

Let us Help Children Learn



E Q U I P
IMPACT EVALUATION

Report of the STUDY
Conducted & Presented by

Prof. P. Sandeep

October 2006

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Executive Summary | i - v |
| Backdrop | 1 |
| Basic Questions | 5 |
| Survey | 5 |
| Findings of the Study | 6 |
| A. Teachers' Responses | 7 |
| B. Students' Responses | 17 |
| C. Parents' Responses | 22 |
| D. Scholastic Achievement | 25 |
| E. Opinions | 28 |
| Summary of Findings | |
| a. Summary for Surveys | 33 |
| b. Summary for Scholastic Achievement | 37 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 38 |
| Conclusions | 41 |

Backdrop:

The CfBT as not-for-profit education resource management organisation declared that it supports schools, trains teachers and assists the Governments in bringing about educational improvement. As part of its endeavour, the CfBT states, it enables individuals, communities and institutions to maximize their potential. A CfBT study in Andhra Pradesh and Tamilnadu revealed that "small and medium education institutes served a large majority of students but did not have the resources and in many cases not even the basic infrastructure to provide quality education". This compelled the CfBT to explore the possibilities of partnerships with financial institutions for capacity building in such schools; and, it found the HSBC responding to the perceived needs.

The HSBC, it is stated, as part of its education initiative aims to provide access to education particularly for children from disadvantaged background who might not have otherwise the opportunity to go to school. Accordingly HSBC states that it funds education projects across the world to help give young people hope, a positive attitude, opportunities for success and, above all, a better future.

It is obvious that confluence of these two streams of thought and action is highly desirable to ensure quality education to all, especially Unreached and unreachable.

As stated earlier, the CfBT study in Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy revealed that the private schools faced some common problems/issues, such as: teacher turnout, student dropout,

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

fear of delegation, competition with other schools and inadequate and limited resources. In order to help such schools, its initiative was intended to maximize their potential through services such as, School Improvements Plans, School Manager Training Programmes, In-Service Teacher Training Programmes. Parent Orientation Programmes; etc. It is obvious from this that through its inputs CfBT is attempting to increase the confidence and motivation levels among managements and heads of schools, offer support and encouragement of teachers so that they identify with the profession and excel in their professional endeavours; and these converge in providing quality education to students through innovative need based and learner centered approaches. But to accomplish this one more concurrent input is essential in terms of improved infrastructure and other facilities that ensure creation of quality teaching-learning situations. That is exactly the role earmarked for HSBC. Such joint effort by CfBT and HSBC, it is believed, can ensure improvement in standards and pave the way for excellence in education.

EQUIP is the combined effort of HSBE and CfBT, which has a declared objective of providing support for all round quality improvement in schools serving low income families. The existing private schools for low-income families are provided loans for infrastructure improvements such as laboratories, libraries, child friendly furniture, teaching and learning material for teachers, sports equipment, toilets, etc; and, the schools that and combined effort, it can be seen as an opportunity for the school to improve their lot - both in terms of material and manpower

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

resources and there by contributing to qualitatively improved output - student excellence.

Basic Questions:

How is, EQUIP, the combined effort of HSBC and CfBT working? That is, can an integrated programme of financial assistance and technical support increase the quality of provision of schooling for the poor?

Has it resulted in any ripple effect on neighbouring institutions?

What are the positive out-comes on the indicators like, Leadership & Management of the School; Quality of Teaching; Governance and Relationships; School Infrastructure; and, Learners' Achievement?

SURVEY

In order to obtain data a two stage survey approach was adopted for this evaluation study, viz., Baseline Survey and Impact Assessment Survey.

The target for the evaluation was found to consist of two streams of schools: EQUIP (HSBC + CfBT) schools and WSIP (CfBT) schools. The sample schools for the study were selected by adopting systematic random sampling method. Accordingly five schools in each group - EQUIP and WSIP were selected, and they are:

EQUIP : Wisdom High School, Sai Krupa High School,
LR Kishore High School, Kasturba High School and
Lotus High School.

WSIP : Manchi High School; Mission School;
Neo Rosary School; Oshin High School;
St. Zains High School.

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

In addition as Control Group the following schools were selected through simple random sampling method.

Neighbourhood Schools:

Falcon High School; Indira High School;
Sunbeam High School; Neo Holy Fatima High School;
Silver Drop High School.

There is an approximate time gap of nine months between conducting Baseline Survey and Impact Survey. It is to be noted here that all the three types of schools have similar characteristics, such as:

- ✍ Average strength on rolls : 200-300 students
- ✍ Catering to low socio-economic group
- ✍ Average fee ranges from Rs. 100 to Rs. 250 per month.

The sample size of Baseline and Impact surveys for Teachers, Students and Parents are as follows:

| SURVEY | TEACHERS | STUDENTS | PARENTS |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Baseline | 194 | 425 | 309 |
| Impact | 95 | 314 | 46 |
| Total | 289 | 739 | 355 |

In addition, 15 Members of Management, 15 Head Masters were also interviewed and their opinions were sought through structured questionnaire.

Further Scholastic Achievement Record for the corresponding Academic Year (2005-2006) consisting of achievements in English Language, Mathematics and General Science were collected from both EQUIP and WSIP Schools.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study are presented in the sections that follow in the order of Baseline Survey followed by Impact Survey; and at the end a conclusions section summarizes the findings and brings out the Parameters on which Impact is visible and where still need for improvement. Further as stated earlier as part of the study three questionnaires were administered to Teachers, Students and Parents, in Baseline as well as Impact surveys. Accordingly the presentation follows the sequence of discussing the findings on Teachers, Students and Parents.

