Evaluation of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme in the interior of Suriname

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEIP</td>
<td>Basic Education Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB</td>
<td><em>Bureau Onderwijs Binnenland</em> (Bureau Education Interior) (old name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFE</td>
<td>Child Friendly Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td><em>Christelijk Pedagogisch Instituut</em> (Christian Pedagogic Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECRTNO</td>
<td>Early Childhood Resource Teacher Network of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBGS</td>
<td><em>Evangelische Broedergemeente in Suriname</em> (Evangelical Brotherhood in Suriname)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO</td>
<td><em>Gewoon Lager Onderwijs</em> (Primary Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOL</td>
<td><em>Instituut voor de Opleiding van Leraren</em> (Institute for Teacher Training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millenium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MINOV</td>
<td><em>Ministerie van Onderwijs en Volksontwikkeling</em> (Ministry of Education and Community Development) (Old name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOWC</td>
<td><em>Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur</em> (Ministry of Education, Science and Culture) (Current name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCOS</td>
<td><em>Stichting</em> (Foundation) <em>Projekten Christelijk Onderwijs Suriname</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Pedagogic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td><em>Persoonlijk Ontwikkelings Plan</em> (Personal Development Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td><em>Programmema Effectievere Scholen Suriname</em> (Programme more effective schools Suriname)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent-Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td><em>Rooms Katholiek</em> (Roman Catholic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKBO</td>
<td><em>Rooms Katholiek Bijzonder Onderwijs</em> (Roman Catholic Special Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td><em>Surinaams Pedagogisch Instituut</em> (Suriname Pedagogic Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCET</td>
<td><em>Surinaams Centrum voor Training en Educatie</em> (Suriname Centre for Training and Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td><em>Team Ontwikkelings Plan</em> (Team Development Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Childrens Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVOB</td>
<td><em>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Technische Bijstand</em> (Flemish Organization for development Cooperation and Technical Assistance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgements

Conducting this study would not have been possible without the support and collaboration of many people in Suriname.

First of all, we would like to express our gratitude to school leaders and teachers who took time out of their busy schedules and welcomed us into their schools. They freely shared information, allowed us to perform observations in the class rooms, and permitted us to conduct focus group discussions with the children. We also thank the representatives from national and international organizations that are active in the field of education and officials from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur, MINOWC) who all provided detailed information on the UNICEF-supported Education Programme in promoting Child Friendly School approaches in the interior.

This study was commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (MINOWC). UNICEF’s Programme Manager, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Programme Assistant and MINOWC’s focal points all guided and advised the consultant during project development, research instrument development, literature study, and data analysis.

Opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of UNICEF, MINOWC or other institutions the authors are affiliated with. The authors are responsible for all errors in translation and interpretation.

Marieke Heemskerk & Celine Duijves

Social Solutions Consultancy

1 Until July 2015 the Ministry which includes education was called Ministry of Education and People's Development (MINOV). Recently this name changed to Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (MINOWC). This last designation will be used in the report.
# Table of contents

Abbreviations .................................................................................................................. 2
Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................... 3
Table of contents .............................................................................................................. 4
Summary ........................................................................................................................... 6
Samenvatting .................................................................................................................... 9

1. Introduction ................................................................................................................... 13
   1.1 The “I believe in you” vision .................................................................................. 13
   1.2 In-service teacher training ..................................................................................... 13
   1.3 Goals and Objectives of the evaluation .................................................................... 15
   1.4 Key definitions ....................................................................................................... 17
   1.5 Report lay-out ........................................................................................................ 17

2 Methods .......................................................................................................................... 19
   2.1 Evaluation criteria .................................................................................................... 19
   2.2 Evaluation matrix and log frame ............................................................................. 20
   2.3 Sample ..................................................................................................................... 20
   2.4 Methodology .......................................................................................................... 30
      2.4.1 Desk review ..................................................................................................... 30
      2.4.2 Consultations with key stakeholders ................................................................. 31
      2.4.2 Consultations at schools .................................................................................... 31
   2.5 Protection of Human Subjects and Ethical Review ................................................... 33
   2.6 Limitations .............................................................................................................. 33

3 Review of existing literature and data .......................................................................... 35
   3.1 Documents under review ....................................................................................... 35
   3.2 Education in the Suriname interior ......................................................................... 35
   3.3 Relevance of the “I believe in you” programme ..................................................... 36
   3.4 Training sessions .................................................................................................... 37
   3.5 Assessment of project goals based on review of existing data ............................... 38
      3.5.1 Existing evidence with regard to the impact goal ............................................. 38
3.5.2 Existing evidence with regard to outcome and output goals ............................................. 41
3.5.3 Existing evidence with regard to input goals ................................................................. 42

4 Results .................................................................................................................................... 43
4.1 Relevance and appreciation of the in-service teacher training programme ......................... 43
4.2 Opinions of the trainings, the trainers and the working books .......................................... 44
4.3 Understanding of the main concepts ................................................................................... 47
4.4 Application of training tools (teaching material) in class .................................................... 50
4.5 Eye for the uniqueness of each child ..................................................................................... 54
4.6 Parent Teacher Associations .............................................................................................. 56
4.7 Planning and evaluation ....................................................................................................... 56
4.8 Changes as a result of the training ....................................................................................... 57
4.9 Impacts on the children ........................................................................................................ 59

5 Conclusions and recommendations ......................................................................................... 62
5.1 Rating of evaluation criteria ............................................................................................... 62
5.2 Potentialities ......................................................................................................................... 63
5.3 Weaknesses ........................................................................................................................ 64
5.4 Lessons learned .................................................................................................................. 65
5.5 Recommendations ............................................................................................................... 65

Project planning ....................................................................................................................... 65
Implementation ........................................................................................................................ 66
Capacity building ...................................................................................................................... 67
Policy recommendations ........................................................................................................... 68

Annex 1. Consulted Key Stakeholders ....................................................................................... 69
Annex 2. Motivation for inclusion of the research schools ........................................................ 70
Annex 3. Reviewed documents and data ................................................................................... 72
Annex 4. Research Instruments ............................................................................................... 74
Annex 5. Conclusions with regard to the main Evaluation Criteria and Questions .................... 103
Summary

This report presents the evaluation of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme, which was implemented by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (MINOWC) with the support of UNICEF in the interior of Suriname, in the period 2009-2013. The aim of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting contributions of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme in the four interior districts: Brokopondo, Marowijne, Para and Sipaliwini.

The objective of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme was to promote more child friendly education in Suriname. To reach this objective, four teacher training modules were delivered to all (92) primary schools in the interior. The main impact goal of the UNICEF/MINOWC “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme was that at least 80% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education. Output goals were:

1. All primary schools teachers and school leaders in the interior applying the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standards.
2. At least 50% of schools in the interior have a School Development Plan and functioning Parent Teacher Association.

Methodology: A reconstructed log frame and evaluation matrix guided the evaluation. Field work was conducted from July to August 2015, at 11 interior schools. The consultant collected data though:

a) Desk review of existing quantitative and qualitative sources,
b) Survey interviews with 40 school teachers and semi-structured interviews with 10 principles,
c) 21 Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with a total of 105 children; boys and girls separately,
d) Consultations with MINOWC, Nucleus Centres, UNICEF and other key stakeholders.
e) Classroom observations.

Study limitations included the fact that the effects of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme cannot be isolated from changes resulting from other interventions in the educational realm, and the absence of baseline data and a log frame prior to project implementation. Another limitation was the small sample size, which limits extrapolation of the findings to all interior schools in Suriname.

Desk review: The desk review reveals that the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme largely achieved its input goals, but suggests limited achievement of impact, output and outcome goals defined in the log frame.

Results: Interviews and consultations with key stakeholders in the education sector imply that the “I believe in you” concept of introducing CFS was widely appreciated. All but four interviewed teachers were of the opinion that the “I believe in you” trainings had an added value, and indicated that they had acquired skills and tools in those trainings that they had not obtained elsewhere.

The consultant found large differences between schools and between individual teachers with regard to their ability to create a child friendly school environment. Between 70 and 85 percent of interviewed
teachers were able to explain main training concepts. Furthermore, all but three teachers indicated that they had changed their way of teaching because of the “I believe in you” training, for example by making the classroom more attractive, using more visual materials, and teaching more interactively. Several working forms, such as group work, are now commonly used. Also, just over half of teachers (52.6%) reported that their way of correcting behaviour had changed. The majority of teachers observed positive changes in the children because of the new teaching methods; including that children understand the subject matter better, are more concentrated, participate more actively and learn from each other.

On the other hand, during classroom observations the consultant witnessed few examples of a safe and child friendly environment. Even where thematic or reading corners were present, children were not encouraged to use them. Few teachers reportedly understood and made an effort to engage children with multiple intelligences or different learning preferences. None of the teachers used the working form cards. Furthermore, observations and FGDs suggest that teachers commonly use corporal punishment and verbal abuse. Only three out of 40 surveyed teachers had developed a personal development plan (POP) that they regularly updated and used. Four out of 11 school teams had constructed a Team Development Plan (TOP) with development goals for one or two years. Three out of 11 schools visited for the evaluation had a Parent-Teacher Association in place, but none was active at the time of the research.

Conclusions: The conclusions judge the findings based on the evaluation criteria and list programme potentialities, weaknesses and lessons learned.

Relevance: All involved stakeholders agreed that there was an urgent need for reform of the education sector, that the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme was highly relevant, and that the programme aligned with Suriname government educational policy.

Effectiveness: Because no baseline and log frame were in place at the start of the program, the actual training results are difficult to establish. Reported and observed changes in educational approach that can be attributed to the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme are limited and isolated, and typically not part of a more inclusive new teaching approach.

Efficiency: Execution of the training modules appeared cost efficient and there was good collaboration between stakeholders. Most input goals were reached, though with substantial delays. Limited achievement of impact, outcome and output level goals is a concern.

Impact: The "I believe in you" trainings have likely contributed to a mindshift in the education sector, but this mind-shift has not caused overall structural behaviour change or improved educational achievements at interior schools. Changes are often partial and behaviours contradictory to CFE remain common.

Sustainability: Recorded changes may not last without in-class support and an enabling environment. On a positive note, because the “I believe in you” vision is widely shared, teachers will continue to be exposed to CFE. Moreover, MINOWC started embedding the “I believe in you” vision in policy.

Cross-cutting contributions: The training sessions paid little attention to gender, but cultural relevance was addressed.

With regard to programme potentialities, the consultant concludes that the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme responded to the need for educational reform and for strengthening teachers’ CFE skills. Stakeholders throughout the educational field, including teachers, have become more
aware of CFE and its main concepts and the results suggest small improvements in teaching. The program provided useful tools, appeared to be cost effective, and was adaptive to the needs of the target group.

**Weaknesses** of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme include flaws in the programme logic, and the fact that program activities were not in line with indicators of “quality inclusive” education, which was the primary goal of the program. MINOWC data and field results suggest that the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme has not affected educational achievements, and that implementation of the CFE principles and tools in practice was limited. Finally, programme sustainability is hampered by the lack of in-class coaching during the trainings and follow-up afterwards.

**Lessons learned** include that: future projects will benefit from a well-designed administrative system; project sustainability can improve with financial and practical commitment of partners; training for interior teachers should include in-class coaching; and future educational reforms will benefit from motivated teachers, a strong school leader and school team building.

**Recommendations.** The consultant provides recommendations in four sections: Project planning, Implementation, Capacity building, and Policy. In terms of project planning, it is recommended that for future projects, sufficient resources are allocated to design of the project logic. Furthermore, prior to project implementations, the project partners must document their committed to the programme and programme follow-up. In the section project implementation, the consultant recommends, among others, more consistency in training approaches in the educational realm; promotion of parent participation; motivation of teachers; and increased use of activating didactics.

With regard to capacity building, it is recommended that capacity building of teachers in the interior is better catered to their specific needs, including more on-the-job training. Post training coaching and support to school management are also expected to enhance the capacity of teachers to implement CFE methods. For implementing organizations, the consultant recommends training in project management, including strengthening project design and monitoring skills. In the policy realm, it is recommended that stakeholders work collaboratively on the development of standards for Child Friendly Schools in Suriname. Furthermore, MINOWC is advised to invest in: execution of promising existing policy such as their Nucleus Centres, improvement of the professional quality of teachers and school leaders, and a Human Resources policy that outlines career development tracks available to teachers with different entry levels.
**Samenvatting**

Dit rapport presenteert de evaluatie van het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma voor leerkrachten, dat in de periode 2009-2013 door het Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur (MINOWC) met ondersteuning van UNICEF uitgevoerd is in het binnenland van Suriname. Het doel van deze evaluatie is om de relevantie, effectiviteit, efficiëntie, impact, duurzaamheid en grensoverschrijdende bijdragen van het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma wat is uitgevoerd in de vier binnenland districten -Brokopondo, Marowijne, Para en Sipaliwini- vast te leggen.

Het algemene doel van het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma was bevordering van meer kindvriendelijk onderwijs in Suriname. Om dit doel te bereiken werden er vier trainingsmodules uitgevoerd voor alle (92) scholen in het binnenland. Het belangrijkste impact doel van het UNICEF/MINOWC “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma was dat tenminste 80% van de meisjes en jongens in het binnenland toegang hebben tot “quality inclusive” basisonderwijs. Output goals waren:

1. Alle basisschool leerkrachten en schoolleiders in het binnenland passen de standaarden voor Kindvriendelijke Scholen (CFS) toe.
2. Tenminste 50% van de scholen in het binnenland hebben een school ontwikkelingsplan en een functionerende Leerkracht-Ouder associatie.

**Methodologie:** Om vorm te geven aan de evaluatie werden een logframe en evaluatie matrix samengesteld. Veldwerk werd in juli en augustus 2015 uitgevoerd op 11 scholen in het binnenland. De consultant verzamelde data door middel van:

- a) Analyse van bestaande kwantitatieve en kwalitatieve bronnen.
- b) Enquête interviews met 40 leerkrachten en semigestructureerde vragenlijsten met schoolleiders.
- c) 21 Focus Groep Discussies (FGD) met in totaal 105 kinderen; jongens en meisjes apart.
- d) Consultaties met MINOWC, de Nucleus Centra, UNICEF en andere sleutelfiguren.
- e) Observaties in de klas.

Beperkingen van het onderzoek waren onder andere dat de effecten van het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma niet geïsoleerd kunnen worden van veranderingen die door andere interventies in het onderwijsveld plaatsgevonden hebben. Verder was er vóór de uitvoer van het project geen nulmeting gedaan en was er geen logframe ontwikkeld. Een andere beperking is de kleine steekproef, wat extrapolatie van de resultaten naar alle scholen van het binnenland in Suriname bemoeilijkt.

**Analyse van bestaande bronnen:** Bestaande bronnen suggereren dat het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsprogramma haar input doelen grotendeels behaald heeft, maar dat de impact, outcome en outcome-doelen veelal niet gerealiseerd zijn.

**Resultaten:** Interviews en consultaties bevestigen dat sleutelfiguren in het onderwijsveld het “Ik geloof in jou” concept om Kindvriendelijke Scholen te introduceren waardeerden. Met uitzondering van vier leerkrachten waren alle geïnterviewde leerkrachten van mening dat de “Ik geloof in jou” trainingen een
toegevoegde waarde hadden en dat ze vaardigheden en werkvormen aangeleerd hadden die ze nergens anders geleerd hadden.

De evaluatie vond grote verschillen tussen scholen en tussen individuele leerkrachten in de mate waarin zij in staat waren een kindvriendelijke schoolomgeving te creëren. Tussen de 70 en 85 procent van de leerkrachten was na de training in staat belangrijke concepten uit te leggen. Verder gaven met uitzondering van drie personen, alle leerkrachten aan dat ze hun lesmethoden veranderd hadden door de “Ik geloof in jou” trainingen, bijvoorbeeld door het lokaal aantrekkelijker te maken, door meer visueel materiaal te gebruiken, en door interactiever les te geven. Verschillende werkvormen, zoals groepswerk, werden nu vaak toegepast. Ook rapporteerde iets meer dan de helft van de leerkrachten dat hun manier om gedrag te corrigeren veranderd was (52.6%). Het merendeel van de leerkrachten bemerkte positieve veranderingen in de kinderen als gevolg van de nieuwe aanpak; waaronder dat kinderen de les beter begrijpen, geconcentreerder zijn, actiever participeren, en van elkaar leren.

Aan de andere kant werden er tijdens klassenobservaties weinig voorbeelden van een veilige en kindvriendelijke omgeving waargenomen. Ook waar leer- en leeshoeken aanwezig waren werden kinderen niet aangemoedigd om deze te gebruiken. Weinig leerkrachten deden moeite om kinderen met meervoudige intelligenties en verschillende leervoorkeuren te betrekken, en deze concepten werden niet goed begrepen. Geen enkele leerkracht gebruikte de werkvormkaarten. Uit observaties en FGD kwam naar voren dat leerkrachten nog steeds gebruik maken van lijfstraffen en verbaal geweld. Slechts drie van de veertig geïnterviewde leerkrachten hadden een persoonlijk ontwikkelingsplan ontwikkeld, dat regelmatig aangepast en gebruikt werd. Vier van de elf scholen hadden een Team Ontwikkelingsplan met de ontwikkelingsdoelen voor het komende jaar of jaren. Drie van de elf bezochte scholen hadden een oudercommissie, maar op geen enkele school was deze commissie actief ten tijde van het onderzoek.

**Conclusies:** De conclusies beoordelen de bevindingen op basis van de evaluatiecriteria, benoemen de sterke en zwakke punten van het programma, en presenteren geleerde lessen.

**Relevantie:** Alle betrokkenen waren het ermee eens dat er een dringende behoefte was aan hervorming van de onderwijssector, dat het “Ik geloof in jou” programma relevant was, en dat het programma nauw aansloot bij het onderwijsbeleid van de Surinaamse overheid.

**Effectiviteit:** Bij gebrek aan een nulmeting en logframe bij de start van het programma is het moeilijk de effecten van de training te meten. Gerapporteerde en geobserveerde veranderingen die aan het “Ik geloof in jou” programma toegeschreven kunnen worden zijn gelimiteerd en geïsoleerd, en geen onderdeel van een geheel nieuwe, geïntegreerde manier van lesgeven.

**Efficiëntie:** Uitvoering van de trainingen geschiedde naar het schijnt kosteneffectief, en er was een goede samenwerking tussen de projectpartners. Input doelen zijn grotendeels behaald, alhoewel met vertraging. Een zorgpunt is het beperkte succes op het gebied van impact, outcomes en outputs.

