

# INOVASI RESULTS FRAMEWORK

## (2016 - 2019)

### Introduction

This document contains the INOVASI Results Framework (RF), which forms the basis for Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Research (MERL) in INOVASI.

The RF has been developed in explicit reference to the INOVASI Theory of Change (ToC), which was significantly revised in June 2017 and further reviewed and revised by first quarter of 2018, as the implication of October 2017 and April 2018 strategic reviews. In developing the RF, each of the activities and results from the refined ToC have been used as the basis for identifying information that the INOVASI MERL system needs to generate. This information is expressed either in the form of descriptive questions or, where relevant, in the form of more specific performance indicators. These questions and indicators are relevant to either effectiveness (the extent to which INOVASI is achieving the desired results expressed in the theory of change) or to appropriateness (the extent to which INOVASI's ways of working are reflective of its core principles as expressed in the theory of change, for example focusing on and mainstreaming inclusive education).

In general, the RF reflects a focus on questions ("what do we need to know"), not only indicators. The number of indicators has been intentionally limited, with a focus on "useful" indicators that reflect key results at the output/outcome level rather than activity-level indicators. The indicators contained in the RF were identified in reference to the DFAT Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) version three and have been further contextualized to reflect the specific nature of INOVASI's expected results.

It is also important to note that for the "implement" portion of the ToC (related to the implementation and results of INOVASI-supported pilots/interventions), the RF contains general questions, which are expected to be detailed further in the context of each pilot. The MERL approach for each intervention, which should be generally aligned to the overall INOVASI RF, will describe the more specific versions of the results, questions, and indicators for each pilot.

A set of selected evaluation questions are pulled out from the RF main descriptive questions to represent strategic assessment of INOVASI performance, along with the milestones and targets.



# PROGRAM GOALS



Accelerated progress toward improved learning outcomes for Indonesian students



## End of Program Outcomes (2023)

The policy and practice changes identified are reflected in Indonesian government (district, provincial, national) policies, regulations, budgets and plans

Decision makers can access and use evidence to facilitate and implement more effective education reforms

A credible body of evidence on what policy and practice changes work to improve learning outcomes

## Intermediate Outcomes

National and sub-national stakeholders have access to emerging evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes

District governments adopt policy to directly and indirectly support learning outcomes

Districts scale out successful practices and approaches

## District Level

Communicate evidence of successful practices and approaches to national and sub-national stakeholders

Support policy development to directly and indirectly improve learning outcomes

Support scale-out and system-based pilots to directly and indirectly improve learning outcomes

## Pilot Level

Identify national and local policy issues  
Diagnose and understand local challenges and problems



Identify policy - informed solutions  
(activities)



Context relevant pilots designed  
(output)



Implement context relevant pilots  
(activities)



Participants' knowledge, skills and attitudes improved  
(output)



Participants change practices  
(intermediate outcome)



Student learning improves in partner schools  
(end-of-pilot-outcome)

## Core Program Principles



- Thinking and Working Politically
- Inclusive engagement (gender, disability, ethnicity)
- Tight feedback loops for learning
- Targeted capacity building of stakeholders at all stages of the program
- Continuous sharing

**Selected evaluation questions of INOVASI performance:**

1. How effectively has INOVASI's use of the PDIA approach contributed to: improved capabilities of teachers and education intermediaries; changes in the behavior of teachers and education intermediaries that are likely to improve students' learning outcomes?
2. How effectively has INOVASI generated a credible body of evidence about what works to improve literacy and numeracy through its pilots?
3. To what extent has INOVASI incorporated appropriate gender and social inclusion strategies into its programming?
4. To what extent has INOVASI generated changes in policy and practice in: promoting learning outcomes? In policy and practice at the system level?

**INOVASI MILESTONES TO 2019**

<b>Milestone 2016/2017</b>	<b>Milestone 2017/2018</b>	<b>Milestone 2018/2019</b>	<b>Target 2018</b>	<b>Target 2019</b>
1) Building the foundation for program implementation	2) Pilot for better approaches to improving learning are designed with district government		-	-
	3) Sub-national governments allocate budget to activities supporting implementation of INOVASI's pilot/approach		12 pilots	TBD
			12 districts	17 districts
		4) Pilot for better approaches to improving learning outcomes are implemented	42 pilots	TBD
		5) Participants apply new skills/change practices	1,500 participants	1,500 participants
		6) Sub-national governments allocate budget to activities	AUD 200,000	AUD 200,000