A. Teachers' Responses:

I. Leadership & Management::

1. Vision:

Baseline Survey (TR) : Among WSIP schools only one school teachers stated that their school shares its vision with all and the school's vision is reviewed on a regular basis involving all the stakeholders. At the same time among EQUIP schools none was ready either to share vision or review the same regularly.

Impact Survey (TR) : The teachers, of three WSIP schools and one EQUIP school, informed that their schools made known to all the vision of the school and as far reviewing is concerned teachers of two WSIP schools and teachers of one EQUIP school have stated that they started reviewing the school vision involving all the stakeholders.

2. Administration:

The field of administration has items that call for teachers responses related to 'smooth administration' and 'leadership and management decisions that contribute to school's success.

Baseline (TR): Only one each of the WSIP and EQUIP schools, the teachers were found to feel that the decisions of the management and leadership contribute most to the school's success; and, teachers from three of the EQUIP schools state that they have smooth administration in schools while teachers from none of the CfBT schools were confidently saying the same.

Impact (TR): While almost all WSIP schools' teachers stated that they strongly agree that the decisions of the management and leadership contribute most to their school's success; only two schools' teachers from EQUIP could strongly agree with it; and while three of WSIP schools' teachers agree that the administration in their schools is smooth; none from the EQUIP schools contributed to the idea that administration in their schools is smooth.

3. Policies and Procedures:

Baseline (TR): Teachers of both WSIP and EQUIP schools mostly put their respective schools under average category with regard to policies and procedures which means that their school do face problems with regard to government rules and regulations; maintaining records properly, etc.

Impact (TR): But this situation has changed by the time of the impact survey. The responses of the teachers from WSIP and EQUIP schools indicated that one school each from these two categories have changed their approach as a result they do not face problems with regard to government rules and

regulations; school rules and are made known to all and all official records are updated and maintained properly. However, this change is more promiscuous in WSIP schools and is catching up with EQUIP schools.

4. Team work in Organisation:

Baseline Survey (TR) revealed that team work in the schools, both WSIP and EQUIP, is not very encouraging as - managements are not very supportive of staff; teachers can not express opinions freely; principal is less approachable; management pays less attention to job related problems; principal and staff interaction is less frequent; interaction among colleagues is less frequent; management is lenient in stringent action against irregular and inefficient teachers.

Impact Survey (TR) findings revealed, on the other hand, that there is a change in the perspective. Atleast three of the WSIP schools and two from EQUIP schools have exhibited changed scenario when managements are supportive of the staff; staff freely express opinions and concerns to the management; principal is approachable; management pays attention to job related problems of teaching staff; principal is interacting every day with staff; interaction among teaching staff is good; and, management is taking stringent steps against irregular and inefficient teachers.

II. Teaching & Learning ::

1. Expectations:

During the **Baseline Survey (TR)**, atleast two WSIP schools and three EQUIP schools were found, in the words of teachers, to have high academic standards and high performance expectations for all their students.

This high expectation of academic standards and performance was found to be more promiscuous and prominently seen during the **Impact Survey (TR)**. It means that the notion of academic standards and performance has taken more as necessity than a mere feeling.

2. Child Centered Curriculum:

The teachers responses in **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that only one of the WSIP and two EQUIP schools' teachers were providing age appropriate and challenging work to students; whereas the **Impact Survey (TR)** revealed that most of the schools in these two categories moved on to practice of providing age appropriate and challenging work to the students.

On the provision of enough resource material for all the students, **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that WSIP school are below average in performance and needed much improvement; whereas among EQUIP schools, two were good and 3 were at average level in the provision of enough resources. This trend has not improved by **Impact Survey (TR)** with WSIP schools. However, the EQUIP schools could maintain and have improved in their performance as all of them were found to provide enough resource material for all the students. This can be also substantiated by the observations made during the visits to the schools when students were found to be working on various projects with the help of materials provided by the school and even holding science exhibitions.

Similarly with regard to extra curricular activities, while **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that all WSIP schools needed

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

improvement to meet students' interest and needs for conducting extra curricular activities, atleast three EQUIP schools were able to meet interest and needs of students. However, by the time of **Impact Survey (TR)** the WSIP schools' status has improved and the remaining EQUIP schools have geared up and improved in meeting the interests and needs of students through extra curricular activities.

3. Methods of Teaching:

At the time of **Baseline Survey (TR)**, in the teachers responses, it was found that mostly in WSIP schools teachers were found to need improvement in their instruction; where as atleast two of the EQUIP school teachers were just above average in their instructional strategies.

However, by the **Impact Survey (TR)** time WSIP schools and EQUIP schools in all were found to be providing instruction which includes the active participation of students.

Similarly, in the area of Home Work Assignments, at the time of Baseline Survey all WSIP school teachers and most of the EQUIP school teachers needed improvement. The Impact Survey revealed that two WSIP school's and one EQUIP school's teachers improved and started giving home work assignments that are appropriate and productive.

4. Student Assessment:

In the area of Student Assessment, the **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that one WSIP school teachers and two EQUIP school teachers only were sometimes discussing the students' progress with him/her. But this trend changed with three WSIP school teachers and two EQUIP school teachers picking

up the practice of discussing the students' progress with them regularly, by the time of **Impact Survey (TR)**.