**Impact:** De "Ik geloof in jou" trainingen hebben waarschijnlijk bijgedragen aan een mindshift in de onderwijssector, maar deze mindshift heeft niet geleid tot een algehele structurele gedragsverandering of verbeterde leerprestaties op scholen in het binnenland. Veranderingen zijn vaak niet volledig en gedrag dat indruist tegen de CFE waarden komt veelvuldig voor.
Duurzaamheid: Zonder ondersteuning in de klas en een faciliterende omgeving is de kans groot dat bereikte veranderingen tijdelijk zijn. Positief is dat de “Ik geloof in jou” visie breed gedeeld is, waardoor leerkrachten aan CFE blootgesteld zullen blijven worden. Het MINOWC is bovendien begonnen met integratie van de “Ik geloof in jou” visie in haar beleid.

Cross-cutting contributions: De trainingssessies besteedden weinig aandacht aan gender, maar culturele relevantie is wel besproken.

Met betrekking tot de sterke kanten van het programma concludeert de consultant dat het “Ik geloof in jou” programma beantwoordde aan de behoefte naar onderwijsvervorming en capaciteitsversterking van leerkrachten. Belanghebbenden binnen het onderwijsveld, waaronder leerkrachten, zijn zich meer bewust geworden van CFE en gerelateerde concepten. De resultaten duiden ook op kleine verbeteringen in lesmethoden. Het programma bood nuttige handvatten, leek kosteneffectief en werd aangepast aan de behoeften van de doelgroep. Zwakke kanten van het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsschema waren onder andere onvolkomenheden in de programma planning en het feit dat de programma activiteiten niet aansloten bij de indicatoren van “quality inclusive” onderwijs, terwijl dit het belangrijkste doel van het programma was. MINOWC data en veldresultaten suggereren dat het “Ik geloof in jou” leerkrachten trainingsschema programma geen effect gehad heeft op leerprestaties, en dat toevoeging van de CFE principes en lesmethoden in de praktijk gering is. Tenslotte schaadt het gebrek aan begeleiding in de klas, zowel gedurende de trainingen als tijdens de follow-up, de duurzaamheid van het programma.

Eén van de geleerde lessen is dat toekomstige projecten baat zullen hebben bij een goed ontworpen administratief systeem. Verder: projectduurzaamheid kan verbeteren met financiële en praktische toezeggingen van de partnerorganisaties; training voor leerkrachten in het binnenland zou begeleiding in de klas begeleiding moeten incorporeren; en toekomstige onderwijsvervormingen zullen voordeel trekken uit gemotiveerde leerkrachten, sterke schoolleiders en sterke schoolteams.

Nucleus Centra, verbetering van de professionele kwaliteiten van leerkrachten en school leiders, en een Human Resources beleid dat het carrière pad voor leerkrachten met verschillende ingangsniveaus uitstippelt.
1. Introduction
This report presents the results of the evaluation of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training. For the last few years, UNICEF supported Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (MINOWC) with the implementation of the “I believe in you” vision. This support consisted partly of assistance with the delivery of in-services teacher trainings in the interior based on the “I believe in you” vision document.

1.1 The “I believe in you” vision
The “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme was developed to make a positive contribution to pupil-oriented and child friendly education in Suriname. According to the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) Child-friendly education (CFE) has two major characteristics, both of which relate directly to the right to education and to equity:

1) It is child-centred; and
2) It is child-seeking, trying to ensure that all potential learners, whatever their background and ability, have an equal chance to enter the education system.

Child-friendly education focuses on addressing the full range of barriers to accessing good-quality education – including gender discrimination, poverty, isolation, language, ethnicity and disability. It treats children as rights holders and MINOWC as a duty bearer with obligations to fulfil these rights and to demonstrate, promote and help monitor the rights and well-being of all children in the community (UNICEF, 2013). The MINOWC has not yet defined child-friendly education and standards do not yet exist.

In May 2009 the book “Ik geloof in jou!” (“I believe in you!”) was launched in Suriname, with the aim to contribute to pupil-oriented and child friendly education in Suriname. This vision document was the result of a collaboration between the MINOWC, the Flemish Organization for Development Cooperation and Technical Assistance (Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Technische Bijstand, VVOB) and UNICEF. "I believe in you!" promotes a holistic approach to reach a Powerful Learning Environment (Krachtige Leeromgeving), centred around several subthemes including inclusive education; effective teaching; a healthy, safe and protective environment; gender sensitivity in education; student, community and family participation in education; and enabling environment.

1.2 In-service teacher training
The training programme was developed after the "I believe in you" vision was launched in May 2009 by presenting the publication to the Minister of Education. After that, a large scale capacity strengthening and training programme was developed for the following years to translate this vision for the different stakeholders and their specific responsibilities. MINOWC with support of VVOB and UNICEF developed a comprehensive training programme for all primary school teachers in the country to ensure all 10,000 teachers would understand how to implement the new approach in their classrooms. They received their own copy of the book as a source of inspiration and reference (the vision in the book describes the what

---

2 Since March 27, 2015 the old name Ministry of Education and Community Development (Ministerie van Onderwijs en Volksontwikkeling, MINOV) is changed in Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur, MINOWC).
and the training programme helped to clarify the how), and a national television campaign was broadcasted for many months to inform society about the education reform and the content of the training to explain what a powerful learning environment would look like and what we were all working towards together. This was an important intervention to keep the dialogue with society open and to keep them engaged since they had been consulted at a large scale to provide input for the formulation of the vision.

With this component, the in-service teacher training was covered for all teachers whereby VVOB took responsibility for Paramaribo and the coastal areas and UNICEF for the interior. The materials were developed together, the pool of trainers was trained together and after that, the different groups implemented the training their specific geographical part. In addition to the large-scale in-service teacher training, the new approach was also introduced in all the four teacher training colleges, with a new curriculum "the new teacher" to ensure new teachers would adopt the new approach and have the skills to promote that in schools in their future jobs. The first group of graduates are expected this year (2016). So, the teacher training needs were addressed on both in-service and pre-service levels to ensure sustainability (with reform of the pre-service curriculum, future in-service needs would change as it is expected that new teachers have a solid foundation and understanding of the new approach).

UNICEF focused on all (currently 92) primary schools in the four interior districts (Brokopondo, Marowijne, Para and Sipaliwini). UNICEF’s support to MINOWC included technical and financial support to the development and implementation of four in-service teacher training modules. Its overall goal was that “At least 80% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education”. The expected outcomes included:

1. All primary school teachers and school leaders in the interior have knowledge and skills to implement child-friendly concepts and methodologies.
2. At least 50% of schools in the interior have a School Development Plan and functioning Parent Teacher Association.

Within the programme a group of trainers was trained, who subsequently trained all teachers of all primary schools in the interior. Nine master trainers were part of a training pool that was set up during the development of the materials. Three trainers from the MINOWC Bureau for Education of the Interior (Bureau Onderwijs Binnenland - BOB³) joined the team in a later stage.

The following modules were provided;

I. “I believe in You” (2010/2011)
II. “Powerful learning environment” (2010/2011)
III. “Activating didactics” (2012).
IV. “Deepening in service teacher training” (2013-14)

³ This bureau does not exist in the new organization chart and is merged into the Bureau Primary Education
In 2011, an intermediate evaluation was conducted. Based on the results from this evaluation, UNICEF’s continuing support to the MINOWC focused on deepening the in-service teacher training programmes on “Activating didactics” and “Powerful learning environment” for all teachers in the interior (2012-14).

All is made transparent in a flow chart (Figure 1).

1.3 Goals and Objectives of the evaluation
The aim of this study is to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting contributions of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme in the interior. This evaluation identifies lessons learned and provides recommendations on future national policy and programme priorities for primary education in the interior of Suriname. More specifically, the key purposes of the evaluation include:

1. Assess the results achieved during the in-service teacher training programme period, in line with proposed objectives, targets and strategies, through a reconstructed log frame.
2. Analyse the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and cross cutting contributions of the in-service teacher training programme in achieving CFS and pupil – centred schools in the Interior.
3. Identify specific good practices, weaknesses and lessons learned.
4. Provide recommendations to the MINOWC, national institutions, and development partners including UNICEF, for the future initiatives on achieving Child Friendly Education and pupil – centred education in (the interior) Suriname.
Figure 1. Flow chart of the “I believe in you” programme
1.4 Key definitions

Key definitions used in this report are listed below:

“I believe in you” vision: Belief in the child with its unique talents and capabilities, and in learning.

Child friendly education: Pupil oriented education that stimulates the learning every child, adolescent or young adult, building on his or her own unique talents and possibilities.

Powerful learning environment (Krachtige leeromgeving): On the one hand, it means that teachers give schoolchildren sufficient space to independently explore how to solve tasks, together with their fellow students. Yet on the other hand, it offers sufficient guidance, responding to the individual needs of every child.

Activating didactics (Activerende didactiek): An umbrella term for all pedagogic-didactic interventions of a teacher to stimulate the (mental) activity of schoolchildren. It focuses on the working forms that the teacher uses to stimulate children’s brains, so that they become actively involved. The essence is that the teacher presents the subject matter in a way that is fascinating, interesting, and relevant, and that he or she engages the children. Among others, this means that education must be in line with the daily life experiences and actual knowledge of children.

Quality inclusive education: Education that recognizes diversity in the experiences, abilities and needs of each child and family. Quality Inclusive Education focuses on all aspects of the child's life: the physical, cognitive, language, and social abilities, his or her gender, and his or her family, socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural background. It recognizes that children will vary in the type and range of support and resources they need as well as in how much time they require extra support (ECRTNO, undated\(^4\)).

1.5 Report lay-out

In the remainder of this report we will proceed as follows:

**Chapter 2** describes the methods that were used for (field) data collection. This chapter also describes the study population, visited schools and areas (Annex 2), and the survey sample.

**Chapters 3** presents the results of desk study. Consulted reports and data sources are listed in Annex 3.

**Chapter 4** present the fieldwork results. It analyses information obtained through interviews with teachers and school leaders, and Focus Group Discussions with schoolchildren at primary schools in the interior. This results are complemented with the results of consultations with key informants from national and international organizations that are active in the field of education, and with officials from MINOWC.

**In Chapter 5**, the consultant synthesizes the results based on the evaluation criteria and the log frame. In addition, this chapter contains recommendations to UNICEF and its development partners, the MINOWC

---

\(^4\) ecrtno.ca/wordpress/wp-content/.../IntroductionsandUserGuidelines.pdf
and national institutions, for the future initiatives towards achieving Child Friendly Education and pupil-centred education in (the interior of) Suriname.

Bulky data and other details are placed together in the Annexes. They contain a list of consulted stakeholders, motivation for inclusion of the research schools, an evaluation matrix, the research instruments and the TOR.
2 Methods

2.1 Evaluation criteria
The evaluation was conducted according to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards, as well as other guidelines and standards that UNICEF subscribes to. It focused on four (4) rounds of in-service teacher training sessions that were implemented by the MINOWC, with support of UNICEF, between 2010 and 2014. These training sessions were:

1) I believe in You
2) Powerful learning environment
3) Activating didactics
4) The deepening in-service teacher training programme (repetition of highlights of the previous three training sessions).

The result of the total package of training sessions was evaluated on the basis of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (Table 1). These criteria were determined by UNICEF and MINOWC in their Terms of Reference (Annex 6).

Table 1. Evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Assesses the extent to which the programme suits the priorities &amp; policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Measures the extent to which the programme attains its objectives; and assesses the relation between programme targets, activities, and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. This means weighing the use of (material and human) resources in relation to the achieved results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>The positive and negative changes produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding is withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting contributions</td>
<td>Assesses whether the programme is in line with general principles such as democracy, human rights, good governance, children's rights, rights of Indigenous peoples, gender equality, a sustainable environment and HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC)6

5 No detailed evaluation of the project expenditures will be produced.
6 http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/dac_criteria
2.2 Evaluation matrix and log frame

The Evaluation Matrix (table 2) shows the relation between the evaluation criteria, the primary research questions derived thereof, data collection tools, and the target groups for this evaluation. Furthermore, based on the initial project proposals and other relevant project documents provided by the programme stakeholders, the consultant developed a project log frame to serve this evaluation (Table 3). This log frame visualizes the project logic by revealing the project objectives, success criteria (targets), activities, outputs, and anticipated outcomes. Key evaluation questions were formulated by UNICEF and MINOWC in their TOR (Annex 6). Based on the key evaluation questions and input from the consultant final key evaluation questions were formulated in collaboration with UNICEF and MINOWC.

It is important to note that no log frame or indicators were developed at the onset of the “I believe in you” programme, and baseline data were not collected. Because of a lack of a baseline no benchmarks could be established. Hence the log frame including all listed indicators has been constructed for the purpose of this evaluation, with input from UNICEF. The Evaluation Matrix and the ‘re-constructed’ log frame guided this evaluation. The matrix defined the key methodology used for each of evaluation questions and guided development of the evaluation tools.

2.3 Sample

In selecting schools to participate in the evaluation, there was a choice between evaluating a relatively larger number of schools near one another and near the capital city, or evaluating a smaller number but larger diversity of schools. Together with UNICEF, it was decided to conduct the evaluation at a relatively small but diverse number of schools distributed throughout the interior; in Maroon and Indigenous communities, public and denominated schools, schools both near and far from the capital city, and schools in all interior districts. The consultant realizes that the small sample size may compromise the representativeness of the results. However, given the comparability of results in the huge diversity of schools, and in light of supportive evidence from qualitative interviews and MINOWC statistics, we are confident that the findings provide a reliable representation of the impact of the “I believe in you” training programme at interior schools.

Field work was conducted from July to August 2015 at 11 schools in the districts of Sipaliwini, Marowijne, Para and Brokopondo. Eleven schools represent approximately 12 percent of interior schools. Because the district of Sipaliwini is the largest district and has most schools compared to other interior districts, five of the eleven proposed schools were located in this district. Two schools were selected from each of the other districts, Marowijne, Para and Brokopondo.

---

7 The UNICEF reports document different numbers of interior schools; some speak of 87 schools, while others report that there are 89 or 92 schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Was there a need for the &quot;I believe in you&quot; programme, considering all the other trainings already provided by MINOWC-BEIP, EBGS, RKBO and various NGOs?</td>
<td>Survey interviews</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project goal correspond with the development goals and needs of the target group (schools, schoolchildren)?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>School leaders, MINOWC, UNICEF, RKBO, EBGS, VVOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were the objectives of the in service teacher training programme relevant in the local culture context of the target community?</td>
<td>Survey interviews</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do the objectives of the &quot;I believe in You&quot; vision align with the objectives of Suriname’s <em>Ontwikkelingsplan</em> (National Strategic Plan) and in achievement of MDGs?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>MINOWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How coherent were the “I believe in You” components for teachers and schools leaders, with teacher and school leaders’ formal career paths?</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>MINOWC policy documents, MOP, National Strategic Plan, MDG report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Did the executing organization work with a functional administrative system with clearly stated, measurable objectives, a log frame (or comparable system), success indicators and baseline data?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>UNICEF, MINOWC-BOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the outputs of the training programme? How many people and institutions have been affected? (# trained teachers, # trainers, # schoolchildren receiving CFE, # schools)</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports, mid-term evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have the objectives of the in service teacher training programme been realized in the interior schools? Do outcomes vary between different interior communities, among groups of teachers/school leaders or between boys and girls?</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Monitoring reports and mid-term evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey interviews</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>School leaders, MINOWC, UNICEF, Coaching team, trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>Schoolchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Project monitoring and evaluation documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the teachers in the interior schools gained knowledge and skills in implementing the “I believe in You” approach? To what extent has the programme led to a child-friendly mind-set among teachers? To what extent are teachers applying these knowledge and skills?</td>
<td>Document review, Survey interviews, In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports), training manuals and workbooks, Teachers, School leaders, Coaching team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the “I believe in You” interventions (the in-service teacher training programme) contributed to the improvement of teaching and learning in the interior schools?</td>
<td>Survey interviews, In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Teachers, School leaders, MINOWC inspection, RKBO, EBGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the (timely) achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?</td>
<td>Document review, Survey interviews, In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports), Teachers, School leaders, MINOWC, UNICEF, RKBO, EBGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**

Measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the UNICEF-supported programme provided sufficient support to achieve the &quot;I believe in You&quot; goals in the interior schools?</td>
<td>Survey interviews, In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Teachers, School leaders, MINOWC, UNICEF, RKBO, EBGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the project goals been reached within the dictated timeframe?</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the activities and outputs have been delivered with fewer resources (human and financial) without reducing their quality and quantity? Has the UNICEF-supported ‘Realization of ‘I believe in You!’ programme been cost-effective? (E.g. training and hiring local people). Are there more cost effective ways for deliver the teacher training?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews, Document review</td>
<td>UNICEF, MINOWC-BOB, Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Project documents (Project proposal, PROGRESS reports, monitoring reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the school management, the MINOWC’s guidance staff, regional administration and MINOWC management involved in supporting the “I believe in you” initiative?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>UNICEF, MINOWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How efficient is the level of coordination between UNICEF and other partners, including government and local partners?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
<td>UNICEF, MINOWC, VVOB, RKBO, EBGS, Stg. PCOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact

**The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the in service teacher training programme improved learning outcomes and performance in interior schools? Do outcomes vary between interior schools in different communities and between girls and boys?</td>
<td>Existing reports and data, School data, MINOWC research and planning UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important changes in didactic knowledge and approach among teachers at interior schools as a result of the Project?</td>
<td>Survey interviews, In-depth qualitative interviews, Document review, Classroom observations, Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have schools created a powerful learning environment, where children participate more actively?</td>
<td>Classroom observations, Focus group discussions, Survey interviews with closed and open-ended questions, Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of the in-service teacher training in realization of “I believe in you!” and the reform process of basic education?</td>
<td>Classroom observations, Focus group discussions, Survey interviews with closed and open-ended questions, Document review, In-depth qualitative interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any unintended (positive or negative) consequences from the programme?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews, UNICEF, MINOWC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability

**Measures whether the benefits of an activity are**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the outcomes achieved sustainable? What are the recommendations to the MINOWC, UNICEF and other stakeholders in promoting child friendly and quality education in Suriname as a whole, and for both urban/cost and interior contexts?</td>
<td>In-depth qualitative interviews, UNICEF, MINOWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting contributions</td>
<td>Have gender dimensions and other differences between children on the basis of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and so forth been taken into account in project design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the programme responded to the needs of both girls and boys? To what extent the different strategies were used to address the challenges of all girls and boys??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the Project affect human rights, indigenous rights and/or children's rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the Program respect the general principles of good governance and a sustainable environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGFRAME “I BELIEVE IN YOU”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| At least 80% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education | Improved learning performance and outcomes in interior schools for boys and girls | • MINOWC Research and Planning data  
• School reports (unprocessed data) | Data may not be available. |
| | % of children, boys and girls, who actively participate in class and express enthusiasm for learning | • Focus groups  
• Class observations  
• Teacher interviews | Observation periods are too short to obtain a true understanding of the learning environment |
| **Outcome 1** | | | |
| All primary schools teachers and school leaders in the interior apply the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standards and are better equipped to teach in a child friendly and creative way. | % of school teachers and school leaders who changed their didactic approaches and way of working with children, in line with the CFS standards, as a result of the training | • Teacher interviews  
• Interviews with school leaders  
• Focus group discussions | Since no baseline data was collected no comparison can be made, the analysis relies on recollection and self-reporting of change |
| | % of teachers who provide learning opportunities for children with different learning needs and learning preferences | • Teacher interviews | |
| | % of teachers who can name at least three didactic methods/tools from the training sessions they have used during the school year 2014-2015 | • Teacher interviews | Classroom observations are too short to provide a good understanding of teaching methods |
| | % of teachers who changed their ways of correcting undesirable behaviour and rewarding desirable behaviour a little or a lot as a result of the trainings | • Teacher interviews  
• FGDs with children | Teachers and school leaders may define “participation” in their own way, thus providing skewed results. |
| | Children more actively participate in class by asking and responding to questions, taking notes, and interacting with each other for the purpose of learning. | • Classroom observations  
• Teacher interviews | |
| **Output 1.1** | | | |
| Teachers have gained knowledge of, and | % of teachers and school leaders who can explain the various facets of the “I believe in you” vision in their own words | • Mid-term evaluation | Since training was conducted (2010 and |
| Understand, concepts of CFS | % of interviewed teachers who can explain the following concepts related to Powerful learning environment:  
- Powerful learning environment  
- Learning preferences  
- Child friendly education | Teacher interviews | 2012), knowledge has been diminishing Since training was conducted (2010-11 and 2012), knowledge has watered down. |
| % of interviewed teachers who can explain the following concepts related to activating didactics:  
- Activating didactics  
- Multiple talents  
- Working forms  
- Work independently  
- Collaborative learning vs. group work | Teacher interviews | Mid-term evaluation |
| **Output 1.2** | Teachers better understand their own strengths, learning preferences and weaknesses | % of teachers who can identify their own learning preference. | Teacher interviews  
- Personal Development Plans |
| % of teachers who have developed and up-dated lesson plans, class preparation sheets and POPs | Personal Development Plans  
- Lesson plans  
- Class prep. sheets |
| **Outcome II** | At least 50% of schools in the interior have a Team Development Plan and functioning Parent-Teacher Association | Number of visited schools that have regular school meetings to discuss the implementation of the school plan/Team Development Plan. | Interview with school leader  
- TOP  
- Interview with school leader  
- Interview with PTA representatives |
| Number of visited schools have functioning Parent-Teacher Associations.  
Share between fathers and mothers in the PTAs  
Type of activities the PTAs are involved in | It is difficult to verify to what extent school team meetings really discuss the TOP  
PTA may exist in name but not be active in practice |
| **Output 2.1** | At least 50% of schools developed a Team Development Plan as a result of the training | Number of schools with a Team Development Plan (TOP) with elements from the training sessions | Interviews with school leaders  
- Document (TOP or other) with school vision and team guidelines |
| Number of schools with either formal (written) or informal (oral) guidelines for correcting (punishment) undesirable behaviour and rewarding desirable behaviour of students. | TOP may be non-existent, outdated and of varying quality |
| **Output 2.2** | % of teachers, including headmasters, who can explain the role of PTA | Teacher interviews |
| Parents in some of the interior villages |
| School leaders, teachers and parents understand the role of PTA | % of the trained teachers who have communicated with parents about the PTA and parents participation in the school management | ▪ Interviews with school leaders | may not have been to school themselves and have a poor understanding of the school context and achievements of their children |

**Output 2.3**

Parents have willingness to participate in school management  
Community leaders and parents expressed interests in participating in the school management (yes/no, and how).  
▪ Interviews with school leaders  
▪ Interviews with PTA  
"Participation" can be understood in different ways

**Inputs (Activities)**

At least 12 Trainers are trained to deliver a series of four trainings on CFE to interior teachers  
Number of trainers have been trained in the delivery of all 4 training modules: "I believe in you", "Activating didactics", "Powerful learning environment" and the deepening in-service teacher training programme in the interior of Suriname.  
▪ List of participants in the training of trainers courses.  
Participant lists may be incomplete or lost.

% of interviewed teachers who found the trainers well-prepared, knowledgeable, able to respond to questions and stimulating.  
▪ Teacher interviews  
Teachers may only respond on the basis of the most recent training

4 training modules are developed and used in the training  
Existence of the four training modules  
▪ Project documents  
For the interior, three different trainings and a deepening training were developed

Number of copies of the training materials are produced and disseminated during the programme period  
▪ Project documents  
▪ UNICEF

Satisfaction with training materials among teachers  
▪ Teacher interviews  
Interviewees may provide desirable answers

All teachers in the interior of Suriname follow a series of four trainings in the context of CFE  
Number and % of teachers and school leaders (male and female) in the interior of Suriname who have been trained in Child Friendly education methods, using the "I believe in you" approach (at least one module, 2-3 modules, all 4 modules).  
▪ Project documents  
Numbers of trainees may not have been registered

% of interviewed teachers and school leaders who indicate that they have learned useful skills during the trainings.  
▪ Teacher interviews  
▪ Interviews with school leaders  
Interviewees may provide desirable answers

% of interviewed teachers who positively value the training materials (work books), and still regularly use them.  
▪ Teacher interviews
In selecting schools for participation in the evaluation, we aimed for variation based on the following criteria:

- **District:** Inclusion of schools from all four districts
- **Geographical remoteness,** i.e. inclusion of communities that are located relatively closer to Paramaribo city and communities that are relatively remote.
- **Ethnic affiliation of the population,** i.e. inclusion of communities of different Indigenous and Maroon groups.
- **School size,** i.e. inclusion of very large schools (>300 children), schools with few classes (<100 children), and mid-size schools (100-300 children). In large schools, the hypothesis is that there may be more opportunities for teachers to support one another in implementing and applying the “I believe in you” principles. On the other hand, small schools may have smaller classes and hence more opportunity for personal attention from the teacher.
- **School type,** i.e. Public school (*Openbare school*) or denominational (Roman Catholic, Moravian).

Annex 2 provides a more detailed description of the schools included in this study, in terms of predominant ethnicity of the students, home language, school size and type, and so forth.
Figure 2. Map of Suriname with the location of elementary schools, showing the proposed research communities

- = Evaluation school
  = GLO school
Table 4. Selected schools for the in-service teacher training programme evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>School name</th>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Geographic remoteness*</th>
<th>Ethnic affiliation</th>
<th>No. of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O.S. Kananoe Apetina</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Apetina</td>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Remote (plane)</td>
<td>Wayana Indigenous</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O.S. Drietabbetje</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Drietabbetje</td>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Remote (plane)</td>
<td>Ndyuka Maroon</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EBG Mooitaki</td>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>Mooitaki</td>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Remote (plane/boat)</td>
<td>Ndyuka Maroon</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>O.S. Duwatra</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Duwatra</td>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Medium Access</td>
<td>Saramaka Maroon</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anton Donici school</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Nason</td>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Remote (road/boat)</td>
<td>Paramaka Maroon</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R.M. Schmidt</td>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>Brownsweg</td>
<td>Brokopondo</td>
<td>Easy Access</td>
<td>Saramaka Maroon</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EBG Balingoela</td>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>Balingoela</td>
<td>Brokopondo</td>
<td>Easy Access</td>
<td>Saramaka Maroon</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St. Wilhelmschool</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Powakka</td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>Easy Access</td>
<td>Lokono Indigenous</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>O.S. Bigi Poika</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Bigi Poika</td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>Medium access</td>
<td>Kalinya Indigenous</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St. Theresiaschool</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Moengo</td>
<td>Marowijne</td>
<td>Easy access</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O.S. Albina I</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Albina</td>
<td>Marowijne</td>
<td>Easy Access</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Easy access = <2.5hr travel by road; Medium access = < 5 hour travel by road; Remote = plane travel or combination of road and boat travel

2.4 Methodology

The consultant collected data through:

I. Desk review of existing quantitative and qualitative sources about the four rounds of in-service teacher training sessions.

II. Consultations with participating teachers, school leaders and schoolchildren,

III. Consultations with key stakeholders; the implementing organization MINOWC and its Nucleus Centres, the donor organisation UNICEF and other stakeholders (e.g. VVOB, Stg. Onderwijs, SPI, CPI).

IV. Classroom observations.

2.4.1 Desk review

The consultant used existing reports and (un-)published data to provide a first impression of the programme achievements. Documents that were made available by UNICEF and/or MINOWC included general project documents (TOR, proposal), monitoring reports, training reports, a midterm evaluation report, and training manuals and workbooks. In addition, the consultant used:
The desk review was also used as basis for interviews with key stakeholders. A list of consulted documents is provided in Annex 3.

2.4.2 Consultations with key stakeholders
The consultant conducted in-person key stakeholder interviews with representatives of MINOWC, UNICEF, VVOB, Stichting Onderwijs der EBGS, and other national stakeholders that were indicated based on the input from UNICEF and MINOWC and the desk review. Consultations were held in Paramaribo, Albina and Brokopondo between July and August 2015. One consultation was conducted via email because the respondent resides abroad, another short consultation was done by phone. Stakeholder interviews followed a general questionnaire to facilitate comparison of the answers, but also had questions related to the specific position or expertise of the consulted person/organization. Stakeholders’ and/or UNICEF financial contributions are not described because financial characteristics of the programme were beyond the scope of the consultancy. A list of consulted stakeholders is presented in Annex I.

2.4.2 Consultations at schools
The aim was to interview an average of four teachers per school, but at two schools (Mooitaki and Apetina) only two teachers could be interviewed due to illness (Apetina) and simply not having more teachers (Mooitaki). Of all interviewed teachers, two had the title of district assistant (districtskwekeling) and eleven had Boslandakte. Teachers with these titles are allowed to teach at interior schools only.

At every school but Nason, the school leader was interviewed. The school leader of the Anton Donici school in Nason left when the research team arrived, and the researchers were unable to contact her by phone to make an appointment in Paramaribo.

Table 4 and Figure 2 present the selection of schools, which was made in consultation with UNICEF and MINOWC. For each school in the list, a motivation for inclusion is provided in Annex 2.
### Table 5. Number of interviewed teachers and school leaders, focus group discussions and class observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>School</th>
<th># teachers interviewed</th>
<th>School leader interviewed</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Class obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sipaliwini</td>
<td>Nason</td>
<td>Anton Donici</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apetina</td>
<td>O.S. Kananoe Apetina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mooitaki</td>
<td>E.B.G. Mooitaki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drietabbetje</td>
<td>O.S. Drietabbetje</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokopondo</td>
<td>Balingsoela</td>
<td>E.B.G. Balingsoela</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brownsweg</td>
<td>R.M. Schmidt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duatra</td>
<td>O.S. Duatra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marowijne</td>
<td>Albina</td>
<td>O.S. Albina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moengo</td>
<td>St. Theresia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para</td>
<td>Bigi Poika</td>
<td>O.S. Bigi Poika</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powakka</td>
<td>St. Wilhelmus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At each school, except for Nason, two focus group discussions were held with separate groups of boys and girls from grade 5 or 6. In Nason, only one focus group discussion was held because the 6th graders were not at school and there were only six children (five girls and one boy) in grade 5. Focus groups were conducted with 106 schoolchildren, mostly with grade five children because these children were more vocal than the very young children. The FGD-facilitators used participatory techniques and games to ensure that individual children felt confident enough to participate and express their perceptions, experiences, and ideas concerning their learning environment and experience (picture 1). The FGD with children took approximately one hour and made use of a group exercise, a video and drawings. The Focus Group guide is attached as Annex 4.

The consultant conducted three classroom observations per school in classes with teachers who received the teacher training models. An observation recording sheet was developed based on the evaluation matrix (Table 2) and log frame (Table 3), and is presented in Annex 4.
2.5 Protection of Human Subjects and Ethical Review

Research procedures adhered to professional ethical standards including the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which provide clear initial guidance for children’s participation in programmes, and in research. Prior to conducting a survey interview, the interviewee was approached in an unobtrusive manner. The surveyor introduced herself and explained the purpose of the research. We informed the participants that the participation was voluntary and that their name would not be revealed in the report. Principals were asked for consent to work with schoolchildren in focus groups. Teachers were asked to sign for consent before conducting an interview and before the consultant conducted observation. At schools where pictures were being taken, the principal was asked for consent by means of an Editorial Subject Release Form provided by UNICEF.

2.6 Limitations

The consultant was confronted with several challenges and limitations in the execution of this study.

- The small study sample limits extrapolation of the findings to all interior schools in Suriname. Moreover, due to the small sample size it is not possible to make generalizing statements about differences between, for example, large and small schools, or schools further from or nearer by the capital city.
- The "I believe in you" programme and its in-service teacher trainings programme is not a stand-alone programme. In the past couple of years, the school curriculum has changed substantially under the BEIP (Basic Education Improvement Programme). As a result, it is difficult to say that observed changes in educational performance are due to the in-service teacher training

Figure 3. Focus Group Discussion with girls in Apetina
programme, to BEIP, or to other training programmes/interventions that teachers and/or the school have been exposed to.

- It is not realistic to expect significant changes in educational performance indicators in the short time since the trainings were performed. Therefore, the evaluation focussed primarily on behavioural changes in teachers and not so much on impact on national indicators.
- Because no baseline data were collected, it was not possible to compare our results with the situation prior to the implementation of the in-service teacher training programme.
- Because the log frame was constructed after completion of the in-service teacher training and progress reports did not use pre-established indicators, it has not been possible to establish project progress over time.
- Because the first trainings had been conducted six years ago, teachers had difficulties remembering exactly how many and what trainings they had received within the in-service teacher training programme. Moreover, teachers had a hard time distinguishing between the “I believe in you” trainings and the various MINOWC-BEIP trainings. Nevertheless, after discussing the received trainings and its contents, virtually all teachers remembered the trainings, in particular the most recent ones. Still, the reliability of some of the results may have been affected by the long time lapse between the start of the programme and programme evaluation.
- Schoolchildren, and particularly those in the interior, are often timid and hesitant to express their opinions to adults if they are not sure if this is the “approved” opinion. Even after creating a safe environment, the selection of the group (boys and girls apart, small groups) and using games and visuals, there were typically only one or two children in the group who would speak out. Others would provide “yes, teacher” and “no, teacher” answers, but not much more. As a result, the voices of the children are underrepresented in this report.
3 Review of existing literature and data

3.1 Documents under review
This section compiles and reviews the most important information from documents made available by UNICEF and MINOWC, as well as documents that have been collected by the consultant.

The consultant reviewed project documents—including the original project planning documents (e.g., proposal, TOR), monitoring and evaluation reports, and regular monthly or annual reports related to the project—; the training manuals and guides; Suriname government documents; reports by international organizations; and unpublished data on educational outcomes from the MINOWC department of Research and Planning. Annex 3 lists the documents that were reviewed. The numbers are used in the analysis below to refer to specific documents.

3.2 Education in the Suriname interior
The Suriname government targets for education (e.g. #7) are in line with Millennium Development Goal number 2, which is “Achieve universal primary education” (#6). Overall, Suriname is on the right track towards reaching this goal, especially for girls, as noticeable from the educational indicators presented in Table 7 (obtained from docs #8, #19 and #20). However, repetition and drop-out rates continue to be high. Moreover, extreme disparities in education exists between the coastal areas—primarily the rural area—and the interior where the majority of Amerindians and Maroons live (#8, #9, #10). This is apparent from the statistics (Table 6) as well as numerous reports about the educational sector in the interior of Suriname (summarized in #9). The 2010 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) report for Suriname (#8) shows that these discrepancies start already at pre-school age.

The recent Situation Analysis Maroon and Indigenous education summarizes some of the challenges for education in the interior (#9):

“...education in the interior of Suriname is plagued by numerous problems, most of which have been described before. [...] Children from the interior often attend poorly maintained schools, are taught by unqualified and under-qualified teachers, and obtain little educational support in their home environment. Moreover, in three out of the ten visited schools there was a lack of teachers and school-aged children were staying at home at the time of the research. [...] The home situation does not help to provide the educational stimulus needed by children. Many parents have not completed elementary school and a significant proportion indicated that they had not been to school at all [...] As a result of the listed challenges in elementary education, children from the interior are disadvantaged in their chances to do well in school. ...”

The above-mentioned Situation Analysis (#9) also concluded that the quality of teachers is of crucial importance to improving the educational experience and performance of children in the interior. Generally, the researchers found that children in schools with sufficient and more qualified teachers performed relatively better.
### Table 6. Educational indicators from the MICS 2010 (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Indicators</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net enrolment rate (NER)(^9) in primary education(^{10})</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Intake Rate in Primary Education(^{11})</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children of primary school age attending primary or secondary school, urban areas</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children of primary school age attending primary or secondary school, rural interior</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children entering grade 1, eventually reaching grade 6, total</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children entering grade 1, eventually reaching grade 6, urban areas</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children entering grade 1, eventually reaching grade 6, rural interior</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school completion rates(^{13}), nation wide</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school completion rate, urban areas</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school completion rate, rural interior</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 Relevance of the “I believe in you” programme

In 2008, Suriname’s Ministry of Education (MINOWC) expressed its intent to define a clear vision of the underlying principles for the new education framework for quality education, as expressed in the 2008 document “Quality Education in Suriname” (#4). In 2009, the vision document “Ik geloof in jou” (I believe in you, #14) for reform of the education system (primary school) in Suriname was jointly developed by VVOB (Flemish Agency for Development Cooperation), UNICEF and MINOWC. The essence of this vision document was that education must focus on developing the unique individual talents and gifts of each child, as reiterated in several project documents (#1-3). The 2009 “Ik geloof in jou” vision document named as the main objective of the Suriname educational system:

Promote the quality of ‘learning’ by constantly giving the learning process and the student a central place. This can be maximized by using a student focussed and child-friendly approach. The point of departure is always stimulating ‘learning’ of every child, youth, or young adult, departing from the own, unique talents and possibilities.