		<p>supporting implementation of INOVASI's pilot/approach</p> <p>7) Student learning improves in partner schools</p> <p>8) Evidence of what works and what does not work for improving literacy and numeracy learning outcomes generated for each INOVASI pilot</p> <p>9) Evidence is shared through ICT for development</p> <p>10) District governments adopt and fund improved systems and practices for learning, using evidence from pilots</p> <p>11) District governments adopt policy to directly and indirectly support learning outcomes</p> <p>12) INOVASI provides substantial input into policy through education sector review</p>	<p>1 pilot with improved student learning outcomes</p> <p>2 pilots (Guru BAIK, Gema Literacy)</p> <p>2 forms of ICT</p> <p>5 districts/cities</p> <p>5 districts/cities</p>	<p>TBD</p> <p>42 pilots</p> <p>1 form of ICT</p> <p>5 districts/cities</p> <p>5 districts/cities</p> <p>Results of 42 pilots &amp; 5 research reports are shared for policy review by: 2 national units (MoEC &amp; MORA) 4 provinces (NTT, NTB, Jatim, Kaltara) 17 districts/cities</p>
--	--	--	---	--

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
PROGRAM STAGE: PILOT LEVEL						

Approved

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
<b>ACTIVITIES</b> Diagnose and understand local challenges and problems	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u>            To what extent have relevant national and local policies been identified during pilot design? What gaps and opportunities are identified?</p> <p>What are the challenges and problems that were identified?</p> <p>What policy-informed promising approaches and practices have been identified at district or province level?</p>	1. Number of gendered-policy analyses 2. Number of focused-policy analyses on children with disability	Quarterly	National Policy and GESI team in collaboration with provincial Policy Officer/Specialist and Provincial EPD Officer/Specialist	Descriptive (requires credible justification)	GESI team's report, with sources of data: - Provincial-district baseline study - Policy analysis done by INOVASI Policy Team - Additional policy study when needed - Biodata - Specific study such as stock take reports (e.g. East Java) - DF report - Provincial regular report
	<p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u>            How has policy identification and analysis incorporated gender perspectives? What are the key challenges and opportunities to promote gender equality in learning and teaching?</p>					
	<p>What are the main identified challenges and problems related to potentially excluded students<sup>1</sup>?</p>					
	<p>To what extent did potentially excluded groups participate in the identification of promising approaches and practices?</p>					
	<p>How have key stakeholders participated in understanding local challenges and problems?</p>					
	<p>How have key stakeholders contributed/participated in identifying promising approaches and practices?</p>					
	<p>What are the links to national policy issues?</p>					

<sup>1</sup> **Excluded students** refers to children who are (potentially) socially excluded due to gender inequality, disability or from minority ethnic groups.

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
<b>OUTPUT</b> Context relevant pilots designed	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> How many interventions have been co-designed?</p> <p>To what extent are the interventions considered context relevant<sup>2</sup>?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u> Which interventions target potentially excluded students?</p>	<p>3. Number of co-designed intervention which are context relevant.</p> <p><b>Sub Indicator:</b> 3.1 Number of interventions co-designed to target potentially excluded students (gender, disability and ethnicity)</p> <p>4. Total amount (AUD) of additional funds leveraged for the implementation of Pilot activities (PAF 1)</p>	6-monthly	Policy Team & Provincial Education Program Development (EPD) Team	Descriptive (requires credible justification)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot records or Internal documents managed by provincial EPD, entry into PDMS (module of pilot profile)</li> <li>- Provincial regular report</li> </ul>
<b>ACTIVITIES</b> Implement context relevant pilots	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> How many participants have been involved and trained in the context relevant intervention?</p> <p>Was the intervention implemented as originally co-designed?</p> <p>If there was change and iteration during the implementation, what were major changes or iteration to the design?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u> How were inclusion issues addressed in intervention implementation?</p> <p>How has feedback been used to improve implementation?</p> <p>How have key stakeholders contributed/participated in intervention implementation?</p>	none	At key points during the intervention	GESI Team, Provincial Education Program Development (EPD) Officers/Specialist	Descriptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DF report</li> <li>- Evaluation sheet and Reflection by DF/DEF/Local facilitator</li> <li>- Spot-check</li> <li>- Activity feedback from participant</li> <li>- Periodic reflection for Pilot</li> <li>- PDMS</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> **Context relevant education** refers to any existing local capacities, capabilities and opportunities that might be relevant and have potential for solving specific local problems in learning (by PDIA Process-DFAT).