Similarly, with regard to engaging students with variety of activities the **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that teachers from one WSIP and two EQUIP schools were giving students a variety of ways to show how well they have learned. But this trend has changed by **Impact Survey (TR)** time, when three WSIP school teachers and two EQUIP school teachers turned to the practice of giving students a variety of ways to show how well they have learned.

5. Student Support:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that all WSIP schools' teachers were just average in their approach to students particularly with regard to students talking to teachers freely about their problems or concerns; whereas, in the case of EQUIP school teachers it is found that the teachers are generally good in their approach to students. However, the **Impact Survey (TR)** revealed that things changed with WSIP schools as the teachers were found encouraging students to freely talk about their problems and concerns. In the case of EQUIP school one school excelled in this process and the others continued to practice and maintain supportive interaction with their students.

Further the **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that all WSIP school teachers on an average were supporting their students by respecting them and caring them. On the other hand with two of the EQUIP school teacher mostly they were found to be supporting their students. In the **Impact Survey (TR)** it was found that all WSIP school teachers picked up the thread and started extending support to their students,

and at the same with only two of the EQUIP school their teachers were found to extending the desired support to their students.

6. Student Discipline:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** findings revealed that WSIP school teachers in general were at average level in handling student discipline problems, quickly and fairly; whereas among EQUIP schools, teachers were found to be good in handling discipline problems. Consequent **Impact Survey (TR)** revealed that teachers from WSIP and EQUIP in all could handle the discipline problems quickly and fairly. This is further strengthened by the Impact Survey observation that teachers relatively do not have any discipline problems while teaching compared to the Baseline Survey.

7. Professionalism among Staff:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that teachers of both WSIP and EQUIP were mostly either needed improvement and or just average on the level of the professional skills like preparing and adhering to lesson plans; using a variety of teaching aids including innovative ways of teaching and also were not satisfied with their salaries. On the other hand the **Impact Survey (TR)** revealed that situation has bettered in many WSIP and some EQUIP schools. However, 'satisfactory salary' appears to be still lacking in most of the schools.

8. Continuous Professional Development:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** indicated that WSIP school teachers mostly needed improvement on continuous professional development front. On the other hand, the

EQUIP school were in a better disposition. However, by the time of the **Impact Survey (TR)** both categories of school brought into order the staff appraisal system and also started providing opportunities for professional growth of an development of teachers.

III. Infrastructure::

1. Cleanliness:

In the **Baseline Survey (TR)** it was found that mostly both the categories of schools (WSIP & EQUIP) were at average level in providing basic amenities, in giving importance to personal hygiene and cleanliness. The **Impact Survey (TR)** revealed that EQUIP schools improved a lot and provided basic amenities (toilets & Drinking water), insisted on personal hygiene and cleanliness of students; and ensured clean and well maintained classrooms. [The improved ambience can be seen in the visuals] By and large similar improvements are seen in all but one WSIP schools, where the school is lagging in maintenance of classes. On the whole, there is remarkable change in this front which is visible to the visitors.

2. Safety:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that both WSIP and EQUIP schools were more or less similar at the average level in their disposition towards safety of students and providing medical care to students. However the situation finds a change by the time of **Impact Survey (TR)** when both categories of schools feel responsible for safety of their students and unsure the provision of medical care to students whenever required.

IV. Image of the School::

1. Stakeholder Satisfaction:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** indicated that on the stakeholders satisfaction front while WSIP schools were on the wanting side and needed improvement, the EQUIP schools by and large were at the average level of indicator. Interestingly, as per **Impact Survey (TR)** while WSIP school have improved and started realizing that their schools enjoy a good reputation and that the parents are happy to send their children to these schools; in the case of EQUIP schools only two schools' teachers have expressed strong feeling in this direction, while the remaining maintained a status quo.

2. Teacher Satisfaction:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** indicated that teachers belonging to WSIP school are some what happy to work in the school; whereas teachers from EQUIP schools are in general happy to work in their schools. On the other hand, the **Impact Survey (TR)** indicated that teachers from WSIP schools are extremely happy to work as teachers in the school, and those teachers working in EQUIP schools have not changed their opinion as much.

Similarly with regard to 'enjoying work' the **Baseline Survey (TR)** indicated that WSIP school teachers were somewhat satisfied with their job, if not enjoying it; whereas the EQUIP school teachers were by and large feeling good about job. This trend has apparently changed when WSIP school teachers in good majority enjoy their work and in good numbers the EQUIP school teachers started to enjoy their work, as revealed by the **Impact Survey (TR)**.

3. Parental Involvement:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** indicated that among five WSIP schools only school maintained open communication with parents, conducted Parent Teacher Meetings once every month, and informed the parents about what is going on in the school; at the same time, among five EQUIP schools only one is found to have 'good' level of parental involvement. It is to be noted here that as per the **Impact Survey (TR)** three of the WSIP schools have started open communication with parents and only one EQUIP continued to strengthen the communication with parents. This calls for rigorous intervention.

Further in this front, the **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that WSIP and EQUIP schools seriously lag behind and need improvement in the parental involvement sector. However by the time of **Impact Survey (TR)** there is perceptible change as they started taking initiatives in the direction of involving parents in school activities (eg. Field trips, projects, talks, functions, etc.), and regularly holding Parent Teacher Meetings and also informing parents about the happenings/events in the school.