---

\(^9\) Enrolment of the official age group for a given level of education, expressed as a percentage of the population in that age group

\(^{10}\) Source: MDG Progress Report 2014

\(^{11}\) Percentage of children of primary school entry age (age 6 in Suriname) entering grade 1.

\(^{12}\) Adjusted Net Attendance Ratio

\(^{13}\) Primary completion rate, or gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary education, is the number of new entrants (enrollments minus repeaters) in the last grade of primary education, regardless of age, divided by the population at the entrance age for the last grade of primary education (World Bank website: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.CMPT.ZS)
The “I believe in you” programme is in line with the Suriname government vision on education in the interior, as described in the Implementation Plan Education Interior 2008-2015 (#11, see also #7). This document conveys that in addition to access to relevant knowledge, the educational sector:

“...must provide conditions wherein all stakeholders can interact in a respectful and open manner, with specific attention for the development of so-called ‘soft’ skills and behaviour such as communication, creativity, problem solving capacity, collaboration, respect, pro-activity and empathy.”

Consulted documents suggest that investment in upgrading teachers skills was direly needed. For example, the Suriname government Implementation Plan Education Interior 2008-2015 (#11, see also #7) and other reports identify skills that teachers need to master, including: communicative and management skills; behave in an open, inviting and trustful manner; and have knowledge of development psychological learning styles, pedagogy and didactics, and the school context. Other identified necessary skills include recognizing and acknowledging the variety in learning preferences and multiple intelligences in students; and using activating didactics, taking the multiple intelligences and learning preferences of students into account. The various trainings provided in the context of the “I believe in you” programme responded to this need, underlining programme relevance.

3.4 Training sessions

The “I believe in you” vision was translated into four interlinked two-day in-service teacher training sessions (#2):

1. *Ik geloof in jou* (a broad introduction training on the vision document).
2. *Krachtige Leeromgeving / Powerful learning environments* (including issues on classroom management and positive learning environments).
3. *Activerende Didactiek / Activating Didactics* (including issues on multiple types of learning and cooperative learning).
4. The deepening in-service teacher training programme (repetition of highlights of the previous three training sessions).

In 2012, a 2-day deepening training programme Activating Didactics and Powerful Learning Environment was developed and implemented for interior teachers. In addition, in 2014, new teachers who had been contracted to teach in the interior in the academic year 2014-15 followed a 5-day training about the “I believe in you” vision and related didactic approach and tools (#21) (M. Lionarons, UNICEF education specialist, pers. com. 16/06/15).

During the four school years between 2009 and 2013, all primary schools in Suriname received in-service training on the above listed topics (#2). VVOB implemented the CFS training programme in the city and coastal districts and UNICEF supported the implementation of the training programme for all schools in the interior. Although the same training manuals were used, VVOB and UNICEF had a different approach. For example, UNICEF trained all school teams, while VVOB trained so-called “innovation teams” (*vernieuwingsteams*) (M. Lionarons, Education specialist UNICEF, pers. com. 11/06/15). It is further
important to recognize that the schools in the interior were not supported with a pool of coaches, in contrast to the schools in greater Paramaribo (#5).

For each training programme a detailed Trainers Manual, Teacher Workbook, and training materials (posters and teaching aids) were developed, and teams of trainers identified and trained. Each training had its own objectives, as documented in the mid-term evaluation report (#5), project report #12, and the various training manuals and guidelines (# 13). In 2011, a mid-term evaluation was performed to measure selected project indicators. Based on the training materials, the mid-term evaluation, the log frame and the evaluation matrix, the consultant developed research instruments for use in the present evaluation (Annex 4).

3.5 Assessment of project goals based on review of existing data

The various documents and unpublished MINOWC data provide initial insights in the results of the “I believe in you” programme and the performance of the programme in relation to the programme goals (notably documents #3, #5, #12 #15, #16, #17, #22).

3.5.1 Existing evidence with regard to the impact goal
As stated in the introduction and the log frame, the primary goal of the “I believe in you” programme was that:

**At least 80% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education**

One of the indicators to measure achievement of that goal is, as stated in the log frame: “Improved learning performance and outcomes in interior schools for boys and girls”. Statistic from the MINOWC department of Research and Planning do not provide evidence of “Improved learning performance and outcomes in interior school”. In fact, the data show little change in educational indicators in the years during and following implementation of the “I believe in you” programme in the four interior districts.

An important indicator of the educational performance of schoolchildren is the number and share of children who repeat class (Figure 4). The data suggest that repetition rates have been fluctuating in the past six years. There is no clear trend and the number of children who repeated class was for all four interior districts higher in 2014 than in 2009.

Also for dropout rates, we do not see a clear (downward) trend since the start of the “I believe in you” programme in 2009 (Figure 5). In two of the interior districts, the number of dropouts in 2014 was lower than the number in 2009, and for the other two interior districts, the number was higher. These differences seem random effects as the figures go up and down from year to year. Overall, we see that the number of dropouts in the districts of Brokopondo, Para, and Marowijne lingers around the 400 schoolchildren per educational year, while in Sipaliwini about 800 school children prematurely leave school each educational year.
Figure 4. Number of schoolchildren from interior districts who repeated class, 2009-2014

Source: MINOWC Research and Planning. Email communication December 11, 2015

Figure 5. Number of drop-outs in the four interior districts, between 2009-2014

Source: MINOWC Research and Planning. Email communication December 11, 2015
Another important indicator for Suriname elementary (GLO) schools is the share of schoolchildren who, after making the 6th grade exam, are referred to middle school (MULO). Children who are not referred to MULO may be referred to a lower level continued education institutions (small numbers) or have to repeat grade 6. The GLO 6th grade test results between 2009 and 2015 suggest that educational performance has not significantly changed in this period (Figure 6). Overall, the low number of students that do pass the 6th grade exam with MULO credentials is worrisome, especially in the district of Sipaliwini. There is some fluctuation between the years but there is no clear trend. In Marowijne, Brokopondo and Sipaliwini, the share of students referred to MULO has –on average– slightly decreased in the period under investigation, while in Para share of school children referred to MULO is virtually the same in 2014 (45.8%) as it was in 2009 (45.5%).

Figure 6. Share of children that is referred to MULO on the basis of the GLO 6th grade exam

Source: MINOWC Research and Planning. Email communication December 11, 2015

A final indicator of educational performance we looked at is the number of schoolchildren who have been written off from a particular school, to attend another school. Reasons to be written off include: moving, long-term absence (3 months in a row), failed the same class twice, parents’ request, school advice (referral to special education because student is too slow or too old). The data suggest that there is no clear trend in the number of schoolchildren who have been written off in the past six years, and there is no significant difference between educational year 2008-2009 and educational year 2014-2015 in terms of the number of children at interior schools who have been written off (Figure 7).
3.5.2 Existing evidence with regard to outcome and output goals

As outlined in the log frame (Chapter 2), the “I believe in you” programme for the interior had two outcome goals, with five associated output goals:

1. All primary schools teachers and school leaders in the interior apply the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standards and are better equipped to teach in a child friendly and creative way.
   1.1 Teachers have gained knowledge of, and understand, concepts of CFS
   1.2 Teachers better understand their own strengths, learning preferences and weaknesses

2. At least 50% of schools in the interior have a Team Development Plan and functioning Parent-Teacher Association
   2.1 At least 50% of schools developed a Team Development Plan as a result of the training
   2.2 School leaders, teachers and parents understand the role of PTA
   2.3 Parents have willingness to participate in school management

With regard to outcome goal 1, the consultant observed that the training programme did not include tests such as a written or oral test, essay or presentation. Therefore it is difficult to establish, based on existing documents, the immediate effects of the training modules.

In 2011 the MINOWC Bureau for Interior Education reported that much of what was offered during the trainings was not or hardly applied on a daily basis at school or in the classroom, and that: “the effects of the training are hardly visible” (#1). This observation was confirmed by the mid-term evaluation, which reported that one year after the training, teachers displayed limited understanding and remembrance of concepts and definitions. It was also found that a year or more after the trainings, specific tools or working forms were hardly used, such as energizers. The mid-term evaluation commented that: “A structured
approach to innovation in schools is lacking, the innovation process also seems to lack a formalized and fully institutionalized approach”.

With regard to Outcome goal 2, the mid-term evaluation report reported that “Very few schools had a Team or School Development Plan” (Output goal 2.1). Existing documents provided no information about Parent-Teacher associations (Output goal 2.2), or about parents’ willingness to participate in school management (Output goal 2.3). UNICEF staff confirmed that the establishment of Parent-Teacher associations had received relatively little attention during project implementation (M. Lionarons, UNICEF education specialist, pers. com. 11/06/15).

3.5.3 Existing evidence with regard to input goals
The following input goals were defined:

1. At least 12 Trainers are trained to deliver a series of four trainings on CFE to interior teachers
2. 4 training modules are developed and used in the training
3. All teachers in the interior of Suriname follow a series of four trainings in the context of CFE

With regard to input goal 1, the consultant elicited from the documents that twelve trainers were trained to provide the “I believe in you” and “Powerful learning environment” trainings (#1). In addition, eight Master trainers and eight School Guidance Staff from two Nucleus Centres were trained to provide the deepening training programme.

With regard to input goal 2, it is documented that three different training modules were developed:
1. I believe in you
2. Powerful learning environment
3. Activating Didactics

In 2012, instead of adding a new training module, it was decided to provide a deepening training programme Activating Didactics and Powerful Learning Environment. The deepening training may be considered the fourth training.

With regard to input goal 3, programme documents reported that in total, 814 teachers and 92 school leaders of 92 schools in the interior of Suriname were trained in Child Friendly education methods, using the “I believe in you” approach. Other UNICEF project progress reports indicated that in different phases of the project, 614 (deepening training), 834 (3rd phase) and 930 teachers were trained. The data provided by the involved institutions did not allow for specifying how many teachers received one, two, three or all four trainings.

Existing reports also document a generally great degree of appreciation and enthusiasm of the training programme among teachers in the interior. The mid-term evaluation (#5) asserted that the trainings “were experienced in a very positive way and appreciated very much”. This impression was confirmed in other reports (e.g. #3).
4 Results

4.1 Relevance and appreciation of the in-service teacher training programme

Consulted stakeholders in Paramaribo and at the Nucleus Centres indicated that the "I believe in you" trainings were relevant and necessary. A representative of MINOWC explained that changes needed to be made; ‘we must abandon the old way of teaching, we must focus on the child’. The trainings were not designed specifically for the interior, but the objectives were relevant and well suited for implementation in this part of the country.

A representative of VVOB described the programme as ground-breaking because this was the first time a vision for education was designed on such a large scale. The process was participatory and there was a structural collaboration between MINOWC, VVOB and UNICEF during the design of the vision and the trainings. This approach ensured that the content of the trainings remained relevant, adapted to the challenges in education in the interior, and in line with the development goals and needs of the key stakeholders, the schools and schoolchildren. The Director of the Bureau for Education of the Interior explained that the trajectory with regard to child friendly education had already begun with the decentralization by means of the Nucleus Centres. “The in-service teacher trainings aligned with the vision of MINOWC and the Nucleus Centres”. The trainings were all-embracing; they did not focus on one specific method or one subject but on a mindshift towards child friendly education, according to the head of inspection. He explained that this programme focussed on didactics, and not specifically on one method.

All but four of the interviewed teachers were of the opinion that the in-service teacher trainings had been beneficial, and indicated that they had acquired skills and tools in those trainings that they had not obtained elsewhere. The most mentioned examples of things they had learned in the training, that they had not learned elsewhere were:

- Having clear class rules and repeat those rules
- Independent work and group work
- Working with colour blocks and boards
- Motivate students to participate and work better; give compliments; rewarding students
- Interaction with the children; relationship teacher-students
- Use different work forms (e.g. drawing, making songs or poems)
- Change of the classroom interior; e.g. using learning corners.

Figure 8 provides some of the comments provided by teachers when asked about the specific things they had learned, which had not been a part of other trainings.
During the “I believe in you training” I leaned much more. How to better work with the children, and give them compliments. This way you see that they really make an effort to do better. For example, making agreements, repeating the class rules, and it really works! Also rewarding; children who really made an effort to do well get a pencil or a pen, with a nice eraser. When they notice that, they try harder to work well. 
*Teacher age 35, Duatra*

A piece of progress in myself, in the way I am teaching now. I am more inspired, and the students now participate. 
*Teacher age 41, Powakka*

Work with blocks. It calms the children down, and gives me oversight. 
*Teacher age 32, Albina*

Class room arrangement; How to motivate and stimulate children to work better. Have consideration for children who are slower learners. 
*Teacher age 29, Moengo*

Give compliments, for example a pat on the shoulder. Be aware of your own facial expressions. 
*Teacher age 26, Bigi Poika*

I made [learning] corners. Being more considerate with children. Not correct with a red pencil. Let children sit with four in a group, and during repetitions back in rows of two by two 
*Teacher age 44, Albina*

Teachers who did not believe that the in-service teacher trainings had added value indicated that they had learned the same things during the MINOWC-BEIP training or at teachers’ college, or that it had been too long ago to remember. One important complaint about the training was that the different sessions were too far apart, and that the duration was too short.

**4.2 Opinions of the trainings, the trainers and the working books**

Respondents were presented with five statements about the trainers and asked whether they agreed or disagreed. Table 7 presents the results. The results suggest that generally, the teachers were satisfied with the quality of the trainers. All interviewed teachers confirmed that the trainers created an empowering and safe learning environment, and virtually all (97.2%) found the trainers well prepared and knowledgeable.
Table 7. Teachers’ opinions of the trainers (Total=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%/N)</th>
<th>Disagree (%/N)</th>
<th>No opinion (%/N)</th>
<th>Don’t know (%/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  Trainers were well prepared and knowledgeable</td>
<td>97.5%/39</td>
<td>2.5%/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II The trainers were able to answer my questions</td>
<td>87.5%/35</td>
<td>5.0%/2</td>
<td>7.5%/3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III The trainers treated the subject matters too fast, and consequently I had a hard time following</td>
<td>15.0%/6</td>
<td>80.0%/32</td>
<td>2.5%/1</td>
<td>2.5%/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV The trainers were unable to explain difficult concepts</td>
<td>27.5%/11</td>
<td>67.5%/27</td>
<td>2.5%/1</td>
<td>2.5%/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V  The trainers created a learning climate that made me feel safe, and empowered to pose questions</td>
<td>100%/40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest share of teachers, though not everyone, had experienced that the trainers had been able to answer their questions. The teachers who had no opinion about statement II “The Trainers were able to answer my questions” indicated that some questions could be answered but others could not. Several teachers (15.0% of total) found that the trainers had presented the subject matters too fast, and more than a quarter of respondents (27.5%) felt that the trainers were unable to explain difficult concepts. The answers suggest that, generally, teachers viewed the trainers favourably, but they would have liked them to take more time to discuss the different subject matters and difficult concepts.

When asked what they would like to change about the trainers, most teachers referred to things about the training itself (the class), and not so much to the trainers (the people). Two persons did say that the trainers should have been more motivated and cheerful. Comments that were related to the training typically were requests for more training, shorter gaps between the trainings, more practical rather than theoretical training, more guidance after the training and a certificate after finalizing the trainings.

Teachers also were asked for their opinion about the working books that were used in the last training they participated in. Nine teachers conveyed that they never received any workbooks, and hence could not give their opinion about them. Generally, opinions of the working books were favourable. Almost all of interviewed teachers disagreed with statement I, claiming that the working books were unclear and confusing, and virtually everyone found the books looking nice and well-cared for (93.5%). The teachers also generally liked the exercises, and believed the books helped them learn faster.

Teachers who had no clear opinion about specific questions, even after asking the question in different ways, often indicated that they were ambivalent about the question, that the statement was sometimes true but not always, or that they agreed in part, but disagreed for another part. For example, in a reaction to statement V “I found the exercises in the working book childish”, one teacher reported: “sometimes,
but nevertheless they were educational”. Other teachers understood “childish” as meaning “adequate for children”, and hence they would say that it was good because they were working with children.

Table 8. Teachers’ opinions of the working books (N=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I The working books were unclear and confusing</td>
<td>6.5% (N=2)</td>
<td>93.5% (N=29)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II The working books looked nice and well-cared</td>
<td>96.8% (N=30)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Using the working books helped us learn faster</td>
<td>87.1% (N=27)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
<td>6.4% (N=2)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV I like the diversity of exercises in the working</td>
<td>90.3% (N=28)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V I found the exercises in the working books</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
<td>96.8% (N=30)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI I still regularly (at least monthly) view the</td>
<td>58.1% (N=18)</td>
<td>38.7% (N=12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about what they would change about the working books, some teachers named more explanation of exercises, practices, concepts and words. One person also indicated that they would like to see different illustrations, with more animals from the local environment. One person reflected about the working books “You have to teach based on how the children are and act. The books indicate how they do theoretically but practice is different; how the children are in class, their environment, the home situation... “.

When asked about the trainings, some of the stakeholders commented that during the first trainings no local people were hired or empowered to execute trainings or other services. Employees of the Nucleus Centres in Albina and Brokopondo emphasized the importance of the deployment and involvement of locals. Staff of Nucleus Centres were only involved during later stages of the training programme. During the final training (Capacity strengthening), representatives from both Nucleus Centres were trained and involved in the first follow up activities. In Brokopondo this included follow up visits to the schools in their working area. However, representatives were not stimulated in structural post training support and the lack of transport and/or gasoline made it impossible to reach the schools in person.

Key stakeholders found the materials wonderful, but also lamented that they were expensive. Stakeholders explained that the "I believe in you" book and the in-service teacher training manuals consisted of extensive reading material. One trainer of trainers explained that since Suriname has no reading culture, it took some effort to get through the modules. Opinions concerning the practical use of the materials were divided. A trainer of trainers explained that many things were practical and easy to implement right away. The education counsellor from Stg. Onderwijs stated that the training was very
practical: just do! ‘You saw changes in the classroom right away’. However, others explained that the trainings gave insights, but ‘the positive vibe that existed right after the trainings had to be provided with sufficient energy’.

