by school staff. SCALING: As PCC is working on another project to train and mentor 50 Shikshak Sahyogis (teacher mentors), who will be leveraged to scale this program to the other 200 regional medium schools in Pune city.

**Hygiene Factors:** PCC also works with the Shikshan Mandal (Education Department) in Pune to reduce the non-academic workload of teachers and to ensure that all their time is spent on either teaching or upskilling. This ranges from working with the Shikshan Mandal to reduce non-education related trainings for teachers to implementing a model where teachers remain in the project even when they are transferred (teacher transfers have been limited to project schools), to increasing school working hours to 6 hours a day for students and 7 hours a day for teachers.
Project Hypothesis

Schools with specific external support (at all levels) and necessary learning infrastructure, should show a higher increase in student learning as compared to schools that do not have the it.

Over the last couple of years there have been many implementations, focusing on specific aspects of education such as teacher training, curriculum support, technology in education, etc. Though these implementations are successful, they are held down by their singular focus on one aspect of educational change.

Our hypothesis is that if organizations were to come together and apply their core competencies across all of the aforementioned educational change areas, they could multiply their impact by collaboration to create pathways for each other. This hypothesis then lends itself to our collective impact model, that brings together multiple partners with different competencies to work together on aspects such as teacher training, community development, capacity building for school leadership, etc.
Project Vision

In Pune City schools, multiple issues such as low learning levels in Language and Math, as also a lack of concrete learning in English has lead to a mass exodus from regional medium schools into PMC English medium and low cost private school - student’s enrolment is reducing at more than 5% year on year. The SIP Project is an attempt by PCC, the Pune Municipal Corporation and Pune School Board to address these issues. The Project aims to demonstrate proof points of excellent education in Pune public schools by improving learning levels of students and thus cause an increase in enrolment in schools.

The SIP project functions with a network of 15 schools (13 Marathi medium and 2 Urdu medium) and focuses on creating a holistic learning environment for students through improved teaching learning practices and deeper community engagement. SIP Project schools function for longer hours to increase student engagement, have specialised staff to engage with communities and have extremely dedicated teachers who receive rigorous in-service coaching and mentoring so that they may implement better teaching learning practices in classrooms.

Using these schools as a benchmark, PCC hopes to create a vision for Student Achievement in schools that is inclusive of efforts of all stakeholders in the school system and becomes aspirational for other schools in the city to achieve. Over the next 5 years, these 15 schools can then be facilitated to mentor and coach other schools in their respective geographies to achieve the same vision and also leverage the 50 member Sahyogi team to scale best practices from these 15 schools. Over the next 10 years the aim of the project is to get all 220 regional medium schools in Pune to this vision of better learning and higher student attendance & enrolment.
Building The Model

The model has 6 core components:

**Pre-school to class 10:**

There are 220 regional medium schools that run from Balwadi (pre-school) to grade 7/8 and. Interestingly, there are only 26 Marathi/Urdu secondary schools from grade 8-9 to 12. The disparity in the numbers show that most kids in regional medium school either drop out or move to private schools post 8th grade to complete their 10 boards. Therefore, a key tenet of the SIP project is to provide Balwadi to grade 10 in the same building not only to increase enrollment in schools but also to provide an end-to-end experience for the parents where children are guaranteed facilities till they finish their schooling.

**Improve teaching learning practices:**

All implementation in SIP schools is via existing teachers and a key piece is to improve teaching learning practices so that kids not only have access to a better education but are also engaged in the classroom. Teachers are being trained by partner organization on implementing a structured remedial programme to bridge the learning gap for 3-5 grades. Teachers are being up skilled in the use of Constructivist methodology in their classrooms in line with the Maharashtra state government’s push for the same.
Effective learning infrastructure:

Out of the INR 350 Cr education budget almost 80% is spent on teacher salaries and pension leaving a paltry amount for school infrastructure and resources. Therefore, a key part of the project is making sure effective learning infrastructure in terms of computes, labs, tablets etc is available in the schools. In Y0 of the project the Education Department has already spent around 3-5 crores across the 15 schools and will keep investing to upgrade physical and human infrastructure across SIP schools.

One shift per school:

Pune has roughly around 150 school building and runs 270 schools (including english medium schools). Therefore most schools run in shifts where 7.15 to 12.15 is one shift and 12.30 - 5.30 is another shift. Therefore kids spend only 5 hours in school everyday including the time spent on brakes and morning assembly. In year 0 of our project 14 out of the 15 SIP schools function for 6 hours for students and 7 hours for teachers thus not only increasing learning time in schools but also providing for exclusive time for teachers to complete lesson planning and administrative tasks. This has been done by combining schools in the same building(a first in the city of Pune)

Remedial education and support:

As can be seen from multiple sources and more prominently from the ASER data at the start of this document, kids in regional medium schools are woefully behind their grade levels. Therefore, the SIP project has a per student remediation programme for grades 3-5 across all schools. Kids spend 1.5 hours per day(45 mins for Mathematics and 45 mins for Language), working on workbooks and other activities in groups under the guidance of teachers to move up to grade level.

Focus on Community Engagement:

Communities form a big part of a child’s learning experience as has been acknowledged by multiple studies as well as the RTE act of 2009. In service of this, the government of Pune has hired 10 social workers who work on community engagement across 9 of 15 schools. The social workers have had amazing success with increasing student attendance in the classroom by conducting home visits as well as driving parent teacher meeting and School Management Committee meetings.
Partner Briefs and Selection Process

ISLI

Background:

India School Leadership Institute (ISLI), established in 2013 as a project of the Akanksha Foundation, is one of the first initiatives in India to focus on developing the skills of School Leaders, to build high-performing schools that commit to and deliver academic achievement and character development of children in low-income schools. School Leaders are defined as headmasters, principals, head teachers and school owners.

Vision

Every school in India will be led by an effective school leader who will create quality learning opportunities that prepare children for higher education and responsible citizenship.

Scale:

School Leaders: 267

Cities: 4

Students: 156,894

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

ISLI works with all the 15 school leaders and in-charges on the SIP project to provide them with the requisite knowledge, Skills and Mindsets required to run high performing schools.
Background:

QUEST (Quality Education support Trust) has reached out to around 20000 children through its various interventions pertaining to quality of education. These children are in the age group of 3 to 14 years and come from marginalized communities. QUEST has also reached around 1000 teachers through workshops and its online forum (in Marathi). QUEST’s interventions have mainly happened through capacity building of teachers to ensure long term sustainability.

Scale:

20,000 students and 10,000 teachers across projects in rural Maharashtra.