4. Teacher Involvement:

The **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that EQUIP schools were somewhat better than WSIP schools in conducting management staff meetings. However, this called for improvement, and this change for better could be seen in the findings of the **Impact Survey (TR)** when WSIP and EQUIP schools were found conducting, according to a plan and schedule the management staff meetings.

5. Student Involvement:

Baseline Survey (TR) revealed that WSIP and EQUIP schools' students were in somewhat closer interaction with their teachers; but on the involvement of students in decision making the EQUIP schools exhibit an edge over WSIP schools. However, the **Impact survey** revealed that situation has bettered in one school each of the two categories (WSIP, EQUIP).

6. Alumni:

The **Baseline (TR)** as well as **Impact (TR) Surveys** revealed that two/three WSIP schools and one/two EQUIP school students were continuing their studies after matriculation. This shows that school are keeping track of students' academic progression after leaving their school. This is found to be improving.

7. Publicity:

On the publicity front the **Baseline Survey (TR)** revealed that schools (WSIP, EQUIP) were in general found to be at an average level and needed to improve a lot. The signs of change were visible as indicated by **Impact Survey (TR)**, when WSIP and EQUIP schools acknowledging the importance of publicity started to improve the image of the school through programmes and activities, promoting student achievements and encouraging students to participate in inter-school competitions.

B. Students' Responses (SR)

I. Leadership & Management::

1. Policies and Procedures:

The Baseline survey (SR) revealed that neither the WSIP nor EQUIP school students know and understand their school's rules and regulations. Further from Impact Survey (SR) it is found that only one of the EQUIP school has shown some visible change in this direction. It is needed on the part of the managements to see that their students know and understand the school's rules and regulations. Unless this is accomplished one can not find adherence to rules and regulations by students when in, around and or out of the school. This calls for rigorous intervention for improving the situation.

II. Teaching & Learning::

1. Expectations:

It is interesting to note from the Baseline Survey that students of the sample schools - WSIP & EQUIP - do not subscribe to the feeling that their school has high expectation about their academic standards and performance from them. The intervention in between does not appear to have any visible impact to witness any change as only one EQUIP school is benefited by such intervention. This calls for concerted effort by management to make their students aware about the needed academic excellence and WSIP/EQUIP is also required to emphasize this aspect through their appropriate training component.

2. Child-centered Curriculum:

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

The Baseline Survey (SR) revealed that in one school each from WSIP and EQUIP categories, the student respondents stated that only sometimes they find school work challenging; and, most of them stated that their school work is never or rarely challenging and teachers rarely give them enough resource material. The consequent Impact Survey (SR) findings revealed that the situation has bettered in two WSIP schools and one EQUIP school; that means, students now find school work challenging - difficult but interesting.

It is found in the Baseline Survey (SR) that students are never or rarely involved in different activities that interest them. Atleast this was the case with all WSIP and EQUIP at the beginning; but by the Impact Survey (SR) time things appear to have changed atleast with two WSIP schools. The EQUIP schools are yet to catch up with the trend of involving students in different activities that interest them like sports, and music.

Further, the Baseline Survey (SR) revealed that students from both streams of schools never knew and or confident whether the present learning will help them in the next class. However the Impact Survey (SR) revealed that students from two EQUIP school and one WSIP school have come to believe that that what they are learning now will be useful in the future/next class.

3. Methods of Teaching:

In the Baseline Survey (SR) it was found that only one WSIP school students stated that their teachers teach them to think, solve problems and learn by doing things; and, none of the students (either WSIP or EQUIP) contributed to the idea that homework helps in better learning. But things

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

have not changed much. This is evident from Impact Survey (SR) findings. With regard to 'the teachers teach me to think' only one WSIP school picked up the thread; while EQUIP schools are on the way to change; and, with regard to 'homework', two of the WSIP school and one EQUIP school could bring in some change in the desirable direction as students are saying that their teachers teach them to think, and help learn by doing things, and homework helps them learn better. More effort is needed to improve the situation.

4. Student Assessment:

In the Baseline Survey (SR) it is found from the responses of students that the teachers, from both WSIP & EQUIP schools never or rarely discuss the progress of student with them or exposed their students to different ways of learning. The Impact Survey (SR) revealed that one WSIP school and two EQUIP schools could bring in some change when students responses indicated that their teachers discuss students' progress with them regularly and they are learning through projects and portfolios, etc.

5. Student Support:

The Baseline Survey (SR) revealed that neither of the two sets of schools were allowing free expression of opinion or concerns by students to their teachers, nor teachers were taking good care of students. The Impact Survey (SR) revealed that things have bettered, as two each of WSIP and EQUIP schools started facilitating free expression of opinions and concerns by students to their teachers; and, three WSIP schools and two EQUIP schools' teachers are taking good care of their students.

6. Student Discipline:

The Baseline Survey (SR) revealed that in both types of schools rarely or never students were punished for either coming late to school or not doing homework. On the other hand, the Impact Survey (SR) brought out that one WSIP and two EQUIP schools have started enforcing student discipline.

III. Infrastructure::

The Baseline Survey indicated that schools in general have inadequate space to accommodate students and 'non-visible' blackboards; lack of basic amenities such as toilets, drinking water, negligence of personal hygiene and cleanliness, not well maintained school premises less safe Class Rooms and Play Grounds, and non-availability of basic medical kit. However, the Impact Survey (SR) indicated remarkable changes brought in to school; as a result of which in the words of students as observed during the field trips, there is enough space to sit in the classroom, black board can be seen from last bench also; basic amenities like toilets, drinking water are available; school is giving importance to personal hygiene and cleanliness; school premises is clean and well maintained ; and classrooms and play ground are safe; and, basic medical aid kits are made available to attend to injured, etc.