Most key stakeholders were very positive about the design and the appearance of poster material, activity cards and manuals and were of the opinion that this positively contributed to the trainings.

4.3 Understanding of the main concepts

Teachers were asked to explain the underlying idea behind the “I believe in you” vision, and to describe what the concepts “Powerful Learning Environment” (Krachtige leeromgeving) and “Activating Didactics” (Activerende didactiek) meant to them.

Twenty-eight out of 40 teachers were able to explain the “I believe in you” vision (70.0%). They mentioned one or more of the following aspects:

- The teachers has confidence in the capacities and possibilities of each child
- Education that respects the unique skills of each child
- Education that takes the learning potential (leer-kracht) of each child into account
- A positive approach, encouraging, building self-confidence
- Having belief in the children (as a teacher)
- The child is central
- Belief in yourself and in the children,
- Learn the children that they are worthy
- Better relationship between teachers and schoolchildren

Six teachers (15%) erroneously believed that the “I believe in you” vision focused on having belief in the teacher. One teacher reported, for example: “The child has to believe in you. When the child asks something, it must have confidence in what the teacher says.” A colleague from another school explained the “I believe in you” vision as such: “Having belief in yourself, and the children have belief in the teacher”. Yet another teacher conveyed: “Belief in the teacher, how she deals with the children. Children must have belief.” These answers show some degree of misunderstanding of the main concept of the programme, of which the central idea is to focus on children and their experiences, rather than on teachers.

The answers may be a sign that teachers wish for more trust in them as teachers; by the children, by parents and by the ministry. At four out of eleven schools, teachers openly expressed frustration about the fact that they felt abandoned. Abandoned by a ministry that does not provide basic living and working conditions, by parents who do not show any interest in the learning progress of their children and do not show up at parent meetings, and by the schoolchildren who are struggling to get by at school and repetitively perform bad.

In contrast to the “I believe in you vision, it was noticed that many teachers expressed themselves negatively about the schoolchildren saying, for example, that they were “slow” (traag). Especially about boys, negative things were said, including that they do not want to work, are lazy, do not listen, are more likely than girls to become criminals, and so forth. Since this was an informal observation on the part of
the researchers and not structurally recorded, we cannot state what percentage of teachers voiced such perceptions. International research has found that low teacher expectations of students negatively impact student learning outcomes, and vice versa. Hence, unintentionally, teacher expectations may reinforce the sub-optimal performance of children in the interior, particularly that of boys.

These observations and other evaluation results suggest that in essence, (at least some) teachers’ attitudes towards children may not have changed much. Teachers believe that they have changed because they now use a certain tool, more consciously compliment children, and have created a learning corner. However, these changes are often isolated behaviours and not part of a more structural change in attitude in teachers and in school teams as a whole.

The concept of Powerful Learning Environment was better known: 84.6 percent of surveyed teachers could provide a fitting description ($T_{\text{tot}}=39$). Several examples are provided in Figure 9.

**Figure 9. Teacher’s understanding of the concept “Powerful Learning Environment”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The environment in which the children are being taught must be cheerful. They must like to go to school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 24, Bigi Poika*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The children must feel at home, so that they are comfortable when following class. Decorate the class room as nice as possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 35, Duatra*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An environment where you feel safe and motivated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 31, Apetina*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The environment of the children must look nice; child friendly. Decorate the class room, your [learning’] corners ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 25, Nason*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use more materials, do other things so that all children are served ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 27, Nason*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A motivating and child friendly learning environment, where learning and playing go together.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Teacher age 26, Nason*

When asked what the term “Activating Didactics” meant for them, almost three quarters (72.5%) of teachers were able to give an example or describe the general concept.
Figure 10. Teacher’s understanding of the concept “Activating Didactics”

The “I believe in you” teacher trainings aimed to make cross-cutting contributions by taking gender and cultural factors into account as issues that affect children’s educational experience. With regard to gender, twenty-two out of thirty-six interviewed teachers (61.1%) were of the opinion that boys ask for a different approach than girls. They found that boys are typically busier in class, less motivated, naughty and wild, do not want to listen, want to do practical things and ask for more attention. In Mooitaki, it was also mentioned that boys want to go to the gold fields where they can earn quick money without any diploma, and hence they are not interested in school. Four teachers partly agreed and partly disagreed with the statement, and just over one quarter of teachers (27.7%) were of the opinion that boys and girls should be dealt with in the exact same way.

According to three-quarters of interviewed teachers, the in-service teacher trainings had not paid any attention to differences between boys and girls, and the ways in which you might approach them differently (70.0%; T_{stat}=40). Three teachers could not remember whether this subject had been dealt with during the training, and others mentioned that they had talked about it. For example, one teacher said that during the training they had spoken about differences between boys and girls in puberty, and how to speak with them. Two teachers recalled that they had learned that they could place boys and girls next to
each other in class, so that they can learn from one another, and yet someone else mentioned that boys should also be allowed to do ‘girl-things’, such as playing with dolls.

The results suggest that the training did not pay sufficient attention to more structural differences between boys and girls that exist in the Suriname educational system. These differences are an important fact to be considered. For many years, girls have been performing much better in school than boys, and girls consistently score better than boys on virtually all educational indicators. More girls than boys complete elementary school, fewer girls than boys repeat class, and Suriname girls are about two times more likely than Suriname boys to attend University. The reasons behind these differences are multifaceted and beyond the scope of this evaluation. The structural nature of this phenomenon, however, warranted more attention for this topic during the training.

More teachers mentioned that the trainings had paid attention to cultural sensitiveness (70.0%; N\textsubscript{total}=40). For example, they had been told that they could repeat their explanation in the local (home) language, use items from nature in class, go outside with nature education, use pangis (breach cloths) during a lesson about clothing, and use local examples (e.g. speak about a dugout canoe instead of a train). One teacher even made a ‘Maroon culture corner’ in her classroom with a matapi (cassava wringer), calabash and pangis.

4.4 Application of training tools (teaching material) in class

During the in-service teacher trainings, teachers learned about different working forms. We asked which working forms they found particularly useful. The answers are listed in Table 9. By far the most used working form of the programme is to work in groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple answers per person possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work in groups (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work classroom-wide (klassikaal) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments and rewards (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual approach (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of visual materials (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work independently (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing songs (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present/drama (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go outside (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-wide conversations (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use creativity/ Drawing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning corners (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour blocks/boards (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One teacher said about the use of energizers:

For example, we have to sing but a few are still sleepy. Then I can do a few gymnastic exercises with them, or a song with movements, or I take them outside to pick leaves or run around for a bit, and next I take them back inside (age 27, Nason).

The mentioned working forms were considered useful in the local teaching context for various reasons. With regard to group work, it was often commented that it allowed for slower students to learn from the
fast students. Energizers were deemed useful because it helps capture the children’s attention when they are dozing off. Visual materials help the children understand better, and rewards (and punishment) motivate children to work harder. Working with the colour boards and planks brings, as we will see again later in this report, more calm and order in the classroom.

We asked teachers what specific measures they had taken to create a positive learning environment. Their answers are listed in Table 10. The most often mentioned ways used by teachers to create a positive learning environment were giving compliments, positive communication and arranging the classroom differently. It may appear contradictory that teachers express themselves negatively about children, but also give compliments. However, this apparent contradiction only confirms our main conclusion, namely, that isolated new tools have been adopted, but there is no true change in attitude in general.

Table 10. Self-reported strategies used by teachers to create a positive learning environment (N<sub>total</sub>=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple answers per person possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Give compliments (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive communication (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arrange the classroom differently (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give children individual attention (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motivate and reward children (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do creative activities (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and visualize class rules (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greet children friendly when entering class (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Play games (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use visual materials (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in class management (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have mutual respect for one another (teacher and children) (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use energizers (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some teachers were very creative in thinking of ways to make the learning environment more child-friendly. For example, a teacher in Duatra used a carton box to fabricate a television as a reading stimulus for children (Figure 11). During reading class, the child whose turn it was to read would sit in the TV to read aloud to the other children. The teachers could turn up the volume or provide other tips. The children liked this tool a lot.

In order to help teachers with ideas for alternative working forms, the training “Activating Didactics” provided teachers with 50 “working form cards” (werkvormkaarten). Each card describes a specific working form; explaining the purpose, learning preference, group size, duration, required material and work plan. The idea of the working form cards is that teachers select, adapt and use these cards to make their teaching more activating. Examples of working forms are “check-in-duo’s” (the children first make an assignment independently, and afterwards they work in pairs to compare their answers); “three step interviews” (the children interview each other and report back), and “puzzle” (e.g. with a drawing or text). Only three teachers reported that they had used the working form cards, but none of them was still using them (7.5%; N<sub>total</sub>=40). Others typically did not have the cards or had never seen them.

Children in the focus groups confirmed that they sometimes played learning games. Particularly in math class teachers reportedly used games, such as bingo-type games to practice the numbers, games with dice to practice adding and subtractions, and shopping games to practice calculating with money. School
Children from Brownsweg reported that they also did quizzes and competitions in groups. Children in all FGD reported that they sometimes were allowed to work together. They appreciated group work because it allowed them to discuss with each other –sometimes in their own language– and understand better.

Two appreciated teaching strategies that were mentioned in almost every FGD, were that teachers provided individual attention and occasionally explained in the home language. Schoolchildren indicated that explanation in their native language helped them understand the subject matter better.

One working form that received particular attention during the trainings was the use of colour blocks and/or boards (Figure 12). Each child has a large dice with different colours on each side. The colours have a pre-determined meaning, for example, red means I do not want to be disturbed, green means you can ask me questions, and the question mark means I have a question. During independent work, the children place their dice on the table with a specific colour on top to indicate their status. The teacher also has a dice, or a series of coloured boards to indicate whether or not children can come to her desk to ask questions and so forth.

The results suggest that the colour blocks were a well-received tool. Two-thirds (65.0%; N_total=40) of teachers had tried out the colour blocks and the largest share of consulted teachers was still using them. One teacher reported that this method had not worked for her. Others generally indicated that the children were more tranquil, and that the tool helped keep order:

“It is very useful. The children work independently and are calmer” (Mooitaki)

“Yes [it is useful], especially when you have busy children in your class. And it gives the weaker students an opportunity to get help from stronger students. And they learn to work together, so it also stimulates social behaviour”
“How the kids were very busy.... If they see a colour they know right away, I have to sit quietly or the teacher will come by” (Duatra)

“Yes [it was useful], the children knew the colours by heart and worked hard to be able to turn their block on green, to be free.” (Browsweg)

“Then the pupils know when they can ask a question. It is calmer in class” (Powakka)

Teachers who were not working with the colour blocks named various reasons. One person was afraid that the children would start throwing the blocks around; another teacher had not followed this training; yet another teacher already had her own tools that worked for her; and others lacked the time, resources or conditions.

Two thirds of teachers (67.5%; N$_{total}$=40) reported that they had created at least one learning corner in their classroom, and in 13 of 27 observed class rooms, the observers reported learning corners. Of the 13 observed learning corners, 10 of them were colourful, creative and educational (Figure 13). The learning corners were also used during lessons.

Reading corners were less often present and apparently seldom used. In one third of observed classes a reading corner was present, but less than half of them the reading corner could be considered inviting or inspirational. In other classes the reading corner consisted of two or three books on a table, which looked as if they had not been used in the past year. For example, for one of the classes the observer described the reading corner as such: “A table with six books and a couple of outdated magazines. One book named ‘sailing, boating and rowing’ appears to be a water sport guide for the Netherlands. There is also an old, turned yellow dictionary. I do not have the impression that something happens with this corner”. Another observer reported about another class: “the reading corner is a table without books; only a box with old junk.” During no single observation the reading corner was used, even when children were done with their work. The observations suggest that teachers may have learned that they have to create a reading corner, but not know how to make creative use of them.

Among those teachers who had created a learning or reading corner, 10 persons had obtained the idea from the “I believe in you” in-service teacher trainings. Others had learned about it during their teacher training (5 persons), the BEIP training (3 persons), from inspection, their colleagues, the principal, EBG or just had thought it up themselves. One teacher reported that she had learned about learning corners at teachers college, but only during the “I believe in you” training she came to understand the importance.

Teachers who did not have learning or reading corners often commented that the situation in the class room did not allow for it. For example, a teacher of a combination class (1$^{st}$ and 4$^{th}$ grade) in Mootitaki explained that she was teaching in the village meeting hall. Every day after class she had to empty out the ‘class room’. Other teachers reported that their class room was simply too small, or that they lacked material and furniture.
4.5 Eye for the uniqueness of each child

The in-service teacher trainings emphasized that each child has its unique talents and skills and, as a result, different children possess different types of intelligence and have different learning preferences. Teachers were asked in what ways they took the individual qualities and talents of each child into account. Their answers are listed in Table 11, starting with the most mentioned approaches.

Table 11. Approaches of teachers to take individual talents and preferences of children into account, with the number of times each approach was mentioned (N_{total}=40) Multiple answers per person possible.

- Pay individual attention to each child (21)
- Let children help each other/work together (13)
- Emphasize the specific talents of each child/give children the opportunity to develop their talent (10)
- Observe the child and get to know him/her (8)
- Let children do activities they are good in/enjoy (3)
- Personalized assignments: give rapid learners additional exercises and provide additional instructions to slow learners (3)
- Engage children actively/ask questions (2)
- Address children personally (1)

The in-service teacher trainings had presented the teachers with different “learning preferences”, namely: (1) Copy skills (de kunst afkijken); (2) Practice; (3) Participate; (4) Discover; and (5) Accumulate knowledge. We asked teachers how they used these learning preferences in class. Fourteen out of forty teachers had a hard time remembering the learning preferences and their meaning, and fifteen others could not name examples for all learning preferences. Those who did provide examples named, among others, the following:
### Table 12. Example teaching strategies used to respond to different learning preferences

| Copy skills | ▪ Ask children who are good in a certain subject to help the others  
  ▪ Children are seated in groups, and are allowed to help one another |
| Practice | ▪ For example, practice a difficult word  
  ▪ Solve mathematic problems on the black board  
  ▪ Test-repetitions  
  ▪ Repetition of the same math problems  
  ▪ Practice together/practice in groups |
| Participate | ▪ Work in groups; strong learners with weaker children  
  ▪ Read a piece and ask children to retell the story  
  ▪ Ask a lot of questions  
  ▪ Play games  
  ▪ Let children make a handicraft item or write a paper |
| Discover | ▪ Go outside |
| Accumulate knowledge | ▪ Central teaching  
  ▪ Give them a book to read/learn from the books/read a book with them  
  ▪ Use visual materials  
  ▪ Explain/translate difficult words |

The training also talked about multiple intelligences, and the fact that children (and other people) typically are strong in certain subjects but less skilled in others. The areas are: think smart, people smart, self-smart, music smart, word smart, image smart, nature smart, self smart and body smart.

Teachers were asked to name three learning activities they had executed in the past educational year to discover and stimulate multiple intelligences in children. Thirteen teachers (32.5%) could not name any educational activities aimed at children with different skills; five teachers (12.5%) named one example and another fourteen (35.0%) provided two examples ($N_{total} = 40$). One out of every five teachers was able to name three ways in which they had responded to multiple intelligences in their class.

The answers suggested that few teachers completely understood the concept of “multiple intelligences” or how they could stimulate or use it in class. For example, the only examples named with “think smart” were that some children were very fast with solving math problems. None of the teachers volunteered examples of how they helped children develop their think smartness, for example by giving them Sudoku’s or other logic puzzles. The most mentioned form of intelligence that teachers said they used in class is music smartness. Many teachers said they sang songs, let the children make and sing songs or rap, let them play instruments, and so forth (named by 17 teachers). However, only two teachers reported using music as a vehicle to learn other things, for example by making a song to teach Dutch language education.

Children who are image smart are helped by using visual materials in class (named by 7 teachers), and exercises to stimulate children who are word smart included making poetry, letting the child read out load, and spelling tests (8 teachers). To facilitate children who are nature smart the class is taken outside, mostly...
to teach nature education lessons (named by 6 teachers). People smartness may be stimulated by drama lessons and role play (5 teachers), and examples named as activities for children who are body smart were dance and sports (2 teachers).

4.6 Parent Teacher Associations

Although the MINOWC has recognized the importance of PTA’s by installing a parent participation stimulation unit (Ouderparticipatie Stimulerende Unit, OSU), only 3 out of 11 schools visited for the evaluation had a PTA in place. At the time of the research, none of these three PTAs had started with activities. The PTAs at the schools in question were, or will be, supported by the education umbrella organizations (e.g. EBGS, RKBO) or a CBO.

The EBG school in Balingsoela described their PTA as ‘being formed’. Parents were being trained by Stg. Onderwijs and the school leader explained that he expected the PTA to be installed next school year. In Moengo the PTA at the St. Theresiaschool was already installed, but had not yet executed activities. The PTA included three parents and two teachers (two males and three females). This PTA is supported by a local CBO; Okanisie Pikien. In Powakka, five parents and two teachers (two male, five female) were part of their PTA. The school leader explained that the PTA must be revived and that a mindshift needs to be made in the village. Stg. RKBO will assist and train the PTA when the PTA is ready.

The school leader in Brownsweg explained that there is no PTA but parents are trained by a foundation, Stichting Projekten. In Apetina there are some parents who help when necessary, but not on a structured base.

4.7 Planning and evaluation

During the trainings, the importance of class preparation before class, and evaluation afterwards, were repetitively emphasized. In addition to stressing the importance of short-term planning (making a lesson plan), the training also motivated teachers to make a longer term Personal Development Plan (POP) and school teams to make a Team Development Plan (TOP).

Eleven out of 40 teachers had developed a Personal Development Plan (Persoonlijk Ontwikkelings Plan - POP), prior to (2 teachers), during (4 teachers) or after (5 teachers) the training. Among those teachers who had a POP, two teachers said they did not use the POP at all and four teachers looked at it once in a while but did not actively use it. The other teachers reported that they used their POP to guide their actions, but two of them never updated it while three teachers conveyed that regularly updated this document.

Besides a Personal Development Plan for teachers, the development of a Team Development Plan (Team Ontwikkelings Plan, TOP) was stimulated during the “I believe in you” teachers training programme. Three school leaders indicated that they had an up to date TOP with development goals for two years. Of these three school leaders, one school explained that his school had a yearly updated TOP. Another school leader of Moengo explained that her team designed a TOP that was sent to the inspection, and the third school leader had designed a TOP during the trainings but had never updated it. Four school leaders never
designed a TOP, they keep on postponing it (1), reported that it was not necessary because they already motivated teachers (1), or had no defined reason (2).