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
OUTPUT Participants' knowledge, skills and attitude improved	<p>Related to effectiveness: To what extent have participants' knowledge improved?</p> <p>To what extent have participants' skills improved?</p> <p>To what extent have participants' mindsets (attitudes) changed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. to what extent are stakeholders increasingly identifying literacy and numeracy as an important issue?</li> <li>• How many stakeholders identify inclusion as an important issue?</li> </ul> <p>Why/why not?</p>	<p>5. Number of intervention participants who have shifted their mindset to one more oriented to finding local solutions (disaggregated by gender)</p> <p><i>Others to be defined at intervention-level</i></p>	At key points during the intervention	GESI Team, MERL Team	Descriptive based on regular monitoring result and additional specific study if needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-post test</li> <li>- Facilitator/trainer report</li> <li>- Baseline and end-line survey at school level (questionnaires for parent/teacher)</li> <li>- Classroom observation</li> <li>- Provincial-district baseline and endline study</li> <li>- Beneficiaries' stories of changes</li> <li>- Spot-check</li> <li>- Activity Feedback (INOVASI and Participants)</li> <li>- Participatory Action Research</li> <li>- Biodata</li> <li>- Alumni monitoring system (using SMS blast or other type of IT)</li> </ul>



RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME Participants change practices	Related to effectiveness: To what extent have targeted intervention participants changed their practices <sup>3</sup> ?	6. Number of women and men who apply improved technical skills to support better quality education services (PAF #3) ( <i>disaggregated as relevant</i> ).	Middle of intervention	MERL Team, GESI Team, Policy Team	Outcome evaluation	Main Method/Data source: - District and School survey (baseline & endline)  Supporting method/data source: - Stories of change - Classroom observation - Spot-check data - Participatory Action Research - Case study - Alumni monitoring system - MeE
	How many have changed practices? What % have changed practices?	7. Number of schools with improved institutional and organisational capacity to address literacy and numeracy ( <i>note: Only for particular interventions targeting school capacity</i> ).	End of intervention			
	What are the success stories of improvements in classroom learning opportunities, including for potentially excluded students?	8. Number of women and men who apply improved knowledge on gender perspective to support gender equality in teaching and learning (PAF#3)				
	To what extent have INOVASI processes (especially PDIA) influenced the organizational behavior of participating schools, gugus (school clusters), or the district education office?	9. Number of women and men who implement inclusive learning scenario/plan				
	Related to appropriateness: How have the changes improved attendance of boys and girls at risk of exclusion?					

<sup>3</sup> NOTE: **participants** and **practice** to be defined about the theory of change for each individual intervention.

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME (End of Pilot Outcome) Student learning improves in partner schools	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> To what extent have interventions led to an increase in student learning<sup>4</sup>?</p> <p>Were there differential effects for different types of students (e.g. boys vs girls)?</p> <p>What is the alternative explanation for the result? How likely is it that the pilots caused the result?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u> To what extent have interventions led to increases in student learning for potentially excluded students?</p>	<p>10. Number of students who demonstrate improvement in literacy and numeracy (<i>disaggregated by gender, disability and ethnicity as relevant.</i>)</p> <p><b>Sub-indicator</b></p> <p>10.1 Number of potentially excluded students that have demonstrated improvement in literacy and numeracy (<i>Indicator for inclusion.</i>)</p> <p>11 Number of pilots that demonstrate improvement in participants' attitude and behavior change</p>	<p>Scheduled by pilot timeframe and at the end of program</p> <p>(Early detection where relevant)</p>	MERL Team, GESI Team	<p>Before and after (baseline &amp; endline studies), impact evaluation (only for relevant pilot)</p> <p>For early detection: monitoring and midline</p>	<p>Main Method/Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline and endline assessment at school level</li> </ul> <p>Secondary Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing student assessment data</li> <li>- Spot check/ Classroom Observation/ FGDs or interviews with teachers</li> </ul> <p>Participatory action research.</p>
DISTRICT LEVEL						

<sup>4</sup> NOTE: **student learning** to be defined in reference to the theory of change for each individual intervention i.e. what does student learning mean in the context of the intervention.