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

QUEST works with teachers of grades 1-5 in the Marathi medium schools of the project to run 2 programmes: Lipi and Ank(for grades 1-2) and Saksham(for grades 3-5). Quest not only provides training to teachers to run these remediation programmes but also has 3 on-ground support staff that help teachers in implementing the programmes in their classrooms.
Grammangal

Background:

Grammangal was founded in 1982 by renowned educationists Anutai Wagh and Ramesh Panse to provide holistic education to the rural and tribal children of Palghar and Dahanu Talukas of Palghar (then a part of Thane District). Beginning with a small school in Dabhon village of Dahanu Taluka, Grammangal implemented programs and methodologies that have positively impacted the learning of thousands of school children in Maharashtra and other parts of India.

Grammangal has developed and implemented teaching-learning methodologies that are strongly grounded in the principles and current understanding of Cognitive Science, Child Development and Learning. The methodologies are based on the precepts of constructivism and aimed at providing stress-free, joyful and enriching learning experiences to children.

Scale:

Grammangal has run multiple programmes in different districts in Maharashtra and has over the years reached thousands of teachers and more than 1,000,000 students via their projects.

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

Grammangal runs a program that helps teachers of grades 6-8 implement Constructivism in their classrooms.
Background:

Pratham is an innovative learning organization created to improve the quality of education in India. As one of the largest non-governmental organizations in the country, Pratham focuses on high-quality, low-cost, and replicable interventions to address gaps in the education system. Established in 1995 to provide education to children in the slums of Mumbai, Pratham has grown both in scope and geographical coverage.

The mission to improve the quality of education in India and ensure that all children not only attend but also thrive in school is being accomplished by working in collaboration with the government, local communities, parents, teachers, volunteers, and civil society members. Our programmes aim to supplement rather than replace governmental efforts. They are implemented on a large scale to not only reach as many children as possible, but also to create an adoptable demonstration model for state governments.

Scale:

Pratham is one of the largest NGOs in India. Their impact for the year 2015-16 year is as follows:

Geographies: 23 states and Union territories
Direct interventions: Children reached 1.2 million
Partnerships with the Government: Children reached 4.5 million
Total beneficiaries: 5.7 million

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

Pratham works with teachers from grades 1-8 in the Urdu medium schools on the SIP project by providing inputs on Urdu and Math.
Akanksha Foundation

Background:

The Akanksha Foundation is a non-profit organisation with a mission to provide children from low-income communities with a high-quality education, enabling them to maximize their potential and transform their lives. Akanksha works in the field of education, initiating school reform through The School Project, and providing a supplemental education through the Akanksha centers.

Scale:

Currently, Akanksha reaches out to over 6500 children through two models: the after-school or center model and the School Project.

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

The Akanksha foundation has been working with communities for over 2 decades now and brings those learning for the project. Social workers hired by the government are trained by the Akanksha Foundation.
Background:

The Centre for Learning Resources (CLR) is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation (NGO) located in Pune, India. Since 1984, CLR has been working in the fields of Early Childhood Care and Development, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and the Teaching of English in Maharashtra and other states in India. While they work also with post-secondary youth, CLR's main goal is to improve the quality of early childhood care and development, early childhood and elementary education that rural and urban disadvantaged children receive in our country. As a technical support organisation, the CLR is committed to working in collaboration with all those government agencies and NGOs engaged in meeting this challenge.

Scale:

CLR Works across multiple states in India and runs large scale projects with the government, reaching thousands of teachers and millions of students directly and indirectly every year.

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project:

CLR runs their LWRE (Let's read and Write) video based programmes for English learning across grades 3-4 across all SIP schools. The programme is built in such a way that kids learn English via Marathi and even teachers with a low mastery over English can run the programme in their classrooms.
Anjali Gokhale and Vidya Ghugari

Background:

Anjali and Vidya, Our CLR consultants come in with immense experience. Anjali has worked with National institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development, CLR(Center for Learning Resources), Forbes Marshal Foundation and has freelances for the SIP and other projects now. Vidya on the other hand has worked with Doorstep and CLR in the past.

Implementation Specific to the SIP Project

Anjali and Vidya currently work on coaching and mentoring as well as on classroom strategies for Balwadi teachers and Sevikas across all SIP schools, through a 5 member Sahyogi model.
Project Pre-requisites and Why Year 0

Project Pre-requisites

Project pre-requisites set with the government at the start of the year were:

• All infrastructure expenses to be made by the local government: This is something that has been provided by the PMC. The government has spent around 3-5 crores on the 15 schools in year 0 of the project

• Social workers: The SIP project specifically aims to have the communities involved with school. Therefore, the government has hired 10 social workers this year and will be hiring the rest in Y1 of the project. The 10 social workers work across 9 schools.

• One Building one school and one shift per school: This has been achieved in 14 out of the 15 schools by combining schools

• Increase School timings: 14 out of our 15 schools function 7 hours a day for teachers and 6 hours a day for students (as opposed to the 5 hours per day for both)

• 1.5 Hours of Math and Language Differentiation everyday: This has been achieved by implementing the Saksham Program across schools

• School Staff trainings: The prerequisite for training for the school staff on this project was 2 days a month. This has been achieved by giving students holidays on 2 days a month (a Friday - Saturday combo) and training the teachers then

• Printing of Material and Books: This is another cost that had to be borne by the government. The shikshan mandal thus got material and books printed by the PMC press

• 2 English teachers per School: At the start of the SIP project the government had agreed to provide 2 English language teachers from English medium PMC schools. This has not been achieved due to a systemic shortage of teachers in English medium (the shortage is 400 teachers across 50 schools)

• 100% staffing for SIP Schools: This has not been achieved due to systemic problems. There is still a vacancy for 18 teachers across 15 schools
• Balwadi Entry Age: Balwadis in PMC schools take in kids as young as two while the official entry age is 4. Though the local policy paper to get this done was passed, it was not implemented. It is expected to be implemented next year.

Why Year 0:

The reasons why we refer to this year of the project as year 0 is as follows:

• **System readiness:*** Systemic programmes take time to set up as a lot of uncertainties that have to be dealt with before they start. The PCC team has spent the first half of year 0 working with diverse administrative and political stakeholders in getting the program set up.

• **Mindsets take time to change:** The project faced some opposition from teachers and headmasters at the start of the year as school timings were increased without an increase in pay for 15 out of the 220 schools in the city. The PCC team spent a lot of time in Y0 communicating with Teachers, Headmasters and other stakeholders to invest them into the project. This is one of the many deeper mindsets that needs to be worked on. Using Y0 as the year to learn more about mindsets is important.