Both during the “I believe in you” in-service teacher trainings and during the various BEIP training sessions, teachers learned about the importance of lesson preparation. The largest share of teachers (72.5%) reported that they daily made their lesson plans. Others did so weekly (10.0%), monthly (2.5% - 1 person) or never (12.5%) (Figure 14). One teacher explained that she just started to learn to make her lesson preparation and that she could not yet tell how frequently she would make such a plan.

Figure 14. Number of teachers who indicated that they daily, weekly, monthly or never make lessons plans (N<sub>total</sub>=40)

Teachers also were asked whether, how and how frequently they evaluated their teaching. Over one third of teachers (36.8%) reported that they evaluated daily, 44.7 percent did so weekly and 5.3 percent a couple of times a week. Yet others (15.8%) evaluated their own work after repetitions, or when necessary. Only one person reported that she never evaluated because of a lack of time. Evaluation occurs by writing things down in a special notebook (26.3%), self-reflection (21.1%), asking questions in class (15.8%), or by making an error analysis (10.5%).

4.8 Changes as a result of the training
All but three teachers indicated that they had changed their way of teaching as a result of the “I believe in you” training. The changes were diverse, and included using more visual materials, energizers, and colour blocks/boards. Others said they now paid more attention to making the classroom attractive by using decorations, learning corners, and plants; and by letting the children bring something from themselves to decorate the classroom. Yet others changed their way of correcting the schoolchildren’s work, are now paying more attention to classroom rules, listen more, play games, allow the children to express themselves more freely, give more compliments, and are more patient with difficult children.
Just over half of teachers were of the opinion that their way of correcting behaviour had changed entirely (25.0%) or a little (27.5%) (Figure 15). Seven teachers indicated that before the training they hit children, but not anymore. Others reported that before they yelled more, gave senseless punishments, made the children stay inside during break time, or sent them outside. As a result of the training—they say—they talk more, are more patient and search for a more positive way of dealing with the child. Nevertheless, some teachers admitted that they still hit the children, and others used undesirable ways of punishment such as withholding food, keeping the child inside during break time (for an entire week), not letting the child (or the entire class) participate in gym class, and letting them write (senseless) lines.

It must be noted that the results of the Focus Group Discussions were not in line with teachers’ self-reporting about correcting behaviour. In more than half of the focus groups, children indicated that their teacher used physical violence such as slapping or beating (not just a ‘tick’), pinching, and turning the ear. Threatening with corporal punishment was even more common and often witnessed by the team. Children do not report such incidents to their parents or the school leader because they fear that they will only receive additional punishment. Children consider corporal punishment as such a normal part of their school experience that one child even indicated that “it is necessary for the teacher to hit because otherwise the children will not listen”. Children did indicate that they perceived certain forms of punishment as “unfair”. For example, children in Moengo reported that if one child was behaving poorly, the entire class was not allowed to go for physical exercise.

The contradiction between teachers’ self-reporting and results from the FGD may in part be explained by teachers giving desirable answers. Teachers know that MINOWC prohibits corporal punishment, and therefore they may deny their use of such methods to correct behaviour. Another possible explanation is that some behaviours are so much engrained in a teacher’s own upbringing and way of dealing with children, that they may not see anything wrong in it. For example, a teacher may not see ‘turning the ear’ or ‘pinching the upper arm’ of a child as a severe act, and thus honestly deny the use of corporal punishment when asked about it.

In our opinion, apparent contradictions between results from self-reported surveys, which show a change in teachers’ behaviour, and results from classroom observations and focus group discussions, do not necessarily indicate that one research method is more reliable than the other. Teachers may truly believe that they have changed their ways as they use some new tools and pay more attention to, for example, classroom decoration and motivating students. However, most teachers have not (yet) internalized a Child Friendly Education mindset. As a result, behaviours contradictory to Child Friendly Education continue to be structurally present and characterize the educational experience of schoolchildren in the Suriname interior. The use of different research methods allowed the evaluator to expose the different sides of the story.

*Figure 15. Number of teachers who indicated that their ways of correcting behaviour and motivating students had changed totally, a bit, or not at all as a result of the in-service teacher trainings (N_{total}=40).*
Teachers also were asked how they motivated or rewarded children. Most common means of motivation were giving compliments, motivational talks, giving candy or small presents (pencil, eraser, stickers), applauding with the class, and giving a pat on the back. Twenty-two out of forty teachers indicated that they rewarded good work with a sticker, stamp, and/or motivational words (“well done”), and one teacher reported that she no longer corrected with a red pen. Most teachers (62.5%) reported that their ways of motivating students had not changed as a result of the “I believe in you” training; they already did this on their own account. Those who did report that they had changed their way of motivating students mostly indicated that they gave more and more targeted compliments, talked more softly in class, and bought small presents to hand out.

School children confirmed that teachers rewarded good work with compliments, small presents or other forms of appreciation. For example, children in Brownsweg reported that their teacher could reward a good grade with a pen, a sticker, a notebook, juice or a hug (brasa). In Powakka, children reported they might get a cookie or a sticker as a reward; in Balingsoela children mentioned compliments, a hug or applause from the class; and children in Bigi Poika were rewarded with compliments, stickers and play time. In Moengo, school children told that their match teacher let children who had obtained a good grade draw a “lottery ticket” that determined what prize they had won (e.g. pencil, notebook, etc.).

### 4.9 Impacts on the children

When asked about the impact of the new way of teaching on the children, most teachers commented that the children were calmer (mentioned by 13 teachers), understood the lessons better (11), participated more actively in class (9) and learned from each other (8) (Figure 16). Teachers also had experienced that children were more motivated and concentrated and, possibly as a result, had better grades.

*Figure 16. Impact of the “I believe in you” teaching approach on the children, according to teachers (N_{total}=40) Multiple answers per person possible.*
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Some stakeholders indicated that it is difficult to tell if the objectives of in-service teacher trainings were reached. The head of inspection noticed that it is difficult to determine the net impact of the in-service teacher trainings because of other investments in educational reform by Stg. Onderwijs der EBGS, RKBO, BEIP, MINOWC and several other organisations. Some aspects of the training were typical for the "I believe in you" in-service teacher trainings. For example, the current use of working with cubes and shelves, and placing schoolchildren in groups are clearly positive changes and direct impacts of the “I believe in you” trainings.

When asked about the most important thing they had learned from the “I believe in you” in-service teacher trainings, Teachers mostly referred to:

- Placing the child central, and look at the unique capacities of each child;
- Improvement of the relation teacher-child;
- Different teaching methods to bring the subject matter in a fun way, e.g. use of energizers, use of colour blocks; having children work in groups;
- How to motivate children; and
- How to more actively engage children, e.g. no longer one-way teaching but interaction between the teacher and the class.

Teachers also were asked what they were proud of. About half of the teachers reported that they were proud of the children and their achievements. For example, one teacher said: “I am proud of the children. Some of them were weak, but by talking, and giving compliments, I see that they have progressed. They make an effort.” (Teacher age 25, Nason). A colleague reported: “I am proud of the children, they really make an effort to speak Dutch” (Teacher age 30, Moengo). Other teachers mentioned that they were proud of the achievements with specific subjects, such as mathematics, language education and geography/history/nature education. Seven teachers were also proud of the improved collaboration with
colleague teachers and the school leader. A teacher indicated: “we have a good collaboration. Together we brainstorm about how things can be improved.” (Teacher age 35, Duatra).

Continued guidance of teachers may elevate the chances that a teacher training has a lasting impact on children. A VVOB representative explained that for this reason, the “I believe in you” teacher trainings in Paramaribo relied on a supervisors’ pool (begeleiderspool). Trained supervisors worked in pairs to supervise a cluster of schools, which were visited every three months. During these visits, the supervisors discussed with participating teachers about their progress and possible challenges. VVOB explained that available literature suggests that the effect of trainings is limited without follow up.

Eleven teachers indicated that there is no guidance at school when there are questions concerning new methods and activating didactics. All other teachers (N=27) explained that guidance was available from the school leader (48.1%); school leader and colleagues (25.9%); Nucleus Centre (11.1%); or by just colleagues (7.4%). Two teachers from Brownsweg explained that they received guidance from BEIP, and one reported that the trainer was still providing guidance.

One fifth of teachers (20.0%, N_{total}=40) reported that were not motivated by the education organization (BOB, EBGS, RKBO), school leader or colleagues to apply the "I believe in you" methods. More than half of the teachers (65.0%) explained that their school leader and/or colleagues motivated use of child friendly teaching methods, and five teachers were stimulated by the education organization.
5 Conclusions and recommendations

These conclusions synthesize the results from the desk review, stakeholder interviews, and field visits at 11 interior schools. The section includes a rating of the evaluation criteria, description and discussion of the main potentialities and weaknesses identified in the study, and lessons learned.

The overall goal of the UNICEF/MINOWC “I believe in you” programme in the interior was that at least 80% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education. Anticipated outcomes were:

1. All primary schools teachers and school leaders (principles) in the interior applying the Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standards.
2. At least 50% of schools in the interior have a School Development Plan and functioning Parent Teacher Association.

5.1 Rating of evaluation criteria

The evaluation was structured according to six evaluation criteria. Table 13 rates the programme based on these earlier discussed criteria, using a colour code, where dark green stands for excellent, light green for good, yellow for insufficient, and red for weak. Annex 5 explains the conclusions with regard to the evaluation criteria in greater detail.

Table 13. Rating of evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>The combined sources (lit. review, stakeholder interviews, fieldwork) lead us to conclude that the project was highly relevant. All involved stakeholders agreed that there was an urgent need for reform of the education sector, and the programme was in line with existing government policy objectives and international education standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>The project logic was severely flawed. The programme had not been able to develop a clear log frame, nor well-defined realist programme goals or measurable indicators. Neither was there a monitoring system, and recommendations from progress reports and the mid-term evaluation were not followed up. Reported and observed changes in educational approach are limited and isolated, and typically not part of a more inclusive new teaching approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Making use of existing logistic structures, the train-the-trainers model and training entire school teams benefitted efficiency. There also was good collaboration and frequent communication between the partners. The input goals were mostly reached, though with substantial delays. A major concern is, however, the limited achievement in terms of impact, outcome and output goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>MINOWC data show no positive change in school results at interior schools between 2009 and 2015. Teachers learned some of the main concepts related to CFE and adapted a couple of specific tools. However, implementation of the concepts in practice was mostly minimal. Moreover, changes are often partial and behaviours contradictory to CFE remain common, including corporal punishment and verbal abuse of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>In the absence of follow-up activities, on the job training and coaching at schools, many teachers have not or only partially implemented the learned tools. Educational reform did not build on strong school teams and school leaders. As a result, changes are typically not structural but isolated individual initiatives and not likely to last if there is no enabling environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a positive note, because the “I believe in you” vision is widely shared among stakeholders, teachers will continue to be exposed to different elements of CFE. Moreover, MINOWC started embedding the “I believe in you” vision in policy.

Cross cutting contributions
Child friendly education is in line with general principles of human and child rights. The learning materials were gender neutral. However, during the trainings no explicit attention was paid to differences between boys and girls in teaching approaches. Cultural context was addressed in the trainings.

5.2 Potentialities
It was necessary to make education, especially in the interior, more pupil-oriented and child friendly, and the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme was developed to contribute to this goal. Besides, repetition and drop-out rates were high, particularly in the interior, and investment in teachers was needed. MINOWC staff was involved in programme design and responsible for various elements of programme execution. The objectives of the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme aligned with the Suriname government vision on education and with the MDGs. Furthermore, the “I believe in you” approach is coherent with the curriculum at teachers’ college and other trainings designed and/or supported by the ministry. There was good collaboration and frequent communication between the programme partners.

Referring to the log frame, the input goals were largely reached; trainers were trained to deliver trainings, were well prepared, knowledgeable, and able to respond to questions and stimulation. Four training modules were developed and used, and copies of training materials were disseminated -although exact numbers could not be determined. The results suggest that all teachers in the interior followed one or more modules and learned useful skills.

As a result of the programme, teachers have become more aware of CFE and its main concepts such as “powerful learning environment” and “activating didactics”. Some working forms were identified as useful and have been incorporated within classrooms. Two appreciated teaching strategies that were mentioned in almost every focus group, were that teachers provided individual attention and occasionally explained in the home language. School children indicated that explanation in their native language helped them understand the subject matter better. There are also small improvements in teaching, for example, teachers recognize that working in groups and giving compliments are important tools.

In general, the programme provided a good start and useful tools to achieve the “I believe in you” vision at interior schools. Good practices that could contribute to further reform of education in the interior are: trainings were on location, teaching materials were attractive, and trainers were skilled. Finally, the programme adapted to the specific needs of the target group, for example by including a deepening training.
5.3 Weaknesses

The lack of a functional administrative system including a log frame, baseline data necessary to establish net impact of the programme, well defined programme goals, and measurable indicators was one of the weaknesses of the programme. Besides, the programme activities were not directly related to indicators of “Quality inclusive” education, which was the primary goal of the programme. Furthermore, it remains unclear to what extent changes in knowledge and skills of teachers can be attributed to the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme. MINOWC statistics on among others repetition rates and dropouts suggest that the “I believe in you” in-service teacher training programme had virtually no impact on educational achievements. Similar conclusions were drawn in the mid-term evaluation, but no follow up was given to important recommendations in this report.

Changing teachers' behaviour is a long-term objective that requires constant support and supervision. Training sessions were too few, too short and too far apart in time. Delays were partly caused by bureaucratic processes and changes in administrative systems and staff. As a result, much time of training sessions needed to be dedicated to refreshment of knowledge from earlier trainings.

Implementation of the CFE concepts in practice is, apart from a few cases, minimal. Limited follow-up by the project team, and the lack of teachers' in-class support systems and supervision, are partly debit to the minimal change in teaching practices within the classrooms. It must be acknowledged, however, that creating Child Friendly Schools cannot be accomplished with teacher training alone. It also requires infrastructural changes, such as better living conditions for teachers (housing, guaranteed water and electricity), well maintained school buildings and furniture, and sufficient and good quality learning materials. In addition, facilitating conditions such as parent participation and a supportive home environment play an important role.

The programme did not explicitly pay attention to gender differences and challenges of boys and girls. Practices that are contrary to CFS principles such as: corporal punishment, threats and intimidation of schoolchildren still prevail within schools.

Finally, the sustainability of the programme is limited. Major factors that influenced the non-achievement of programme sustainability include:

- Limited in-class practice during the trainings
- Lack of follow-up and coaching; teachers feel left alone to figure out how to translate the theory to practice
- Structured approach to innovation in schools was lacking; few schools have a Team Development Plan or a strong school leader to drive innovation
- Teachers and school leaders often do not form a team but rather are accustomed to using an individual approach in teaching and management
- Limitations in the professional background of teachers
- Absence of monitoring and evaluation schemes,
5.4 Lessons learned
Based on evaluation results the following lessons learned can be formulated:

- A functional administrative system is essential.
- Give follow-up to relevant recommendations from (mid-term) evaluations and progress reports.
- Collaborate with and learn from partners that execute a similar programme or have experience with a similar programme (VVOB).
- The presence of financially and practically committed partners is essential for follow up, and for consistency in training approaches and implementation of CFE standards.
- Motivated teachers, a strong school leader and professional school management are the pillars of educational innovation.
- Post training coaching in the form of remote guidance and/or coaching on the spot (incl. telephone support), is critical to achieve sustainable outcomes.
- Working forms for activating didactics were appreciated by teachers and all teachers who used them were positive about the impact.
- Educational reform will benefit from a more structural approach, among others by developing standards, investing in execution of existing policy, and investing in HR policy.

5.5 Recommendations
Considering:

I. Continuous efforts of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture to promote Child Friendly Education in schools in Suriname in general, and in interior schools in particular;
II. That the aim of this evaluation was to: “Evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the in-service teacher training programme in the interior, identifying challenges and opportunities, and provide recommendations on future national policy and programme priorities to the primary education in the interior of Suriname”;
III. The data collected in the framework of this consultancy and our key findings reported here above;

The researchers assert that continued efforts to promote Child Friendly Education are extremely important in working towards improved educational outcomes at elementary schools in the Suriname interior. Our recommendations are organized in four sections: Project planning, Implementation, Capacity building, and Policy.

Project planning
1. For future programmes, it is important to allocate sufficient resources to design of the project logic. Such preparations help establish whether programme goals and objectives are achieved, and ensure that different parties involved in project execution are on the same page.
   a. Develop a project log frame with clearly defined goals and objectives and measurable indicators and milestones.
b. Baseline data must be collected to establish the starting point with regard to predetermined indicators (as defined in the log frame) prior to project implementation.

c. Design a monitoring system to keep the programme on track, in time and on budget. Such a system should include a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan. Monitoring and evaluation reports should include measurements against pre-determined indicators and milestones.

2. In order to enhance project sustainability, the various project partners must be financially and practically committed to the programme and programme follow-up. This commitment should be mutually agreed upon prior to project implementation, and documented in the project work plan

**Implementation**

3. Strive towards more continuation and consistency in training approaches within MINOWC, and between MINOWC and other educational organizations. The educational approaches taught in different trainings for teachers are not always in line with one another, which is confusing.

4. Stimulate parent participation at schools as a means to improve academic performance, through support for Parent-Teacher Associations and other means of parent involvement. In designing programmes aimed at support for Parent Teacher Associations, collaborate with government departments (e.g. MINOWC department for parent participation) and foundations that already support Parent-Teacher Associations in the interior.

5. Stimulate the involvement and commitment of locals to execute trainings or other services, for example staff and employees at the local offices (Nucleus Centres).

6. Only motivated teachers can motivate students and enhance student participation. Develop models for incentives to motivate teachers. Involve teachers in the development of such models, to increase chances that incentives are truly of interest to the target group.

7. In all cases where activating didactic tools were used, teachers were positive about their impact on schoolchildren. This observation calls for increase of the use of activating didactics in classrooms. This can be achieved by more in-class guidance for teachers by school leaders, by inspection, and by the MINOWC guidance department (see also recommendations under “capacity building”). A train-the-trainers type workshop on activating didactics, with actual classroom practice, for school leaders and MINOWC staff would be useful to prepare these groups for providing guidance to teachers.