IV Image of the school:

The Baseline Survey indicated that schools were lagging behind in addressing matters related to stakeholder satisfaction, parental and student involvement and

publicity. But the Impact Survey revealed situation is much better with more schools gearing up to meet the demands. In this context it is to be noted that some of the EQUIP schools are more attentive to parental involvement and publicity as well.

C. Parents Responses (PR)

I. Leadership & Management::

1. Vision, Mission & Philosophy:

The Baseline Survey (PR) indicated that most of the schools under the two streams (WSIP & EQUIP) were oscillating between never/rarely and some times, as far as making known the vision of the school to parents and reviewing the same regularly involving all stake holders including parents. The Impact Survey (PR) revealed that one/two WSIP schools and two/three EQUIP schools' parents acknowledged that the vision of the school is made known to all, and school's vision is reviewed on a regular basis involving all the stakeholders.

2. Administration, Policies and Procedures:

The Baseline Survey (PR) revealed a mixed response pattern as far as school's administration is concerned. The respondent parents were wavery as the responses spread across all the alternatives - never, rarely, sometimes and even always. The Impact Survey (PR) indicated no change in the situation, when parents from WSIP schools and EQUIP schools say that they are not satisfied with the school's management and leadership and school rules are not made known to them.

II. Teaching & Learning::

1. Expectations:

The Baseline Survey indicated that both categories of schools rarely entertained high academic standards and high performance expectations from their students. The Impact Survey reveals that three EQUIP schools' parents stated that these school have high set academic standards and high performance expectations for their students. The changing scenario probably has brought in this shift in the opinion of the respondent parents.

2. Child Centered Curriculum:

It is not likely that all parents are / could be aware of intricate pedagogical practices. However, when enquired at the time of Baseline Survey the response pattern was vary. But the Impact Survey (PR) revealed that about three of the EQUIP and two WSIP schools' parents responded that the teachers give challenging work to the students; children have enough resource material to help them; the school arranges extra curricular activities, and their children are being prepared for the next class. It only shows that awareness levels are raising slowly but steadily.

3. Methods of Teaching:

The pedagogical practices continue to baffle the minds of the parents. They were never sure as to what is happening in the classrooms. This is obvious from their responses during Baseline Survey, when they could not properly respond to the query 'whether the school encourages the students to think, solve problems and help students learn

by doing things. Even Impact Survey (PR) could not get any definitive response. This area needs specific attention. However, when it comes to 'homework', it is one area every parent is familiar with. Atleast it appears to be so with one school each from the two streams (WSIP & EQUIP), when they agree that the home work helps his the child learn better.

4. Student Assessment:

The parents of children studying in WSIP & EQUIP schools stated, in the Baseline Survey (PR), that rarely teachers discuss progress with the children. The Impact Survey (PR) indicated that just one WSIP school children's parents said that teachers do discuss the progress with their children regularly.

The use of variety of ways in teaching is the art and science of pedagogy and indicates professional level of the school and its teachers. The Baseline Survey (PR) indicated that, from parents point of view it is a rare or never occurring phenomenon, whereas the Impact Survey reveals that parents from atleast one WSIP and three EQUIP schools agree that teachers use a variety of ways to show how well the students have learned through projects, portfolios, etc.

5. Student Support:

The Baseline Survey (PR) revealed that in parent's opinion their children are, rarely and only sometimes, allowed to express their opinions or concerns; and teachers rarely care about and respect children/students. The Impact Survey (PR) revealed that there is not much impact of the training programmes as only a school or two in WSIP picked up the

thread for change, that way all the schools need to improve in this sector.

6. Student Discipline:

The Baseline Survey (PR) indicated that in the opinion of the parents the discipline problems are rarely handled quickly and fairly. Although the Impact Survey (PR) has revealed that one WSIP school started attending to discipline problems quickly much needs to be done in this area.

III. Infrastructure::

Cleanliness and Safety:

The Baseline Survey (PR) revealed that on the infrastructure front - cleanliness, safety, both categories of the schools are not attending to the requirements. On the whole situation appears to have changed a bit as revealed by Impact Survey (PR) when at least 1-2 WSIP schools and 2-3 EQUIP schools started providing for all basic amenities (toilets, drinking water) giving importance to personal hygiene and cleanliness, maintaining school premises and keeping it clean, taking precaution for safety of students, keeping available emergency medical kit to attend to injuries, etc. However still many schools are required to be brought into full functioning in this front.

IV. Image of the School::

1. Stakeholders satisfaction:

In the Baseline Survey (PR) parents' opinions indicated that they are not very much satisfied with subject being taught and programmes being offered. The Impact Survey (PR) reveals little or no change as only one WSIP school related parents opined that they are satisfied with the subjects

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

taught and the programmes offered are would not like to move their children from that school.

2. Parental Involvement:

In this area also, initially as revealed by the Baseline Survey (PR) schools of both categories draw almost a blank as found in the opinions expressed by the parents. The Impact Survey (PR) revealed that there is impact only one or two schools, both from WSIP and EQUIP, where parents opined that there is open communication between management and parents; the school provides a variety of ways for parents to become involved in school activities like field trips, projects, talks, functions, etc., the school organizes Parent Teacher meetings once a month; and, the school informs about what is going on at the school.