• **The need to be cognizant about pre-existing programmes:** Pune city has more than 35 NGOs running programmes in different sets of schools. As a prerequisite, the SIP project required that no other implementations happen in the SIP schools except for those approved by the technical committee for the project. This took time to achieve and only post the month of January 2017 have the inputs from NGO’s reduced, so that we established a causal pathway in giving primarily SIP inputs only, to these 15 schools.
3 Impact

Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Monitoring and evaluation of the project uses qualitative as well as quantitative benchmarks.

Quantitative Benchmarks:

These are purely number based benchmarks that have been used to evaluate inputs as well as outputs for year zero. The process of defining these benchmarks was as follows:

Build the Logframe: The logframe was built before the implementation of the project and subjected to review by the PCC technical committee and government stakeholders

Output Metrics: The output metrics as defined by the logframe were then broken down into easily measurable pieces

Input Metrics: Based on the output metrics the inputs were designed and then were defined into input metrics

Qualitative Benchmarks:

Apart from the aforementioned Quantitative benchmarks, Qualitative benchmarks were also designed. These are as follows:

Feedback from School Staff: This has been collected in the form of FGDs(focus group discussions) to help guide implementation for Y1

Feedback from Government Functionaries: This was done at the Shikshan Mandal stepback 2017 and has clear short and long term actionables for the project.

All of the above have been detailed out in the next section.
## LFA

### Questions:
1. How do we have outcomes and Outputs for collective action? How do we measure it? How much better is it than working in silos?
2. How do we have outcomes for System Capacity Building? How do we measure the govt. effectiveness in this system? How has mindset changed at all levels of government?
3. Sustainability

### Preconditions:
1. School staffing- HM/Incharge, teachers, S.Ws,A.C
2. P.P.P. model- PMC - PCC - Corporation
3. School under innovation GR
4. Single shift school

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Source of monitoring</th>
<th>Assumption and Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>To demonstrate a replicable and sustainable model of schools with better teaching-learning practices, higher student outcomes and increased student enrolment by driving system capacity building and collective action</td>
<td>Minimum 30% increase in student learning outcomes Minimum 40% increase in teacher performance Minimum 50% increase in student enrolment</td>
<td>- Baseline and endline test/ longitudinal study - School enrolment numbers - Teacher evaluation Matrix</td>
<td>- System will develop the will and capacity to lead the model school project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>1) Increased student learning outcomes(1,3,4,5) 2) Increased student enrolment(2,7) 3) Teachers using constructivism approach to teach(3,4) 4) Fully functioning SMCs (2) 5) Efficient school system( Infrastructure and management) (1,6) 6) White paper(8) 7) Sahyogis trained in partner inputs &amp; comfortable in taking trainings (9,10)</td>
<td>- 10% increase in student learning outcomes YoY - 13% increase in teacher performance YoY - 16% increase in student enrolment YoY - Functioning SMCs( According to RTE Guidelines) - White paper published in a reputed education journal - Sahyogi training effectiveness in Y3</td>
<td>- Baseline, midline, endline - Student enrolment data - Teacher evaluation rubric - Outcomes - SMC evaluation tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>1) Effective school development plan(3) 2) Monthly SMC meetings(5,6,7) 3) Functioning academic support system in the school(2,9,10) 4) Increase in PSM data(1,4) 5) Content repository(8) 6) School process document(9,10) 7) Increased student enrolment YoY(6,7) 8) Newsletter(11) 9) Sahyogis will translate learnings from Y2 into other schools (12) 10) Sahyogis conduct trainings in model schools (13)</td>
<td>- HMs present their SDP to PMC- PCC-Corporators - 9 SMC meetings with reports - Academic coordinators submit quarterly reports on school processes, student activities, challenges faced and learnings - Quarterly newsletter shared with all the stakeholders - 5 student enrolment drives YoU - Shift in number of student on the PSM - Growth on Sahyogi effectiveness rubric - Partner feedback on quality of Sahyogi</td>
<td>- PSM test data - Partner reports</td>
<td>- Functional SMCS and strong community outreach will boost student enrolment - Support from PMC to deploy School Development Plan - Stable school staff with no transfers - Peer review and feedback between model school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1) Train and mentor teachers to use constructivist approach on a monthly basis 2) Conduct monthly planning workshop 3) Train and mentor HMs 4) Provide remedial education to students behind grade level 5) Train and mentor social workers 6) Formation of well functioning SMCs 7) Conduct community outreach programme(information dissemination and enrolment) 8) Develop and deploy resources for the school 9) Coach and monitor Academic Co-ordinators 10) Conduct periodic school review meetings 11) Constant capturing of data, processes and best practices 12) X no of sahyogis will shadow partners in Y2 13) X no of sahyogis will lead trainings in Y3</td>
<td>- Scores obtained by students in diagnostic tests and end of the year test results - Minimum 20 days of trainings conducted for teachers, HMs, SWs, ACs - SMC planning document - 4 school meetings a year - Minimum 10 ODCs per teacher per year - 9 planning workshops in a year - Collated content shared on Drive</td>
<td>- Diagnostic test(baseline, midline and endline) for identifying student learning - Quantitative and qualitative reporting by partners for students - Quarterly meetings with partners and technical committee - Quarterly report on school performance - Partner report on teacher, HM, SW performance</td>
<td>- Teachers, HMs and support staff are motivated to apply inputs provided by PCC and partners - Schools operate 7hrs a day with 6 hours of instructional time for the students - Healthy working relationship between School - PMC - PCC-Corporators - Lack of resistance from teacher unions - Funding available to recruit new people, pay partners and deploy resources - ECE sahyogi can be effective mentors for their Balwadi peers - Inspection instruments sensitive to remedial education plans - Sahyogi can coach and mentor teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Impact Metrics:- School Improvement Project

The project impact metrics for Year 0 for the SIP project are as follows:

Input Metrics:

**Academic Coordinator Inputs:** Inputs by academic coordinators such as: In-school training workshops, observation debrief cycles, etc will be assessed quantitatively and qualitatively for effectiveness as also to build and operationalize the AC role

**Partner Inputs:** Partner inputs such as Large group trainings, and in-service teacher training will be measured for effectiveness as well as compliance to contracts

**Social Worker Inputs:** Social worker effectiveness will be measured in terms of community visits, parent investment, etc. These will be reported to the Govt.