8. Have professional standards in place for project monitoring, and make sure that monitoring reports include measurements of the indicators defined in the log frame. Follow up on outcomes and recommendations of monitoring and, if necessary, adjust the strategy.
Capacity building

9. Customize capacity building of teachers to the specific needs of teachers in the interior, including more on-the-job learning. Teachers often are uncertain about the application of CFS methods in practice, and more hands-on guidance in the classroom could help them overcome their hesitance to use such methods. Training on location was appreciated and is advisable for future trainings.
   a. When providing teachers’ training, include a ‘practice day’, where teachers return to their classroom and apply a new tool or skill and where observation can take place.
   b. Invest in support ‘in class’ for example by a mentor who is part of the trainings programme
   c. Invest in assessment of given classes and reflection with colleagues.

10. Post-training coaching will enhance the durability of the impacts of capacity building programmes with teachers. The MINOWC Department of Guidance (Begeleiding) could play a stronger and pro-active role in coaching at interior schools. In addition, staff from MINOWC Nucleus Centres, care-coordinators (zorgcoordinatoren) from the Bureau Basic Education (Bureau Basis Onderwijs) and staff student care (Medewerkers Leerlingen Zorg) from Stg. RKBO and Stg. Onderwijs der EBGS, can serve as school coaches. National and international interns could also support schools in such efforts. In fact, the need for a follow-up process after the training (remote guidance and/or coaching on the spot, telephone support), modelled after the example in Paramaribo where school coaches helped the schools in the renewal process, was identified early on (e.g. mid-term evaluation) but never acted upon.

11. Provide technical and other support to school management.
   a. Support team building at schools as a means to facilitate and enhance the sustainability of educational innovation.
   b. Strengthen school leaders. Given the key role played by school leaders in creating child friendly schools it is important that school leaders are well-equipped for their task and strengthened where necessary. The MINOWC and its partners in education should train school leaders in management skills, coaching skills, and tools to inspire and motivate a team.
   c. MINOWC inspection and the guidance department (begeleiding) should support school leaders in strengthening their school management skills in practice.
   d. School leaders should have better access to resources to execute their management function and, for example, motivate teachers by rewarding commitment and excellent performance.
   e. Support needs to be combined with a support network to guide executers through the process and have regular moments of reflection to evaluate progress, do trouble shooting, and celebrate successes.

12. Build capacity on project management within the implementing organizations. The implementation of the training was one of the first large-scale initiative(s) in education conducted by VVOB, and also one of the first training initiatives from the MINOWC and UNICEF that was primarily executed in the interior, on location. The project suggests that organizational and administrative capabilities need strengthening to conduct similar processes in the future. This implies, among others:
a. Strengthening of all organizations involved in project design skills, for example training in why and how to develop a log frame, why and how to collect baseline data, etc.

b. Strengthening of all organizations involved in project monitoring, including the design and measurement of monitoring indicators, development of monitoring reports and translation of monitoring data into Project adjustment.

**Policy recommendations**

13. The various stakeholders involved must work collaboratively on the development of **standards for Child Friendly Schools in Suriname**, in line with the “I believe in you” vision document. Such endeavour requires a structure that will enable key stakeholders in the educational field (e.g. MINOWC, RKBO, EBGS, UNICEF) to discuss long-term planning and data sharing. One of the stakeholders should take a leading role in the coordination of monthly or bi-monthly meetings to discuss strategic planning and each other’s priority areas in order to ensure synergy, complementing activities and to avoid overlap and conflicting approaches.

14. Improvement of education learning outcomes should be based on a long-term education strategic plan and strong coordination between key stakeholders and continuous performance monitoring. **Clear definitions and standards** on child friendly schools in the context of Suriname should be designed, piloted, and implemented.

15. MINOWC should **invest in the execution of promising existing policy** such as their Nucleus Centres, Department of advisory (afdeling begeleiding), and Department of Inspection.

16. **Keep on improving the professional quality of teachers and school leaders** to realise the best possible quality of education. Teacher training is just a small investment with regard to the improvement of education in general and towards child friendly schools specifically.

17. **Invest in Human Resources policy** and maintain a good HR policy in order to guarantee that all teachers meet basic professional standards, and that there are opportunities to upgrade their skills level.
   a. Among others, the HR policy should outline **professional career development tracks** available to teachers with different entry levels. In this context, it is relevant that teachers who have *boslandakte* or *districtskwekeling* qualifications, which only allow for teaching in the interior, are stimulated and offered opportunities to obtain a nationally recognized teaching qualification.
   b. Teachers should have a **Personal Development Plan** that provides direction to their desired career development and should, among others, show received trainings.
   c. Design an administrative system to **monitor the capacities** of (interior) teachers. Such a “teacher monitoring database” would include data on the entry qualifications and trainings followed by each teacher, in line with MINOWC policies and the Personal Development Plan.
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<td>July 10, 2015  (by email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sampi</td>
<td>MINOWC Bureau Education Interior (Bureau Onderwijs Binnenland)</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>July 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Van Brussel</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Programme assistant</td>
<td>June 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Van Horenbeeck</td>
<td>VVOB</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
<td>July 6, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vrede</td>
<td>Nucleus Centre Albina</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>July 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Motivation for inclusion of the research schools

O.S. Apetina (95 pupils, 5 teachers) is located in the remote Wayana indigenous community of Apetina, which can only be reached by charter plane (1.5h) or a three-day boat ride. It is one of the very few schools in the interior of Suriname where teachers—all but one are from Paramaribo city—do not speak or understand any of the local Indigenous language. Interviews at this school may provide a unique opportunity to assess how the “I believe in you” methodology may or may not provide teachers with tools to overcome differences in language and culture between themselves and their pupils in this remote forest community. Moreover, as the children and their parents have little exposure to urban culture and national media (national TV and radio cannot be received), research in this community may also shed light on the cultural appropriateness and adaptive capacities of the “I believe in you” approach.

O.S. Drietabbetje (319 pupils, 13 teachers), in the Ndyuka Maroon community of Drietabbetje, is a large interior school, that can be reached by plane (1.15h) or by bus/boat (2 days). Pupils do not speak Dutch at home, but some of the teachers speak the local Ndyuka language and many children also understand the Suriname national Creole language Sranantongo. Drietabbetje features a community radio station but national TV and radio cannot be reached. Therefore, research in this community may shed light on the cultural appropriateness and adaptive capacities of the “I believe in you” approach in a Maroon community with limited exposure to the Dutch language and Suriname urban culture.

The EBGS Mooitaki school (70 pupils; 3 teachers) in the Ndyuka Maroon community of Mooitaki and the Roman Catholic Anton Donici school (101 pupils; 6 teachers) in the Paramaka Maroon community of Nason are relatively small schools (=<100 pupils). The communities are remote and cannot be reached by road. The pupils at these schools only speak their tribal language at home and few parents master the Dutch language. Some teachers speak the local Maroon language or Sranantongo. There is no pre-school at the Mooitakischool, and hence the first grade is the first time that most pupils are confronted with the Dutch language. An additional challenge is that there are three teachers to teach the six grades of elementary school, so that the classes are combined. Generally, children and women in both villages have little exposure to the Dutch language and Suriname urban culture, as national TV, radio and newspapers cannot be accessed in the village. Therefore, research in this community may shed light on the cultural appropriateness and adaptive capacities of the “I believe in you” approach in a particularly challenging environment, as well as on the support this approach might offer in confronting language challenges in education.

O.S. Duwatra (135 pupils; 9 teachers) is a mid-sized school in the Saramaka Maroon community of Duwatra. The school features a pre-school (both classes) and each class has its own teacher. Two of the present teachers have not been trained in the “I believe in you” methodology. Research in this village may provide an opportunity to see whether and how the acquired skills and tools are passed on between trained teachers and their colleagues who have not been trained. The EBG school in the Saramaka Maroon community of Balingsoela (212 pupils, 11 teachers) can be reached in 1.5 hours driving by car from Paramaribo. The student population is of Saramakan Maroon descent and most of the children speak the
local Saramakan language at home. The school leader just started at this school, after 12 years of experience at other schools. He participated in all “I believe in you” trainings.

The R.M. Schmidt school (462 pupils; 23 teachers) in the Saramaka Maroon community of Brownsweg, the O.S. Albina I in Albina (410 pupils, 18 teachers), and the St. Theresia school (313 pupils, 19 teachers) in Moengo are large schools (>300 children). The listed communities (Brownsweg, Albina, and Moengo) can be reached in 2-3 hours driving from the capital city of Paramaribo. At the latter two schools (St. Theresiaschool and O.S. Albina I) the student population is of mixed ethnic descent. Most parents of the pupils understand and speak at least basic levels of Dutch, and Dutch is occasionally used in the home environment. Because there are many teachers at these schools, the teachers can support each other in application of the “I believe in you” methodology. A challenge is that some of the classes are rather large (up to 35-40 children), and research in these communities may help understand applicability of this method with large groups of pupils. Four out of the nineteen teachers at the St. Theresiaschool have not been trained, and hence this school provides an opportunity to observe differences between teachers who have and those who have not been trained, as well as for researching knowledge transfer between these groups.

The St. Wilhelmusschool in Powakka (183 Pupils, 15 teachers) and the O.S. Bigi Poika (56 pupils, 7 teachers) are located in Indigenous communities in Para district. Both communities can be reached within three hours driving from Paramaribo city. Few families have maintained knowledge of the indigenous languages (respectively Lokono and Kalinya). Sranantongo is the most common home language and many parents speak some level of Dutch. Despite the limited number of schoolchildren, the O.S. Bigi Poika has seven teachers (excl. the library teacher), and as a result the classes are extremely small (second grade only has one child). Interviews in this community may help understand use of the “I believe in you” methodology in very small groups. The St. Wilhelmuusschool is a mid-size school where three out of the 15 teachers have not been trained.
# Annex 3. Reviewed documents and data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution/Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final project proposal Activating Didactics 15/08/11</td>
<td>MINOWC-BOB/UNICEF</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOR Ik geloof in jou Deepening Training Program, 28/03/13</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In Service teacher training, second phase, final report</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2012(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Report regarding evaluation study of the training sessions &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; and &quot;Krachtige leeromgeving&quot;</td>
<td>Shana Bergman-Kasanom</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meerjaren Ontwikkelings Plan (Development Plan) 2012-2016</td>
<td>Government of Suriname</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Multiple Cluster Indicator Survey (MICS) 2010</td>
<td>Government of Suriname</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Situation Analysis Indigenous and Maroon Education. Suriname</td>
<td>Social Solutions</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Situation Assessment and Analysis of Children’s Rights in Suriname</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Project report Capaciteitsversterking leerkrachten binnenland. Juni 2013 / Februari 2014. Voortgangs rapportage Fase 1 en deel Fase 2</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Training manuals and tools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Krachtige Leeromgeving trainershandleiding</td>
<td>Stg. PCOS &amp; Stg. Bouwsteen;</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Activerende Didactiek, deelnemers werkboek</td>
<td>Stg. Educacion Profesional Basico</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deelnemerswerkboek verdiepingstrainingen Krachtige Leeromgeving &amp; Activerende Didactiek.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deelnemershandleiding &amp; werkboek. eendaagse training krachtige leeromgeving &amp; activerende didactiek</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Werkvormkaarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“Ik geloof in jou” vision document</td>
<td>MINOWC/UNICEF/VVOB</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Continuation of the third In-Service Teacher Training of the remaining schools on &quot;Activerende Didactiek&quot; in 2012. Final Report</td>
<td>MINOWC/BOB</td>
<td>2012(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PROGRESS Intermediate Reports 2009 and 2010, and PROGRESS year reports 2008 and 2009</td>
<td>VVOB</td>
<td>Various years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Progress report in-service trainingen binnenland Suriname</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MINOWC Educational Yearbooks</td>
<td>MINOWC</td>
<td>Various year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UNICEF Statistics website</td>
<td>Data.unicef.org</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Progress reports Capacity Strengthening Teachers Interior, 8 reports</td>
<td>MINOWC/BOB</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Unpublished data</td>
<td>MINOWC</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Identifying and Promoting Good Practice in Equity and Child-Friendly Education</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus groep discussie

Duur: 50 min. 1 focus groep met jongens, 1 met meisjes.

Aantal kinderen: 6-10 uit klas 5. Onze ervaring leert dat kinderen uit lagere klassen meer moeite hebben zich uit te drukken. Kinderen uit klas 6 zullen in hun toetsperiode zitten en willen we daarom niet belasten. We zullen het schoolhoofd/de leekracht vragen maximaal 10 leerlingen uit klas 5 te selecteren voor de FGD.

Aanpak: De FGD wordt door twee personen geleid. Een van de personen maakt aantekeningen, en de andere persoon is de voornaamste gespreksleider. De twee FGD begeleiders vullen elkaar aan waar nodig en nuttig.

I. Opening [10 min]

De trainers stellen zichzelf voor en leggen uit waarover ze met de kinderen willen praten. De kinderen wordt ook gevraagd om zichzelf voor te stellen. Ieder kind krijgt een sticker om zijn of haar naam op te schrijven, en op het uniform te plakken. Ze krijgen 3 min. om de naamkaartjes te versieren met stiften, glitter en stickertjes.

II. Onze leekracht [15 min]

De kinderen krijgen een stapeltje met indexkaartjes met daarop begrippen die horen bij (a) een kindvriendelijke leekracht waarbij ze zich thuis voelen en van wie ze veel leren, (b) een niet-kindvriendelijke leekracht. Voorbeelden van woorden op de kaartjes zijn: "geeft complimenten", "doet leer-speeltoestellen", "laat kinderen in groepjes werken", "behandelt jongens gelijk als meisjes", "geeft individuele aandacht", "slaat", "schreeuwt" etc. Er hangen twee flipcharts aan de muur, een van een kindvriendelijke leekracht, en een van een minder kindvriendelijke leekracht. De kinderen wordt gevraagd de kaartjes op het juiste veil te plakken.

Na de oefening wordt er gesproken over de verschillende kenmerken van een kindvriendelijke en minder kindvriendelijke leekracht. De discussieleiders stellen over elk kaartje een paar vragen aan de groep, bijvoorbeeld:
- Waarom hang je het kaartje "laat kinderen in groepjes werken" bij de goede/leuke leekracht?
- Hoe vaak werken jullie in groepjes? Hoe gaat dat (bijv. krijgt iedereen een rol?)
- Welke dingen kun je leren als je in groepjes werkt die je anders niet leert?
- Wat heeft juf afgelopen week uitgelegd wat moeilijk te begrijpen was?
- Hoe heeft de leekracht dit toch kunnen uitleggen, bv door voorbeelden, lokale taal?
- Waarom is het prettig als de leekracht een compliment maakt?
- Welke complimenten heeft jouw leekracht deze week aan jullie gegeven?
- Waarom is het niet leuk als een leekracht schreeuwt?
- Wordt er bij jullie in de klas wel eens geschreeuwd? Kun je een voorbeeld noemen?
- Etc.
III. Straffen en belonen (15 min)

De FCD begeleiders laten een kort filmpjes zien over een lastige leerling in de klas, genaamd: “Leerling moet voor straf liedje zingen”

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HqHz3SH2BFM).

Het filmpjes laat een klas zien, met een meisje dat tijdens de les haar telefoon op neemt en vervolgens de leerkracht negeert wanneer die haar vraag om de telefoon uit te schakelen en weg te leggen.

Halverwege wordt het filmpjes stilgezet en er wordt aan de leerlingen gevraagd wat voor straf zij aan de leerling zouden geven. Er worden vragen gesteld over corrigerend opreden in de klas en op school:

- Als jij de leerkracht was, wat zou je doen in dit geval?
- Welke straffen hebben ze zelf dit schooljaar gehad?
- Was het een goede straf voor wat er gebeurd was, of was het niet terecht?
- Wat vinden ze een hele vervelende straf die door de leerkracht wel eens gegeven wordt?
- Hebben die straffen het gewenste effect? Datzou je het gebeurde niet meer doen vanwege die straf?

Na de suggesties wordt het filmpjes afgekeken.

- Wat vonden zij van de oplossing van de leerkracht? Was het goed? Of niet?
- Denk je dat dit zou werken in jullie klas?
- Hoe zou jouw juf het kind bestraffen?

De leerkracht kan behalve straffen uitdelen ook kinderen belonen en complimenteren.

- Wat voor dingen doet jullie leerkracht om jullie te belonen als je iets goed gedaan hebt? Denk bv aan een compliment geven over wat je net gedaan hebt, een stickertje of een krul bij je werk, aanmoedigende woorden bij een toets resultaat, je mag een leuk werkje in de klas doen, etc.

- Wat voor andere soort beloningen zouden jullie geven als je een leerkracht zou zijn, bv als een kind een voldoende gehaald heeft voor een moeilijke toets, een mooie tekening heeft gemaakt, of een ander kind heeft geholpen met iets wat hij niet begreep? Kun je iets nieuws bedenken?

IV. De leuke les, de leuke klas, de leuke leerkracht (15 min)

Tekenosdracht: verdeel de leerlingen in 2 groepen, laat de leerlingen van de ene groep een tekening maken van een les die heel leuk was en een les die helemaal niet leuk was. Wat zijn leuke onderwerpen en waarom? Wat is een leuke leerkracht? Hoe ziet een leuke klas er uit?

Bespreek de tekeningen klassikaal. Schrijf steekwoorden op van dingen die wel en niet leuk zijn in de klas, en plak ze op twee verschillende vellen “Niet leuk” en “leuk”

Hoe zouden de niet leuke dingen wel leuk kunnen worden? Hoe kan de klas leuiker worden? En de leerkracht?

“Wat vindt de buur ervan”? Kind zet zijn mening over een bepaald onderwerp of een stelling op een vel papier. Bovenaan het vel staat een stelling of woord. (ieder kind een eigen woord/stelling). Het vel
wordt doorgegeven aan de buurman/vrouw? Die kan erop reageren – totdat het blaadje weer bij de 1e persoon is.

Invuloeofening: ieder kind krijgt een briefje met daarop zinnen waarin een woord weggelaten is, en een reeks trefwoorden. Ze moeten een passend woord invullen. Bv. “Onze leerkracht geeft ................................................ Complimenten” (nooit, eke dag, heel soms etc)

Afsluiting (5 min.)

Kinderen worden bedankt voor hun bijdrage. Ze mogen ook nog vragen stellen aan de begeleiders als ze die hebben.