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
Support scale-out and system-based pilots to directly and indirectly improve learning outcomes	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> To what extent have knowledge sharing activities been conducted in partner districts? What activities have been conducted? What have been the responses?</p> <p>To what extent are relevant stakeholders in partner districts aware of the approaches/ interventions supported by INOVASI and their results and benefits?</p> <p>To what extent do relevant stakeholders in partner districts have access to information about the approach/ intervention results and benefits?</p> <p>To what extent do relevant stakeholders in partner districts understand the benefits of the approach/ intervention results for supporting student learning outcomes?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u> To what extent was continuous sharing with partner districts implemented?</p> <p>To what extent has the experience of participating in INOVASI design and implementation processes resulted in enhanced understanding among district stakeholders about the approach/ intervention results and benefits?</p>	None	Quarterly	Provincial Team Communications Teams Policy Team	Data as the fact  Descriptive (requires credible justification)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Digital analytics (Facebook, etc.)</li> <li>- Media coverage</li> <li>- Activity feedback</li> <li>- Biodata/Attendance list</li> <li>- Participants will be disaggregated into practitioners, intermediaries, policy maker</li> <li>- Internal spot-check and/or reflection</li> <li>- Provincial quarterly reflection &amp; reporting</li> </ul>

RESULTS FROM REFINED TOC	MAIN DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONS (WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW)	INDICATOR (WHERE RELEVANT) AND LINKAGES TO PAF	TIMING / FREQUENCY	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TYPE OF EVIDENCE	METHODS/ DATA SOURCES
Support policy development to directly and indirectly improve learning outcomes	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u></p> <p>To what extent are partner districts/provinces aware of policy gap analysis supported by INOVASI?</p> <p>To what extent do partner districts/provinces understand the benefits of policy alternatives in supporting improvement of learning outcomes</p>	None	6-monthly	Policy Team, Provincial teams	Descriptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular reflection</li> <li>- Regular provincial and national report</li> </ul>
Communicate evidence of successful practices and approaches to national and sub-national stakeholders	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u></p> <p>To what extent are national and sub-national stakeholders aware of the successful practices and approaches supported by INOVASI?</p> <p>To what extent are national and sub-national stakeholders aware of the results and benefits of the successful practices and approaches supported by INOVASI?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u></p> <p>To what extent were partners involved in knowledge sharing and engagement at the national and sub-national level?</p>	None	6-monthly	Communications Team SNI Policy Team	Descriptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular reflection</li> <li>- Regular provincial and national report</li> </ul>
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES						

District scales out successful practices and approaches	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> To what extent have partner districts applied or scaled out INOVASI-supported approaches/interventions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which districts and which interventions? Number of teachers, schools and students involved?</li> <li>- What form of application and scale out? (e.g. budget allocation, policy change, practice change, implementation of policy, other)</li> <li>- Was there any change to the approach? (i.e. adaption or adoption)</li> <li>- What has been INOVASI's role in adoption or scale out?</li> <li>- What other factors have contributed to the adoption / scale out?</li> </ul>	<p>12. Number of districts that make improvements in educational service delivery practices. (PAF # 9).</p> <p>13 Total amount (AUD) of additional (non DFAT) district-level funds leveraged for the application and scale-out of INOVASI approaches/interventions (PAF #1).</p>	6-monthly	Provincial Teams (EPD and Policy in particular)	Narrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leverage of scale out</li> <li>- Significant Policy Change (DFAT)Records/change records</li> <li>- Story of change (policy/practice)</li> <li>- Case study</li> </ul>
District government adopt policy to directly and indirectly support learning outcomes	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> To what extent have partner districts adopted policy to support learning outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which districts and which policies?</li> <li>- What form of policy change? (e.g. budget allocation, stipulation of new policy, strengthening of existing policies, change to current practices)</li> <li>- What are the implications of the policy for improving student learning outcomes?</li> <li>- What has been INOVASI's role in policy change?</li> </ul> <p>What are other factors contributing to policy change?</p>	<p>14. Number of districts that make improvements in educational service delivery policy</p> <p>14.1 Number of development policies improved to support inclusive learning and teaching (gender, disability and other social inclusion)</p>	6-monthly	Provincial Teams (EPD & Policy in particular), GESI Team	Narrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leverage of scale out</li> <li>- Significant Policy Change (DFAT)Records/change records</li> <li>- Story of change (policy/practice)</li> <li>- Case study</li> </ul>