Output Metrics:

**Student Learning Outcomes:** Student learning outcomes across partners will be measured as an indicator of partner effectiveness

**Student Engagement:** % change in student attendance and enrollment will be measured as an indicator of Student engagement to to test project hypothesis

**Whole School Development:** Whole school development will be measured on the basis of Parent Teacher meetings, School Management Committe meetings as well as the readiness of the School Improvement Development project (as defined in the RTE act 2009).

**Project Outputs and Learning Documentation:** A “Project outcomes and Processes document” will be created by end of year one to meet project scalability, replicability and learning goals
Data Gathering Systems

As the project was in Y0, all our partners used their own development frameworks while providing on ground support. The idea behind this was to let the partners test their tools in the Pune context and then combine them in year 1 to form a common system across projects. That being said the following systems were used in the project:

Academic Co-ordinator Inputs and learning:

The ACs have used two different types of teachers for inputs(Quantitative) and learnings and next steps Qualitative. Please find a sample of what that looks like below:

Partner Inputs:

In Y0, data gathering and management was done according to partner requirements rather than standardized.

i) Balwadi Inputs: Balwadi Sahyogis would meet once a month with our training partners and ACs to discuss their inputs for the month and debrief the experience. This would be done in the form of discussion over feedback provided on the basis of videographed evidences from different classrooms.

ii) QUEST and ISLI Inputs: For Quest and ISLI, the ACs set up a structure where partner on ground staff and ACs would have once a month check ins to align on the inputs being provided to ensure that the teachers were not confused by conflicting inputs.

iii) Social Worker Inputs: Social worker inputs were recorded via handbooks that were provided to them.
Stories of Change

Design For Change

Every year Design For Change (DFC), India organizes “I CAN” challenge to encourage student leadership and empower them with problem solving skills. This year one of our SIP School “Pandit Deendayal Upadhayay, 74G” participated in the challenge and their project was selected as the top 100 most inspiring stories across India.

Project Name: अन्न हे पूण्यावास्थ !

- DFC project around preventing wastage of mid-day meal
- Std 4th students taking initiative to feel the problems, imagine the solutions and working on it.
- Selected as the top 100 most inspiring stories amongst a total of 3610 received stories from 27 states across India.

Prizes:

- Rs 10,000/- cash prize to continue the project.
- One year subscription of Tinkle Digest
- Set of 12 books from Amar Chitra Katha
- Invitation to two days “I CAN Awards 2016” event at Ahmedabad.

Different stages of DFC being followed by kids at 74G school
Process:

Three teachers from 74G school with the help of Academic coordinator decided to register for the challenge. The teacher were very enthusiastic to introduce this to their students. They collected the lesson plans and toolkit provided by DFC and begin their preparation.

Feel: The students began to realise that they can solve any problem. They started listing down the problems they see in themselves, in their school and communities. Some of the major problems that came up were “Students writing skills and handwriting”, “Wastage of food in lunch break” and “cleanliness in their community”. Post voting the students decided to work on the problem of food wastage in their school.

Imagine: At this stage the students went through multiple stages of finding a solution and understanding its effects. The students tries to get more ideas and explore the imagination of all the students by arranging a drawing competition. In the drawing competition the kids were asked to make different designs of broom, floor cleaning machine, food distributor robot based on students need, etc.

Do: Based on the ideas that came up in the imagine stage the kids decided to implement the top 3 ideas. Student committees were formed under the leadership of Raju-Meena manch. One committee worked on encouraging low wastage of food by discussing the importance of food in each classroom and by creating slogans against food wastage. Another committee made sure the kids take only the required amount of food. The third committee was responsible for collection even the small amount of waste food in the dustbins and keeping the school clean.

Share: The efforts of the students showed good results as the food wastage was reducing a lot. The kids were very excited to share their future plans and get support from parents as well. In the monthly parents meeting the idea was shared and parents were also encouraged to be aware of food wastage at their homes as well.

74G staff & student receiving the DFC certificate at the I CAN awards 2017
AC Inputs

In-school staff workshops

While all the partners in the SIP project work with different stakeholders the Academic Coordinators looks at the school development as a whole. Through daily school visits and classroom observations the ACs analyse the gaps in the school. ACs conduct in-school staff workshop to address gaps such as:

- Coach & Support the PMC teachers in the school by identifying their development needs on a regular basis.

- Support the School HM in developing and implementing the 3–year project goals aligned to improvement in learning outcomes & school enrolment

- Strengthen academic monitoring of the students through remediation interventions and spoken English programs

- Strengthen the intervention inputs at School level that are given by project partners through follow-up in classroom instruction/teaching learning practices.

The in-school staff workshop is a space where all the teachers and the HM come together. This is a space to reflect on the work we do and learn new things for personal growth. Through this year ACs conducted workshops in the following topics.
Workshops conducted by AC's in the past year:

1) **Getting to know each other**

In the beginning of the academic year most of the staff in the model schools were new to each other. So in order to know each other better and start building a positive school culture the first in-school workshop was planned.

2) **School values**

This workshop was designed to make the school staff more aware of their personal values. The HM with the help of AC facilitated the workshop. As the teachers reflect on their values they also felt the need to norm on school values. The session helped the staff to come up with 4-5 school values that they will focus on throughout the year.

3) **Teacher self evaluation**

As the partner inputs got intensified the teachers worked hard to implement it in their classes. For the teachers to be aware of their strengths and areas of development and see the growth in themselves it was essential to reflect regularly. This workshop was designed to reinforce the need for self-evaluation and also suggested tools to do so.
4) **Adapting to change**

This workshop was based on ‘adapting to change’ where teachers read the story “who moved my cheese” and reflected on their own attitude and approach when encountering change. Teachers were given bookmarks on which they pledged what they wanted to change/transform within them that will help them grow and develop more both personally and professionally.

**HM personal and professional development conversations**

To accelerate the leadership development of HMs in model schools the ACs work closely with them. The ACs in every school visit spends a good amount of time with the HMs. Collecting updates, getting to know the highs and lows in the school and planning for the week is the focus of every HM conversation. These conversations also aims at supporting the HM in the development of academic monitoring skills and planning to build a positive school culture.

**Classroom observation and debrief**

Academic coordinators observe 2-3 classrooms everyday and debrief the teachers based on the observation. ACs focus mostly on the classroom culture which includes teacher-student interactions, class values, rules, procedures, time management, etc. During the debrief the teachers are encouraged to self-analyse their lesson. The AC share the strengths of the teacher and also give them an area of development.