3. Student Involvement:

The Baseline Survey (PR) findings indicated that parents do not find students being involved in the decisions concerning them. The Impact Survey (PR) revealed that one EQUIP school started, according to parents opinion, involving students in decision concerning them, eg., school rules, student activities, etc.

4. Publicity:

The Baseline Survey did not find any trace of publicity by schools, in the opinion of the parents, neither the situation has improved in between, when it is found that only sporadically a school or two are making any attempts in the direction of seeking ways to improve its image (One WSIP school), encouraging students to participate in inter-school competitions (two WSIP and one EQUIP schools).

D. Scholastic Achievement

Any reforms and or innovative initiatives are basically aimed at improving standards in education. The improvements in standards in education are obtainable, besides other measures, from the assessment scores. The prevailing practice of school assessment has two streams of continuous assessment, viz., Unit Tests and Terminal examinations (Quarterly, Half-Yearly and Annual). If the inputs of WSIP in the form of TTP, MDP, etc had any impact on the pedagogical and other practices in the schools, it would be most probably visible in the scoring pattern on achievement tests. It is obvious from the CfBT and EQUIP that programmes were initiated a year before and were reinforced during 2005-2006 academic year. If some sustainable change has occurred in creation of appropriate 'learner-centered' classroom teaching-learning situations, that should be visible in the linear incremental progression among the scores of the learners. For this, from grades 3 to 9, for the achievement test scores(of all four unit tests, and two term end exams and annual) in subjects: English, Mathematics and Science for all children (3022) in the sample schools (WSIP, EQUIP and Neighbour) were collected and compared.

| Class | School Type | | |
|-------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| | CfBT | EQUIP | Neighbour |
| 3 | 183 | 262 | 129 |
| 4 | 188 | 286 | 119 |
| 5 | 122 | 251 | 116 |
| 6 | 118 | 198 | 144 |
| 7 | 97 | 117 | 108 |
| 8 | 85 | 172 | 87 |
| 9 | 71 | 88 | 81 |

Tends in Scholastic Achievement:

The basic assumption underlying the comparison of achievement scores in selected subjects is : that if the conventional practices are replaced or being replaced by the more rational, objectivistic and constructivist approaches in organizing classroom teaching-learning situation, there would be visible linear progression with remarkable consistency across the tests. This indicates that there is a perceptible change in the classroom learning organizational climate.

What the data says?

1. In the case of English Language:
 - a. Among the WSIP schools the consistency is mostly seen in classes 3 & 4; and then in upper classes 7 to 9;
 - b. In the EQUIP schools a remarkable consistency is found in test scores across all classes, 3 to 9;
 - c. In the Neighbouring Schools the linear progression is highly sporadic and fluctuating across the tests and classes.
2. In the case of Science subject:
 - a. The WSIP schools' children test scores indicated linear progression in classes 3 & 4 only;
 - b. The EQUIP schools exhibited linear progression in classes 3, 4, 5 & 8;
 - c. The Neighbour schools although exhibiting inconsistency in earlier classes could also show linear progression in upper grades, i.e., in 6-9.
3. In the case of Mathematics subject:

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

- a. The WSIP schools had shown consistency in some upper classes only, i.e., 6, 7 and 8 only.
- b. The EQUIP schools had shown remarkable consistency in all classes' test scores.
- c. The Neighbour schools have some what periodic increment in school: 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 classes' test scores.

Therefore it may be concluded on the scholastic achievement the test scores of students in three different types of schools indicated interesting performance levels as follows:

1. The WSIP schools have grounded well only with early classes, esp., with classes 3 & 4;
2. The EQUIP schools on the whole have firmly grounded the innovative practices in all the classes 3 to 9; and,
3. The Neighbouring Schools are to a large extent inconsistent in performance levels.

Further, English Language and Mathematics only are showing perceptible performance progression in any set of schools. The Science subject apparently lags behind for appropriate pedagogic inputs.

E. Opinions Expressed During Personal Interviews:

Teachers:

Q. How do you teach in the classroom?

A. "I follow activity method. Children are involved in actions; One child is doing some thing; I ask, what is she doing? The child questioned would say, she is reading, writing, etc.'

Q. What are the uses/advantages of grouping?

A. "Classroom is converted into 4 to 5 groups; they do together given activity; whoever is weak and is not able to do, ask better performing students and solve problems or complete the assigned activity; group composition is changed depending on the learning situation".

Q. What do you want to learn more as teacher from CfBT training?

A. "How to handle 'very dull' children; they forget whatever is learnt; they read well, but do not remember what is read; whatever I teach - one or two children do not understand any thing".

Q. What are your experiences in adopting activity method?

A. We have to give materials to make models; when we encourage students to do come with models some do so but sometimes parents come and question: 'what is this, for everything you are asking children to do all these models, charts, etc.?'

Q. Is there any change in your approach in dealing or interacting with parents? (before and after training)

A. Our request for their cooperation is well understood.

Q. Do you give Homework?

A. Yes,

Q. Do you check homework?

A. Yes,

Q. After checking Homework, what do you tell children?

A. If they do correctly, it is OK; if not we ask them to learn and get back.

Q. Do you explain students where they had committed mistake, and why?

A. We tell them, and help them 'learn' to solve the problems.

Q. In future training programmes what do you want to learn?

A. We wish to know, How to explain children in a better way, so that they understand lessons easily, pick up better. We have been teaching for so many years, still we do not know many things, we want to learn more; for example, to teach better we want to learn more; during our training in a very short duration we were shown some 'models of teaching'; model lesson plans; further in a limited time slot we were taught many things; we may not be having full knowledge and ability to grasp everything that is taught in the training classes; many things are happening in the world; we can not cope up with the day to day happenings in the classrooms; we have no time to learn about developments in the world related to our work; if we are taught about these things in the training classes we will be benefited.