<p>National and sub-national stakeholders have access to emerging evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes</p>	<p><u>Related to effectiveness:</u> To what extent are relevant national and sub-national stakeholders <b>aware of</b> and <b>have access to</b> emerging evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent do relevant national and sub-national stakeholders <b>understand</b> the emerging evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes?</p> <p>How have national and sub-national stakeholders accepted/perceived the evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent have national and sub-national stakeholders accepted the evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes?</p> <p><u>Related to appropriateness:</u> To what extent are national and sub-national stakeholders aware of and have access to emerging evidence of what does and does not work to improve inclusive learning?</p>	<p>15. Number of credible analyses on what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes</p> <p>Sub-indicator: 15.1. Number of credible analyses documentation on what does and does not work to improve inclusive learning</p> <p>15.2 Number of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) that support development (PAF#11)</p>	<p>6-monthly</p>	<p>MERL, EPD, SNI, Communication Team, GESI team</p>	<p>Descriptive (<i>requires credible justification</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6 monthly reflection</li> <li>- Documentation on evidence of what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes</li> </ul>
--	--	---	------------------	--	---	---

## List of Indicators

N o	Stage and Indicator / Sub-indicator	Program Stages	Disaggregation	Notes	Link to PAF
1	Number of gendered-policy analyses	<i>Pilot level</i>	By district and by pilot		
2	Number of focused-policy analyses on children with disability	<i>Pilot level</i>	By district and by pilot		
3	Number of co-designed interventions which are context relevant  <b><u>Sub-indicator:</u></b> 3.1. Number of interventions co-designed to target potentially excluded students (gender, disability and ethnicity)	<i>Pilot level</i>			
4	Total amount (AUD) of additional funds leveraged for the implementation of Pilot activities	<i>Pilot level</i>			PAF #1
5	Number of intervention participants who have shifted their mindset to one more oriented to finding local solutions (disaggregated by gender)	<i>Pilot</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men/women</li> <li>• Position (teacher, principal, etc.)</li> </ul>		
6	Number of women and men who apply improved technical skills to support better quality education services.	<i>Pilot</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men/women</li> <li>• Position (teacher, principal, etc.)</li> </ul>		PAF #3
7	Number of schools with improved institutional and organisational capacity to address literacy and numeracy	<i>Pilot</i>	Disaggregated as relevant.	<i>Only for particular interventions targeting school capacity</i>	
8	Number of women and men who apply improved knowledge on gender perspective to support gender equality in teaching and learning	<i>Pilot</i>		<i>Only for particular interventions incorporating gender training/capacity building</i>	PAF#3
9	Number of women and men who implement inclusive learning scenario/plan	<i>Pilot</i>		<i>Only for particular interventions incorporating training on managing learning disabilities</i>	PAF#3

10	<p>Number of students who demonstrate improvement in literacy and numeracy</p> <p><b>Sub-indicator:</b> 10.1. Number of potentially excluded students who demonstrate improvement in literacy and numeracy</p>	<i>Pilot</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boys/girls</li> <li>Excluded group</li> </ul>		
11	Number of pilots that demonstrate improvement in participants' attitude and behavior change	<i>Pilot</i>	By province, district and by pilot and types of schools (Madrasah, public and private schools)		PAF#9
12	Number of districts that make improvements in educational service delivery practices	<i>Intermediate outcome</i>			PAF#9
13	Total amount (AUD) of additional (non DFAT) district-level funds leveraged for the application and scale-out of INOVASI approaches/ interventions	<i>Intermediate outcome</i>	Public/ Private funding		PAF#1
14	<p>Number of districts that make improvements in educational service delivery policy</p> <p><b>Sub-indicator:</b> Number of development policies improved to support inclusive learning and teaching (gender, disability and other social inclusion)</p>	<i>Intermediate outcome</i>	Policy for inclusive learning		
15	<p>Number of credible analyses on what does and does not work to improve learning outcomes</p> <p><b>Sub-indicator:</b> 15.1. Number of credible analyses documentation on what does and does not work to improve inclusive learning</p> <p>15.2 Number of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) that support development</p>	<i>Intermediate outcome</i>	Inclusive learning		PAF#11



## **List of Methods**

### **Related to activities and outputs:**

1. Activity feedback & evaluation
  - a. Participant feedback
  - b. Implementer evaluation
2. Biodata & attendance records
3. Periodic Pilot reflections
4. Activity Report (MERL)
5. Alumni monitoring

### **Related to intervention outcomes:**

6. Student learning assessments
7. Spot checks
8. Classroom observation
9. Participatory action research
10. District & school surveys
11. Participant self-reporting
12. Case studies (including for policy change)
13. Beneficiaries' stories of change
14. Pre/post test

### **Related to communications:**

15. Solicited feedback from target audiences
16. Digital analytics

### **Related to application and scale out of INOVASI-supported approaches/ interventions:**

17. Leverage (budget documentation)
18. Significant Policy Influence (policy change documentation)
19. Case studies / stories of change
20. Provincial reflection & reporting