AC modeling phonics lesson in 94B school.
Social worker support

Academic coordinator supports the social workers by helping them in their daily planning and monitoring. The ACs are the first go to person for the SWs if they need help. The ACs provide the SWs with resources and strategies for parent engagement. The ACs help the SWs set priorities and define timely goals. The ACs also monitor the performance of the SWs and share the observations with Akanksha Foundation.
Partner Inputs (Training) in Y0 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Hours of Training</th>
<th>Training Topics</th>
<th>Training Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUEST</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Math: Concepts such as numbers, addition, subtraction, counting, multiplication, number story, concept of tens and units using sticks and bundles. Language: Reading articles, shared reading and read aloud, lesson practice, Paripath</td>
<td>Developing Teaching Learning material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>School Walk through process, instructional leadership, child protection policy, School improvement development plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balwadi Intervention</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Building ECE perspective for Balwadi teachers, Curriculum implementation, corner meetings, Free play</td>
<td>Developing Teaching Learning material, classroom set up practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 1 & 2 teachers at QUEST training center in Sonale village during exposure visit.

Quest on-ground staff co-teaching in 2B school.
Balwadi mukta khel toys exhibition & training.

HMs during the ISLI workshop.
Training Inputs Snapshot
Social Workers

Social Workers have been assigned to 9 out of the 15 SIP schools, post selection by the government. Social worker salaries and renewals are handled by the government. Social workers were hired for the following reasons:

1) **Connecting Schools to their Communities:** Though community participation is key to having well-functioning schools, a gap in this matter exists with PMC schools. There is no dedicated person in the school who leads community engagement at a school level. Communities and schools have to co-exist and a dedicated resource is what puts it into a high-performing school.

2) **Engaging Students:** Parents form an integral part of a child’s education, especially in ensuring that kids go to school regularly. Multiple schooling models (such as the Akanksha model), have shown that positive changes can be brought out by having a school staff member visit parents in their homes regularly and talk about the child’s progress.

With this in mind, the PCC team has convinced the government to hire social workers on their contractual payroll.
Social Worker Inputs have been the following:

1) **House visits**: Social workers visit students homes to communicate with parents and other family members. The idea is not only to keep parents updates on their kids actions, behaviour and performance in school but to also get to know parents to understand the child’s background.

2) **Parent Teacher Meetings**: Social workers have been a big driver for Parent Teacher meetings in schools. Before the project started, attendance of the parents at PTMs was very low. Therefore the social workers have been working towards getting more and more parents to schools.

3) **School Management Committee Meetings**: Even though SMCs (as defined by the RTE act 2009) exist in PMC schools, most are functional only on paper. This is due to a lack of understanding by parents of what the SMC is supposed to do as well as a lack of drive by headmasters to get it up and running. Therefore the Social workers have concentrated on getting SMCs up and running this year.

SMC meeting at 94B school lead by HM & SW.
Social worker job description
5

Outputs

Student Learning Outcomes

As this was Year 0 of the SIP project, the focus was on setting up the project with government investment, driving school level cultures and preparing for RCTs and other studies that are to begin in Year 1. We did have 3 organizations carry their internal testing and the results are presented below:

CLR Let’s Read and Write Program (LWRE):

The CLR LWRE program is an audio-visual, animation based program to learn English that was used in grades 3 & 4 across 13 Marathi medium schools. The pre and post test data is presented below:

![CLR Pre-Test and Post-Test图表](image)

Pretest in Grade 4 vs Post test in Grade
As we can see, there is a lack of uniformity in growth across schools (in some cases learning levels have decreased) as also no correlation between lessons taught and growth. Working with the CLR team this is our current hypothesis:

1) Change Testing Methodology: The issues in the data could be because of the testing methodology used. The current testing measures Grade 4 (without the CLR program) students at the start of the year and Grade 3 students at the end of the year (with the CLR program). This type of testing usually works with larger sets of students as factors such as teacher skill can be neutralised in this testing methodology. But as this is a pilot implementation, a cohort study will need to be done.

2) Testing Window: As this year was Y0, it was not possible to conduct the pre-test at the start of the year and so testing was carried out in September. Therefore, teachers were not able to complete the lessons that were required to show significant change in outcomes.

These changes will be implemented as part of the testing methodology next year 2017-18.
Baseline Test Results and Learning

Baseline tests were also carried out by QUEST and Grammangal. Please find an overview of results and learnings from the process below.

**QUEST:**

As the RCTs for the QUEST implementation begin in Y1, in Y0 they conducted only a diagnostic test to help drive their differentiated remediation programmes.

Post testing, QUEST divides the students into 4 groups A,B,C & D. Where Group A is the students with the lowest learning levels and D is with the Highest learning levels.

![Grouping based on test conducted by Teachers](image)
Learnings:

Data reliability: Data reliability is going to be a big issue if the testing is going to be conducted by teachers, as there is a fear that they will be held accountable for student learnings. As can be seen above, the graph of student learning levels shifts dramatically when teachers are asked to base students in groups (rather than test them). Therefore, for all testing from now onwards on this project external evaluators will be used as far as possible.
Grammangal testing was carried out by external evaluators and is by far the most valid in terms of student learning levels. Please find details below:

**Teacher testing:**

Teacher testing by Grammangal was carried out in-person for teachers of Grades 6-8.
As we can see, there is a big gap between teacher knowledge levels and the levels required for teaching grade level content. The most disturbing aspect of this data is that the maximum mastery for any area/topic does not cross 34%.

Grade 6: Marathi and Math Achievement Levels

Grade 8: Marathi and Math Learning Levels.

More detailed data points can be found in Partner reports attached at the end of this document.
Student Engagement

Student engagement is a key part of our project outcomes. Our Causal pathway defines the outcomes of student engagement as increase in student attendance and enrolment. Though enrolment can be seen only year on year, as new batches come into schools and mobility happens in the summer break, attendance is an on-going metric.


As can be seen by the data above there is a 4% increase in attendance between September 2016 and March 2016. As the overall enrolment across 15 schools is 5310 students, a 4% increase signifies that on average 212 more students are in school everyday owing to project implementation.
Community Engagement

Community engagement activities were as follows: These activities were carried out by Headmasters and Social workers across schools.

Number of SMC Meetings per school; Number of PTMs per school

Social worker from 24G during house visits.
School Culture
All staff meetings:

Staff meetings were conducted by Academic Coordinators for various purposes in the school:

1. **Punctuality:** There were many instances where it was observed that the teachers were not coming to school on time. It impacted the effective execution of many activities such as value based morning assemblies, classrooms instructions and implementation of partner inputs according to time table. The Academic Coordinators conducted multiple meetings with the staff where they got them to discuss and share the causes behind it and led them to reflect on the consequences. Such sessions led to an increased conscious efforts by staff to be on time.