Q. How were you managing you classroom situations and what is it after the training?

A. Our attempts right through have been to cover the syllabus; many students could not follow; intelligent students could learn something; the weak students - we left them, hoping that they would learn on their own over a period of time. But now (after training) we are different; we are trying to see that 90 to 95% of students learn; we are able to help weak students also, so that they pickup learning.

Q. How is the response / What are the comments from parents of weak children, now?

A. They are expressing happiness ; they say, 'their children are better these days, they are trying to read write and say better than before.

Q. What are the things that you did not understand in the training programmes of CfBT?

A. There are not many; but the things which we understood better are:

- ⌘ The nature of children;
- ⌘ How they develop; How to help them develop;
- ⌘ How to bring out their feelings;
- ⌘ Learning styles - we are able to identify children with styles - auditory, kinesthetic, etc., and accordingly providing learning material that suits their needs; children are able to pickup; parents are also happy with this.
- ⌘ We are benefited by the training to the extent of 50%; earlier we used to just teach the lessons and go; now we are making attempts to see their inner knowledge

come out; even we are now able to change the mindset of the children who earlier felt that they can not do; today they have the feeling that they can do; there is change in them; they are more behaving themselves and with more patience now.

Q. How is management cooperating with these changed teaching approaches?

A. Management earlier: as teachers when we needed charts etc., we used to get on our own (from houses) or make use of just available material in school or in office;

Management now: when we ask for new material management either gives in 2-3 days or give hope to give them in future, and they give accordingly in later.

Regarding Training: There is cooperation from management; they are sending us to CfBT trainings.

Head Masters/ Principals:

" I am convinced with CfBT methods, approaches, etc. We could bring in changes. There are many benefits. We have learnt to give short form answers, any long answer is split into several short forms and when we started giving like that children are learning very well. We started giving a time table of study for children - what to study in the morning; what to study in the evening.'

'We have learnt some so far; we wish to learn more. Being slum area there is totally dependency on us (the school) as they are mostly illiterate. How to develop them is the issue with us?

"we are trained to handle parents'.

These are all helpful and are being used by us.

Managements:

Q. How do you feel about your relationship with CfBT?

A. We are happy with them; we want to send our teachers to training programmes; in the area of interaction we have learnt as managements how to handle teachers, parents and students; since last year our teachers are being trained, some missed; we want to send them to without the lesson missed.

Q. How to improve the link between the HSBC Bank and the School?

A. We got some money, we will go for more; we have invested it on our furniture; our enrolments have gone; seeing our improved infrastructure parents in our locality got impressed and started enquiring about admissions.

As per the procedures are concerned, we are treated on par with the commercial-trade-business clientele; we want the HSBC Bank to look at in a different way and reduce the waiting time for clearance of applications and release of loans.

Q. What are the specific expectations of the parents from you as managements?

A. Parents wanted us to establish a computer lab; they wanted their children to speak English; even rickshaw puller wants his child to learn English.

Q. Your views on sending teacher to training.

A. Every time we able to send a set of teachers, all can not be sent at a time; we have to close the school and send them for training sessions; we can not send teachers phase or class wise; instead conducting the training session in the school campus is the only better alternative.

Summary of findings

This summary is based on the first differential analysis between the Baseline and Impact Surveys presented in earlier sections. It is to be noted here that the IMPACT is visible due to Training Programmes conducted for the Managements (MDP), Teachers (TTP), Parental Interactions during the period between Baseline and Impact Surveys. The Summary follows a sequence of: A. Survey findings; B. Scholastic Achievement Progression in a given year.

A. Summary for Surveys:

The Instruments used for the Baseline and Impact Surveys had four distinct parameters, viz. i. Leadership & Management; ii. Teaching & Learning; iii. Infrastructure; and, iv. Image of the school.

i. Leadership & Management:

WSIP Schools: Many schools are found to be strong:

- ⌘ In sharing and reviewing school vision;
- ⌘ In the ability to take appropriate decisions and maintain smooth administration;
- ⌘ In supporting staff and listening to their opinions; and,
- ⌘ In facilitating team work.

WSIP schools are opening up and moving out of isolation in to transparent interaction within the school.

However, some schools need to pay more attention to established policies and procedures and facilitating team work in the school.

EQUIP Schools: appear to have taken to initiate action in the management front as some schools are found to be:

- ⌘ sharing vision and review the same;
- ⌘ Adhere to rules and regulations;
- ⌘ Facilitate team work in schools.

EQUIP schools are found to be making some efforts in the direction of reformed management as part of school improvement.

However, more focused improvement in the areas of management like Administration, Policies & Procedures and Teamwork in the Organisation is required.

Neighbourhood Schools:

Majority are found to be around average in vision, administration, policies & procedures; and, teamwork in organisation. In general these schools are required to be strengthened in the area of Management; some schools are needed to be improved on the Policies and Procedures.

ii. Teaching and Learning:

WSIP Schools are found using:

- ⌘ Child Centered Curriculum and relevant teaching methods;
- ⌘ Extending support to students;
- ⌘ Able to handle student discipline problems;
- ⌘ Striving for continuous professional development.