2. **Personal development sessions:** These sessions were conducted with the idea to build reflective practices in the school staff. The focus was more on leadership and personal development of school staff along with building in team unity and relationships.

In School session by AC for teachers
3. **Open sharing space:** Given this was year zero, the schools were facing multiple challenges in order to adapt to the change. Staff meetings were conducted in order to understand their challenges which ranged from infrastructure issues, political issues to relationship issues within the staff. These meetings became a space which provided staff the opportunity to be heard, where they discussed challenges with the Academic coordinator, brainstorm solutions with them and shared feedback on their expectations and the programs that were running in school.

4. **ISLI knowledge sharing:** The HMs conducted monthly meetings with the staff where they shared their learnings from the ISLi Trainings with the teachers

---

**Teacher Reflection:**

1. **Change** has been the biggest highlight for our SIP schools this year. Be it the no of school hours which changed from 5 hours to 7 hours or the teaching learning practices, our teachers and HMs have commendably adapted themselves and have been putting in a lot of efforts in their classrooms and schools respectively. Acknowledging the acceptance that has come towards these changes in a year now we still struggle with closed mindset and resistance playing out in many forms such as low motivation and confidence, absenteeism, irregularity, the desire to get transferred, attitude towards children and low sense of possibility.

   **Action Steps:** Since there are many technical inputs already being given by partners there was a strong need felt to plan and conduct regular in school leadership development sessions for the school staff where they get opportunities to read, discuss, debate, reflect on themselves. The idea was to provide the staff the opportunity to grow and develop as individuals which proves to be beneficial for them in various aspects of their life.

   The first session was about the need and importance of ‘self analysis’. Teachers were pushed to self evaluate their own classrooms during observations debriefs.

   The second session, was based on identifying school values which the staff collectively decided on by identifying their own personal values. They were later pushed to conduct assemblies based on school values for each grade separately.
The third session, was based on ‘**adapting to change**’ where teachers read the story “who moved my cheese” and reflected on their own attitude and approach when encountering change. Teachers were given bookmarks on which they pledged what they wanted to change/transform within them that will help them grow and develop more both personally and professionally.

2. **Teacher self evaluation**: The academic coordinators worked closely with the pushed teachers to evaluate their own classrooms during observation debriefs where the teachers identified their strengths and areas of development in the classroom and discussed concrete simple steps of improvement that they would strive to bring about in their next class. The rubric below, is part of the tool used by teachers for self-evaluation. It provides, current status as well as clear next steps for teacher development.
School Level Outputs

1. **SIDP:**

With ISLI’s support HMs have made SIDP’s for their respective schools on which work will kick start from the new academic year. As first timers our HMs did struggle in making SIDPs but having gone through the process they have developed the basic skills to draft one. These SIDPs are surely bound to change in the coming months but the process of drafting one in itself proved to be valuable. It pushed the HM to involve the staff and work as a team towards school transformation leading to an improved staff engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Goal</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time School</th>
<th>Success Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.15.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.15.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of an SIDP from 74G school.
2. Social worker goal setting:

In November we were able to get 10 social workers hired for 9 of our SIP schools. The idea was to introduce the need of such a resource in the public school system who would act as a liaison between the community and the school. Our idea is to show that student learning and engagement can be strengthened by focusing on parent investment (the absence of which impacts enrollment), student attendance and absenteeism and strengthening the SMC committee (which can easily push schools to be accountable for learning outcomes).

In the months of December and Jan, these Social Workers underwent a 4-day intensive training conducted by Akanksha foundation along with a follow up session in Jan. As stated by our HMs: “their presence in schools have proved to be very helpful in increasing the average daily student attendance” which in turn has also been benefitting the classroom interventions.

Although the challenge that had been lurking since day one is the skill gap as they do not have MSW degrees or background in social work. Until January the HMs too were not clear on how to manage and monitor the social workers despite having shared the Job description with them, which led to lots of gaps in the output that was expected after 4 months of them being on board. Therefore, we brainstormed with Akanksha foundation and came to a decision to hold a joint meeting where Social workers, HMs and Academic Coordinators will come together and discuss challenges, expectations and plan individual goals suitable to the context of each school for the next two months which just got reviewed. This has brought about a lot of momentum, built accountability and pushed the the Social Workers to perform.
3. School Values:

Each school has identified/chosen their set of 5 core values that the school will stand for. These values were chosen on the basis of the fact that it resonated with the context and the requirement of the school. Some of the schools have already displayed the values either in the staffroom or corridor. The Academic coordinators are striving to push the staff to drive these values within themselves as well as their classrooms.

Examples of school values from 22G urdu & 74G school.
4. Balwadi classroom set up:

The Balwadi classrooms now look completely transformed as compared to the way they were in the beginning of the year. Mentored by our Balwadi Consultant, the Balwadi sahyogis helped the teachers set up the classroom that supports and pushes every child’s cognitive and motor development. Teachers collected low cost playing and learning materials for the classroom over a period of six month. For an instance, every morning the teacher sets up various theme and play activities indoor and outdoor alternatively where children are free to choose where they want to engage themselves. Another example is the set up of a playing corner where children do role plays based on their observation from daily life e.g. shop, hospital, etc.

5. Multi-grade, multi-level student groups:

Students from grade 1-2 and 3-5 are being taught Math and language through LIPI and Saksham programs designed by Quest where they are grouped on the basis of their skills in those subjects. This is helping all the children get differentiated support and an increased engagement in the classroom.
Systemic Investment

Shikshan Mandal Stepback

The Shikshan Mandal step-back was a first of a kind conversation between the education department and PCC staff. The meeting was held outside the city at the campuses of Forbes Marshall in PCMC.