However many schools are required to improve on:

Impact Evaluation of EQUIP

- ✍ Ability to provide for the diverse needs of the learners;
- ✍ Preparing and providing resource material for the learners;
- ✍ Designing and providing need and interest based extra-curricular activities;
- ✍ Innovative ways of teaching; and,
- ✍ Target based staff appraisal.

EQUIP Schools: it is found that the schools have taken to:

- ✍ Child Centered Curriculum and appropriate methods of teaching;
- ✍ Continuous Professional Development of teachers.

Neighbourhood Schools: All the schools are around the average performance level in the Teaching and Learning areas and its sub-areas. Most of the schools need specialised intervention for child centered curriculum, methods of teaching, and student assessment.

iii. Infrastructure:

WSIP Schools: Majority maintains cleanliness and take safety measures in schools. However few lag behind in maintaining cleanliness and safety especially in the provision of toilets and drinking water and medical care.

EQUIP Schools: Few schools are found to observe cleanliness and safety. Majority are found to lag

behind in the provision of basic amenities;
maintaining cleanliness and provision of medical care.

Neighbourhood Schools: Most schools have satisfactory amenities. At least one school needs specialised initiative on medical care front.

iv. Image of the School:

WSIP Schools: Some of the schools are found to be strong on:

- ✍ Stakeholder satisfaction;
- ✍ Teacher satisfaction;
- ✍ Parental Involvement; and,
- ✍ Student Involvement.

However, the schools mostly are found to be weak on Teacher Involvement and making monthly Parent-Teacher Meetings more useful.

EQUIP Schools: Only one school is found to be strong in

- ✍ stakeholder satisfaction;
- ✍ teacher satisfaction;
- ✍ parental involvement;
- ✍ teacher involvement; and,
- ✍ student involvement.

However, most of the schools are required to improved on stakeholder satisfaction; teacher satisfaction; parental involvement; teacher involvement and student involvement.

Neighbourhood Schools: Two schools only are found to be good in stakeholder satisfaction, teacher satisfaction, parental involvement, teacher involvement, etc. The other three schools need specific intervention for bringing in stakeholder satisfaction, teacher satisfaction, parental involvement, teacher involvement, etc.

B. Summary of Scholastic Achievement Comparison:

On the scholastic achievement the test scores of students in three different types of schools indicated interesting performance levels as follows:

4. The WSIP schools have grounded well only with early classes, esp., with classes 3 & 4;
5. The EQUIP schools on the whole have firmly grounded the innovative practices in all the classes 3 to 9; and,
6. The Neighbouring Schools are to a large extent inconsistent in performance levels.

Further, English Language and Mathematics only are showing perceptible performance progression in any set of schools. The Science subject apparently lags behind for appropriate pedagogic inputs.

CONCLUSIONS:

Based on the above differential analysis and personal interviews conducted, it is to be noted that:

1. Whole School Improvement as a concept is well received in both the CfBT & EQUIP Schools and these are making concerted efforts to improve their schools on three fronts: Scholastic Achievement of the Students; Teacher Efficiency; and, Management's efficiency. At the same time in the front of Infrastructure it is to be noted that they are striving at optimal utilisation of available resources with them to improve the conditions. The changed school ambience and decorated classroom walls with teacher and student made charts, etc., are evidence for this observation.
2. At the same time, HSBC/CfBT - EQUIP Schools are opening up to the idea of comprehensive school improvement, although their priority for the present appears to be improving the infrastructure and make the school able to accommodate more children and also ensure more facilities for them, the remarkable consistent levels of achievement speak volumes about the success accrued due to support from HSBC Bank coupled with pedagogic inputs from CfBT. The reason for lower levels of initiatives, as reflected in interactions with managements, could also be assigned to the prolonged Banking Procedures, delays in accepting the school's proposals and bureaucratic procedural wrangles to sanction and release grants for improvement.

3. The schools in the neighbourhood are facing challenging situation and are eager to make special efforts to improve quality.
4. The teachers in general are happy with the training programmes organized by CfBT; they want to learn more and help children learn with ease; they desire to improve the learning habits of their young students; they are concerned about the problems faced by children especially the memory problem and inability to learn concepts faster; they would like to handle slow learners effectively so that they study on par with the other children. They in one word desire training programmes that help them solve day to day problems faced by them as teachers in the classroom in handling students.
5. Managements express happiness with the CfBT and its methods and approaches; they are eager to get their teachers trained for optimal benefits but prefer 'on campus' training sessions instead of sending teachers to CfBT premises, to ensure that the training is contextual and specific to their needs and does not result in closing down the school for the sake of training sessions.
6. The scholastic achievements are influenced by the pedagogic and other organisation practices that have been given as part of the training programmes by CfBT and coupled with HSBC Bank's financial support the schools are better able to show sustainable linear learning progression among their students.

7. Managements desire the HSBC Bank to open up a bit and see them as separate clientele group; as a group in the education service. They are benefited by the loan and are able to improve their infrastructure and other facilities in the school. But to see that the grant is put to optimal and timely use the Bank may evolve a separate procedural practice for schools.
8. It is to be noted that the Neighbouring schools, due to ripple effect of the happening schools (CfBT + HSBC) around, are eager to seek and obtain the support from these agencies. Any step in this direction would go a long way in the stabilizing private schools to render the educational services to the children of the needy disadvantaged and Unreached populations.

* * * * *