The aims of the Step-back were as follows:

• To provide a safe space where government stakeholders could share their concerns and expectations from the projects run by PCC

• To deepen PCCs understanding of the Pune Education landscape by spending extended time with the government team

• To problem solve on multiple issues that had been chronically cause issues with project strategy and implementation

• To foster a culture of an all inclusive “Pune Education team” rather than a government team and an NGO team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. no</th>
<th>Project Issue Head</th>
<th>Background/Discussions</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staffing (Teacher vacancies, english teachers)</td>
<td>Staffing has been an issue in Model schools. There is currently a vacancy of 18. Also, english teachers promised from the english medium were not available this year as english medium had a shortage.</td>
<td>Teachers will be provided by Mandal.</td>
<td>29th Feb</td>
<td>Akshat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide number of teachers per school including increase in teachers required in schools where 8th grade is opening</td>
<td>10th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check availability of teachers for non-english subjects from other schools</td>
<td>25th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct school merging if enough teachers not available to get teachers</td>
<td>15th April</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assign teachers to Model schools</td>
<td>15th April</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English teachers to be discussed with grades 8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grades 8-10 (Teacher staffing, infrastructure and classrooms)</td>
<td>Currently model does not have the requisite teachers, infrastructure and classrooms required for 8-10 grades. Also, as this comes under Madhyamik and even they have teacher vacancies we cannot ask them to provide funds and teachers.</td>
<td>Self finance proposal will have to be submitted to PMC. That usually takes upto a year therefore it will have to wait.</td>
<td>30th April</td>
<td>EO &amp; PCC team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self finance proposal to be submitted to PMC</td>
<td>15th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a social worker performance review tool</td>
<td>10th March</td>
<td>Akshat &amp; Akanksha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review social workers</td>
<td>15th March</td>
<td>EO and PCC team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove low performing social workers</td>
<td>15th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation MSD social workers with MSDs from UCD</td>
<td>30th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation new social workers from UCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AAOs and supervisors management and responsibility</td>
<td>The PCC team has found it difficult to engage AAOs and Supervisors in year 0 of the project which has caused issues on the ground.</td>
<td>Call for a meeting for all AAOs and Supervisors. Bi-weekly updates to all officers. All officers take responsibility for their model schools.</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>1st March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation meeting for all offices</td>
<td>20th March</td>
<td>Akshat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Set Model School steering committee procedures (HM, officers, PCC staff members per school)</td>
<td>1st March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring of process</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intake age for Balwadi</td>
<td>Even after duplicates are being removed from school lists via SARAL, there are multiple kids who have long absentee records and have dropped out of the school system. This is causing aberration in teacher placements, and so teachers are not available for SIP and SSD and RCT data.</td>
<td>These students need to be removed from the system</td>
<td>20th March</td>
<td>Damini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sahyogis do an actual headcount</td>
<td>30th March</td>
<td>Damini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sahyogis collect long absentee student names</td>
<td>30th March</td>
<td>Damini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are cleared from the system</td>
<td>30th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Model School Project Enrollment</td>
<td>Varied intake age for Balwadi makes it difficult for Balwadi teachers to implement training provided by partners. Discussion: Mandal cannot turn away students as they will just go join private schools.</td>
<td>Pass paperwork for the same</td>
<td>10th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform Balwadi teachers and HMs</td>
<td>3rd March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Model School Project Head</td>
<td>We need a project head to follow up on paperwork so that salaries and pay happen on time</td>
<td>Select strong clerk</td>
<td>10th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meet SIP project heads once every two weeks</td>
<td>15th March</td>
<td>PCC team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Changing school staff (low performing/late absenteeism)</td>
<td>Even after 10 months of intervention, some model school staff seem uninterested. Some of them are also permanently late absent. About 10% of all Model school teachers come under this category</td>
<td>Hold meetings and give an official notice to school staff</td>
<td>6th March</td>
<td>Veenu and Mayuresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO holds a meetings for school staff in list</td>
<td>7th March</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO sends official notice post meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement biometric system for all model schools</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Akshat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School leadership challenges</td>
<td>Some school leaders are not performing, and without a strong school leader it is going to be difficult for the project to succeed as school leader is a conduct for a major part of our implementation</td>
<td>Provide list of underperforming school leaders</td>
<td>6th March</td>
<td>Akshat, Veenu and Mayuresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change underperforming school leaders</td>
<td>30th March</td>
<td>Akshat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Model School report for Government</td>
<td>All data compiled by PCC across implementations needs to be put in a report so that EO and other officers can use it as a reference while talking about the project.</td>
<td>Make report</td>
<td>5th April</td>
<td>Veenu and Mayuresh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step-back Outcomes
Policy Changes: Significant Shifts in School Improvement Process

The multiple policy changes have been implemented in Pune for the SIP project are as follows:

- **One Building one school:** The Shikshan Mandal passed policy to ensure that 14 out of our 15 schools have only one school in every building, as opposed to 2 or 3 schools earlier. This has helped in integrating resources to better utilize them, have enough teachers to teach every classroom as well as reduce logistical and operational overhead for schools. A lot of political navigating was required to get this done as schools in the same building had to be combined.

- **Extended school timings:** All SIP schools function for 7 hours a day for teachers and 6 hours for students, as opposed to 5 hours for students and teachers earlier. This has not only helped to increase the learning time for students in schools, but also has helped to provide teachers with the time to finish non-classroom teaching duties such as paper correction, administrative work, etc.

- **Limiting transfers:** Teacher transfers have been limited in such a way that SIP teachers are to be transferred only in the 15 school system. This ensures that teachers who are receiving inputs as part of the project remain in the system for at least 3 years for maximum impact.

- **Extra government funds allocated:** The Pune city government passed a resolution to spend 5 Crores on 15 schools for next 2 years on upgrading the infrastructure as well as printing extra workbooks and test papers (chosen and built by PCC and partners).

- **Social Workers:** The Education Department also hired 10 social workers for the SIP project (from the PMC UCD Urban Community Development department), reinforcing the project focus area of working with communities to increase parent participation in schools, increase school accountability and enrolment in schools.
Learnings

Project Strategy

As the SIP project was in Year0, a lot of our initiatives in terms of project strategy have succeeded but many have also failed. Learnings are as below:

Admin & Political Stakeholders:

As the project has progressed we have realised the need to engage with diverse administrative political stakeholders for the project. PCC has also realised that this engagement cannot be only for solving issues, but that they must be an integral part of the project. Pune has one of the oldest education unions in the country, is inherently political. One of our major pushes next year is going to be co-creating project strategy with such diverse stakeholders.

Not all Systemic issues can be solved with local policy:

As part of our project prerequisites PCC had convinced the government to pass local policy to enable English language teachers from schools with English as a medium of instruction to be brought into our schools. Even with this policy in place, the SIP schools did not receive said teachers as there is a shortage of teachers in English medium schools, and hiring is on hold due to policy passed by the Government of Maharashtra. Therefore the only option left are either to find ways around this or engage with the State Government to make hiring possible.

Metrics vs Measures of Success:

Last year’s LFA uses Measures of success instead of metrics to measure project outcomes. One realization has been that outcomes of systemic projects are inherently difficult to predict, the project has far surpassed some of our measures of success but has achieved very little on some others. Therefore PCC will be updating its project design to use metrics.
Quick Wins:

Another learning has been around managing expectations regarding project outcomes. Some of the changes we want to see as part of the project are long term (Motivated teachers, RCT data, etc) in such cases, “Quick Wins” are required to keep government as well as project staff motivated. Therefore these quick wins will be part of PCC project implementation and communication strategy from now on.

Project Operations

Learnings from project operations are as below:

Delivery Timelines for Learning Material:

A lot of the learning material for schools was provided by the government for the SIP project (as defined by PCC/Partners). One of PCC’s learnings this year, is that this process has to go through multiple departments and therefore the turn around time is usually in the range of 3-4 months. Therefore PCC will be providing lists of content and material even more in advance for Y1.

Staffing:

Having 2 Academic Coordinators across 15 schools leaves them very stretched and reduces impact on the ground due to sheer scale of the project. Therefore PCC will be hiring at least 2 more Academic Coordinators for the project.

Partner Alignment:

There has been a little trouble getting 7 educational organizations to align with each others work not only due to inherently different approaches to work across the organizations, but also due to logistical difficulties arising from partners being onboarded at different times a year. Therefore a structure will be built into program operations for Y1 to foster stronger collaboration.
Data Reliability:

With baseline tests having been conducted by teachers themselves, we have realised that the data is unreliable and therefore cannot be used to guide instruction. Though there is a larger teacher mindset piece here, that is being worked upon already by PCC staff and Partners, simultaneously all the testing for the RCTs will be carried out by 3rd party agencies.

Large Distributed Data Sets:

This project also deals with large distributed datasets (such as community mapping to enable enrollment drives). In such a scenario, a technology solution is required to enable maximum effectiveness. As a pilot, the community mapping will be done in Y1 with a tablet and a custom built app. Based on the success of the pilot, the program can be scaled.

On-Ground Support:

Currently only 3 out of our 7 partners provide on-ground support. As compared to the implementations of the 4 partners who do not, these implementations are receiving extremely positive feedback from school staff on teacher/staff confidence in implementing new content/methodology as well as mastery over training content. Therefore we are in the process of re-working MoUs with partners to push for the same.
Feedback from Stakeholders

As part of our project strategy, we also collected feedback from stakeholders in the form of Focus Group Discussions. These FGDs were carried across 4 schools (3 marathi and 1 Urdu) and is summarized by partner as below:

**ISLI:**

The overall feedback from Headmasters for the ISLI program was positive. HM’s felt valued as school leaders and not just as administrative heads. Multiple structures introduced in schools by ISLI were well appreciated such as school walk throughs and peer coaching. The HMs also said that the on-ground support provided by ISLI CPMs was valid and helpful but that they would need more of it. HMs also said that sometimes following through on ISLI next steps is difficult because of the administrative load that they have, and would request was ways to reduce the same. They also said that the training needs to be more contextualized and broken down into smaller chunks so that it is more usable. On average, HMs across the 4 schools rated ISLI at a 3 out of 4.

**QUEST:**

The overall feedback for QUEST was also positive. The teachers thoroughly enjoyed the trainings and were very thankful for the on ground support by QUEST staff. The teachers mentioned how the implementation of the training was possible only because of this support. The teachers also mentioned that they found QUEST methodology to be useful, but felt it would be too difficult to meet QUEST’s benchmarks of catering to all children, especially if they have more that 35 kids in a class. There was also a discrepancy in the support received by grades 1 & 2 and Grades 3-5 (support for Grades 1 & 2 being more). Average rating by teachers for the QUEST Program was 3 out of 4.
Grammangal:

The overall feedback for Grammangal was mixed. Though the teachers enjoyed the training and felt it was useful, they felt the lack of on-ground support. The teachers believed that though they had learnt a lot, on-ground support would be required to have those learnings trickle down to students. The teachers also said that as in many schools, there is subject teaching in grades 6-8 they would not want to sit for the trainings of other subjects. The overall rating from Grammangal was 2 out of 4.

Pratham:

The overall feedback for Pratham was mixed. Though the feedback for language training was good, teachers were very unhappy with the Mathematics training. The teachers have requested that specific classroom material be provided to work with students at different level, and on-ground support be provided to help implement the trainings. Teachers also said that sometimes trainings aren’t contextual to the grades that they teach and therefore trainings should be differentiated.

CLR:

The overall feedback for CLR’s LWRE animated program was positive. The teachers said that the students were very engaged by the content, and they had seen growth in students learning levels. The concerns that were raised were more around the infrastructure for implementation rather than the implementation itself. Teachers also mentioned that they were not able to complete all lessons due to not having enough time and therefore PCC and partner expectations need to change, as this content was extra apart from the textbook. The teachers said that it would be good to have some textbook content come into the program so as to enable textbook content also to be covered by this program.
**Balwadi programme:**

The overall feedback on the Balwadi program was positive. The HMs said that they saw changes in classrooms as classrooms now looked more structured. The teachers enjoyed the training and said that this was the first time they felt recognized for their contributions to kids learnings. The Balwadi teachers also said that the on-ground support offered by Sahyogis was helpful. The overall rating for the Balwadi program is 4 out of 4.

**AC:**

Overall the feedback for ACs has been positive. The HMs mentioned how that had a good working relationship and felt free to share their troubles with the AC. The teachers also mentioned how the coaching and mentoring was helping them realize their own strengths and weaknesses. The DFC project session carried out by ACs also received positive feedback. The HMs though felt that the ACs should spend more time in school and help liasoning with the shikshan mandal to help solve issues at the school level.

**PCC and Shikshan Mandal:**

Though specific questions were not asked around this, a lot of feedback came in from the open ended questions which were part of the FGDs. The teachers are unhappy that they are not financially compensated for the extra work that they put in(as compare to teachers in other schools). The teachers also mentioned that they were being pulled out of classrooms for administrative duties, and that had to stop of they were to be able to implement partner implementations to the highest degree. Also, HMs mentioned that even though they managed 2 schools in the same building, the schools hadn't been combined, which added to their administrative overload.
## Finances

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No.</th>
<th>Expense Head</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full-time staff compensation</td>
<td>₹ 19,48,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Costs</td>
<td>₹ 5,67,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partner Expenses</td>
<td>₹ 68,06,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff Re-imbursements</td>
<td>₹ 29,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff Professional Development &amp; Step-back</td>
<td>₹ 12,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditure**  
₹ 93,64,984

---

**Supported by**

[Logos of various sponsors]