Ze krijgen allemaal een snackje en drinken.
KLAS OBSERVATIE FORMULIER

School: .............................................. Klas: ..............................................
Dorp: .................................................. Observer: ..............................................
Naam leerkracht: ...........................................................................................................
Les: ........................................................ Aantal leerlingen: ..............................................
Handtekening leerkracht akkoord met observatie: ..............................................................

Klasinrichting

1. Opstelling tafels
   □ In groepjes van ____________ □ Anders, nl: __________________________________________
   □ Twee aan twee in rijen

2. Hangen de klasse-regels zichtbaar aan de muur?
   □ Ja, kleurig en creatief □ Ja, gewoon geschreven □ Nee, niet zichtbaar

3. Hangt er educatief beeldmateriaal aan de muren zoals posters of zelfgemaakte pamfletten? (b.v.
   voedselpiramide, lengte- en gewichtsmaten, thema’s van geschiedenis of aardrijkskunde)
   □ Nee □ Ja, nl: __________________________________________________________________

4. Is er een leerhoek? (zo ja, maak foto)
   □ Nee □ Ja, beschrijf: __________________________________________________________________

5. Is er een leeshoek? (zo ja, maak foto)
   □ Nee □ Ja, beschrijf: __________________________________________________________________

Krachtige leeromgeving

6. Welke van de onderstaande gedragingen zijn geobserveerd in de klas, en leg uit hoe:
   □ Complimenten geven (leerling of opdracht gericht). Hoe: ________________________________
   □ Leerlingen beïnformen. Hoe: __________________________________________________________________
   □ Gedrag corrigeren. Hoe: __________________________________________________________________
   □ Positieve communicatie: Hoe: __________________________________________________________________
7. Welk deel van de leerlingen lijkt actief bij de les te zijn betrokken
   □ Iedereen (95-100%)
   □ Grootste deel (>75%)
   □ Meer dan de helft (50-75%)
   □ Minder dan de helft (25-50%)
   □ Minderheid (<25%)
   □ Vrijwel niemand (0-5%)

8. Welk deel van de leerlingen lijkt de lesstof goed te begrijpen
   □ Iedereen (95-100%)
   □ Grootste deel (>75%)
   □ Meer dan de helft (50-75%)
   □ Minder dan de helft (25-50%)
   □ Minderheid (<25%)
   □ Vrijwel niemand (0-5%)

9. Besteedt de leerkracht tijd aan individuele leerlingen (bv. uitleg)?
   □ Nee, er lijkt geen behoefte aan te zijn
   □ Ja, nl op deze manier: _____________________________
   □ Nee, leerkracht speelt niet in op behoefte

10. Welke werkwijze wordt voornamelijk tijdens de ies gebruikt?

11. Welke verschillende leervoorkeuren zijn in de les aan de orde gekomen, en hoe?
   □ Kunstafijken: _____________________________
   □ Participeren: _____________________________
   □ Kennis verwerven: _____________________________
   □ Oefenen: _____________________________
   □ Ontdekken: _____________________________

12. Op welke manieren bevordert de leerkracht een krachtige leeromgeving?
   □ Zij/hij legt niet alles uit, maar richt zich op het leerproces van haar/zijn leerlingen.
   □ Diverse soorten uitnodigende materialen en activiteiten.
   □ Verschillende contexten die de nieuwsgierigheid opwekken.
   □ Ruimte voor inbrug van de leerling, voor eigen wensen, oplossingen en creativiteit
   □ Ruimte om samen te werken.
   □ Mogelijkheden voor experimenten en onderzoeken.
   □ Ruimte voor verschillende leerstijlen en leervormen.
13. Welke gedragingen of condities in de klas zijn in tegenstrijd met een krachtige leeromgeving?

14. Zijn de volgende didactische kenmerken in de klas aanwezig, waarbij (1) = kenmerkend voor de les, 2= enigszins aanwezig, (3) = nauwelijks aanwezig, en (4) = totaal afwezig in de les

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenmerk</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De leestof wordt relevant gemaakt door vanuit reële problemen te werken en/of onderwerpen te kiezen die aansluiten bij de belevingswereld van leerlingen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leerkracht stelt verschillende soorten vragen stellen, zoals denkvragen, open vragen en als ..., dan vragen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leerkracht heeft een ruim didactisch repertoire en wisselt activiteiten af</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leerkracht kan boeien en motiveren door zelf enthousiast te zijn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De stof wordt over de leerlingen uitgestort zonder dat er een actieve bijdrage van hen verlangd wordt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andere observaties:

Foto's gemaakt van (Omcirke): Leerhoek leeshoek Posters/pamfletten

Tafelopstelling        klassenregels anders: ____________________________
Voor de observant:

1. Kunst afkijken (apperception)
Mensen die deze leervoorkeur hebben, willen het liefst leren van iemand die iets heel goed beheerst. Dat kan een vaardigheid zijn, of misschien is diegene een expert op een bepaald kennis domein. Het werd tijdens de masterclass ook vergeleken met modelleren, of imiteren van expertgedrag.

2. Participeren (participation)

3. Kennis verwerven (acquisition)
Mensen die deze leervoorkeur hebben, gaan ervan uit dat kennis iets is dat vaststaat, dat feitelijk en objectief is, en dat je dat dus kunt verkrijgen door te leren. Uit een boek, van een filmje, door een hoorcollege bijvoorbeeld. Het schoolse leren sluit hier vaak bij aan.

4. Oefenen (exercising)
Mensen die deze leervoorkeur hebben, stellen prijs op een veilige (gesimuleerde) omgeving waarin ze fouten kunnen maken zonder dat dat consequenties heeft. Ze willen de kennis of vaardigheid eerst oefenen voordat ze het in praktijk brengen.

5. Ontdekken (discovery)
Mensen die deze leervoorkeur hebben, willen het liefst gewoon doen, en zelf ontdekken wat wel of niet werkt. Al handelend komen ze er achter hoe 't zit. En daardoor leren ze.
A. Introductie

[Groeten] Mevrouw/Mr. XXXX. Mijn naam is [interviewer's naam]. Ik ben hier op school in verband met een evaluatie van het "Ik geloof in jou" programma dat tussen 2009 en 2012 door het ministerie van onderwijs in samenwerking met het UNICEF en andere organisaties zoals VVOB uitgevoerd is op scholen in het binnenland van Suriname. Binnen dit programma zijn de leerkrachten in het binnenland getraind in kindvriendelijke lesmethoden. Er zijn trainingen geweest over een speciaal ontworpen boek. Ik geloof in jou, en over Activerende Didactiek en een Krachtige Leeromgeving. Kunt u zich daar iets van herinneren? Hebt u indertijd die trainingen gevolgd? [Eventueel kunnen hier een aantal onderwerpen genoemd worden die tijdens de trainingen aan de orde gekomen zijn, om het geheugen op te frissen].

In het kader van deze evaluatie voeren we gesprekken met beleidsmakers, leerkrachten, schoolleiders, school kinderen, en andere mensen die bij het programma betrokken geweest zijn. Mag ik u ook een aantal vragen stellen over hoe u de trainingen ervaren heeft en wat u ervan geleerd hebt? Deze vragen zijn geen test om te kijken hoe 'goed' u alles onthouden hebt, maar bedoeld om te kijken hoe de trainingen ontvangen zijn, of ze nuttig geweest zijn voor u, en hoe ze verbeterd zouden kunnen worden. Omdat de trainingen gericht waren op de leerkrachten zijn juist uw ervaringen en mening van belang in deze evaluatie.

Het gesprek zal ongeveer een uur duren. Indien er vragen zijn die u niet wilt of kunt beantwoorden kunt u ervoor kiezen die vragen niet te beantwoorden. U kunt ook op elk moment besluiten te stoppen met het interview zonder voor u nadelige consequenties. Het interview is anoniem. We zullen uw antwoorden vertrouwelijk behandelen en dusdanig rapporteren dat de vragen niet terug te herleiden zijn naar uw persoon.

Bent u bereid een interview af te staan?

Instructies voor de interviewers staan tussen [VIERKANTE HAKEN]
Interview met school leider

Dorp: ___________________________ Datum: __________
School: ___________________________ Observer: __________
Aantal klassen, excl. kleuterklas: __________ Aantal kleuterklassen: __________
Naam schoolleider: ___________________________
Aantal jaar schoolleider (algemeen): __________, waarvan __________ jaar op deze school
Aantal GLO leerkrachten __________ en kleuterleerkrachten: __________
Is het schoolhoofd zelf getraind? ja/nee
Zo ja, welke training(en): ___________________________

1. Welke trainingen zijn er op deze school gegeven?
   □ Ik geloof in jou (2010)
   □ Krantige leeromgeving (2010-11)
   □ Activerende didactiek (2011)
   □ Verdiepingstraining krachtige leeromgeving en activerende didactiek (2013-14)
   □ Geen enkele training, leerkrachten zijn in de stad getraind
   □ Geen enkele training, leerkrachten zijn niet getraind
   □ Weet niet
   □ Anders, n.i.: ___________________________

2. Hoeveel leerkrachten die nu op deze school lesgeven hebben de "Ik geloof in jou" trainingen gevolgd?
   a. __________ leerkrachten hebben alle drie modules plus de verdiepingstraining gedaan
   b. __________, leerkrachten hebben een deel gedaan, nl: ___________________________

      de ___________________________ training gevolgd
   d. __________ leerkrachten hebben geen enkele training gevolgd
3. Indien er leerkrachten zijn die geen enkele training gevolgd hebben, waarom niet?

4. Gezien alle andere trainingen die leerkrachten uit het binnenland door het jaar heen al volgen (BEIP, RKBO/EBSS, MINOV), wat ziet u als de meerwaarde van de “ik geloof in jou” trainingen?

☐ Andere training zijn gericht op nieuwe lesmethoden, de “ik geloof in jou” trainingen gingen over de manier waarop je het materiaal aan de kinderen presenteert en hen betrekt
☐ Het is altijd goed om meer training te volgen
☐ Ik zie geen meerwaarde, we krijgen al genoeg training
☐ Andere, nl: ____________________________

5. Kunt u aangeven op een schaal van 1-5 hoe tevreden u bent met de volgende facetten van de Ik geloof in jou training, waarbij 1 = zeer ontevreden, 2 = enigszins ontevreden, 3 = neutraal, 4 = een beetje tevreden, 5 = zeer tevreden, 6 = weet niet/ geen mening

a. Trainingsinhoud, oftewel relevantie van de onderwerpen die behandeld zijn
b. Trainingsduur, de tijd per training
c. Het aantal trainingen
d. De trainingsmaterialen, incl. de werkboeken
e. Competentie en vakbekwaamheid van de trainers

6. Indien er bij bepaalde vragen geen “5” geantwoord is, waarom was de school leider dan niet “heel tevreden”?

a. ____________________________
b. ____________________________
c. ____________________________
d. ____________________________
e. ____________________________

7. Wat betekent voor u “ik geloof in jou”?

__________________________

__________________________
8. Kunt u drie voorbeelden geven van manieren waarop u, naar aanleiding van de trainingen, uw school meer kind vriendelijk gemaakt hebt?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

9. Wat verstaat u onder "activerende didactiek"?
   
10. Waarom is activerende didactiek relevant voor leerkrachten en scholieren?
    □ Kan leerprestaties verbeteren
    □ Leerlingen krijgen meer plezier in leren
    □ Leerkracht krijgt meer plezier in lesgeven
    □ Leerlingen leren de stof sneller en beter
    □ Weet niet
    □ Anders: 

   
12. Welke veranderingen heeft u opgemerkt bij uw leerkrachten in hun houding naar de leerlingen toe, in de periode meteen na de trainingen?
    □ Meer zelfverzekerd
    □ Vriendelijker houding
    □ Ze werken harder om leerlingen bij de les te betrekken
    □ Anders, ni:
    □ Meer enthousiasme
    □ Geen enkele verandering
    □ Weet niet/geen mening

13. Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen?
   
14. Welke blijvende veranderingen in de houding t.o.v. leerlingen, die mogelijk een gevolg zouden kunnen zijn van de trainingen, hebt u opgemerkt bij de leerkrachten op uw school?
    □ Meer zelfverzekerd
    □ Vriendelijker houding
    □ Ze werken harder om leerlingen bij de les te betrekken
    □ Anders, ni:
    □ Meer enthousiasme
    □ Geen enkele verandering
    □ Weet niet/geen mening
15. Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen?

16. Welke resultaten ziet u in het algemeen bij de scholieren ten gevolge van de nieuwe aanpak en manier van lesgeven?

- Geen enkel resultaat
- De kinderen zijn rustiger
- De kinderen begrijpen de stof beter
- De kinderen leren van elkaar

☐ De kinderen participeren actiever
☐ De kinderen halen betere cijfers

Anders: __________________________

17. Voelt u dat u als schoolleider voldoende vaardigheden verworven heeft om de leerkrachten op uw school te begeleiden bij het implementeren van kindvriendelijke lesmethodes, zoals die in de trainingen krachtige leeromgeving en activerende didactiek overgebracht zijn?

- Ja, ik heb er vertrouwen in dat ik de leerkrachten kan coachen
- Ik kan op sommige gebieden wel helpen, maar op andere niet
- Nee, ik heb de vaardigheden en ervaring niet om de leerkrachten hierin te coachen
- Weet niet
- Anders: __________________________

18. Zijn er in 2013-14 schoolbegeleiders/trainers m.b.t. IGU op school geweest i.v.m. coaching?

- Ja
- Nee
- Weet niet

19. Zo ja, wat hebben zij gedaan, welke rol hebben zij vervuld?

- Hulpvragen vaststellen
- Gegevens van de school verzamelen
- Schoolanalyse bespreken met het school team
- Formuleren ontwikkelingsdoelen voor de school
- Training uitvoeren
- Opstellen Team Ontwikkelings Plan
- Persoonlijk Ontwikkelings Plan uitvoeren en opstellen met de leerkrachten
- Anders, nl:

20. “De schoolleider maakt het verschil” (Ik geloof in jou). Bent u het eens met die uitspraak?

- Ja, want: ____________________________________________
- Nee, want: __________________________________________
- Gedeeltelijk want: ____________________________________
- Weet niet
21. Het "Ik geloof in jou" programma stimuleert het werken van de school als een team. Er is ook gesproken over de verschillende fasen van een team. In welke van deze fasen bevindt uw school zich?
- □ Verzameling individuen (leerkrachten werken zelfstandig zonder veel overleg)
- □ Groep (groep begint te vormen, er is overleg over de organisatie van het werk in hun school en hoe de groepsprestaties (de onderwijsprestaties) kunnen worden verbeterd)
- □ Team (team met eigen waarden en normen, dat zijn schoolvisie, doelen en werkverdeling vast stelt)
- □ Zelfsturend, resultaatverantwoordelijk team (effectief werkende en creatieve eenheid, draagt bij aan schoolbeleid en zorgbeleid)

22. Heeft u als schoolteam doelen die ergens vastgelegd zijn?
- □ We hebben geen doelen als team
- □ We hebben wel doelen maar die zijn nergens opgeschreven
- □ We hebben geschreven doelen

23. Indien u geschreven doelen hebt, zijn die bij alle leerkrachten bekend?
- □ Ja, bij iedereen
- □ Bij een meerderheid
- □ Bij een enkeling
- □ Bij (bijna) niemand

24. Indien u geschreven doelen hebt, op welke manier wordt gemeten of deze behaald worden?
- □ Feedback en evaluatie
- □ Controle, test, inspectie
- □ Documentatie
- □ Tijdslijnen
- □ Observatie
- □ Anders, nl. ________________________________________________
- □ Het wordt niet gemeten

25. Heeft de school formele (geschreven) of informele (mondeling afgesproken) richtlijnen voor het corrigeren van gedrag / straffen?
- □ Ja, geschreven richtlijnen die ook besproken worden
- □ Ja, geschreven richtlijnen maar er wordt weinig mee gedaan
- □ Ja, mondelinge afspraken hierover
- □ Nee, er zijn geen afspraken hierover, iedere leerkracht handelt naar eigen inzicht.
- □ Weet niet.

26. Heeft de school formele (geschreven) of informele (mondeling afgesproken) richtlijnen voor het belonen of bevorderen van goed gedrag?
- □ Ja, geschreven richtlijnen die ook besproken worden
- □ Ja, geschreven richtlijnen maar er wordt weinig mee gedaan
- □ Ja, mondelinge afspraken hierover
- □ Nee, er zijn geen afspraken hierover, iedere leerkracht handelt naar eigen inzicht.
- □ Weet niet.
27. Heeft de school een up-to-date Team Ontwikkelings Plan (TOP)?

☐ Nee, we hebben geen TOP
☐ Er was een TOP ontwikkeld na de trainingen maar dat is niet ge-update
☐ We hebben een (jaarlijks) ge-update TOP
☐ Weet niet
☐ Anders, nl: ________________________________

28. Waar hebt u nog verdere hulp bij nodig? Waar zou u meer over willen leren?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

29. Is IKII voldoende onderdeel geworden van de dagelijkse manier van lesgeven en heeft het een plek binnen het beleid van de organisatie (RKBO/BOB/EBGS)? Verklaar je antwoord

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

30. Als het Ik geloof in jou programma opnieuw zou worden ontwikkeld en uitgevoerd en u zou mogen meedenken, wat zou u adviseren anders te doen en waarom?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
A. Introductie

[Groeten] Mevr/Mr. XXXX. Mijn naam is [interviewer’s naam]. Ik ben hier op school in verband met een evaluatie van het “Ik geloof in jou” programma dat tussen 2009 en 2012 door het ministerie van onderwijs in samenwerking met het UNICEF en andere organisaties zoals VVOB uitgevoerd is op scholen in het binnenland van Suriname. Binnen dit programma zijn de leerkrachten in het binnenland getraind in kindvriendelijke lesmethoden. Er zijn trainingen geweest over een speciaal ontworpen boek, Ik geloof in jou, en over Activerende Didactiek en een Krachtige Leeromgeving. Kunt u zich daar iets van herinneren? Hebt u indertijd die trainingen gevolgd? [Eventueel kunnen hier een aantal onderwerpen genoemd worden die tijdens de trainingen aan de orde gekomen zijn, om het geheugen op te frissen].

In het kader van deze evaluatie voeren we gesprekken met beleidsmakers, leerkrachten, schoolleiders, school kinderen, en ander mensen die bij het programma betrokken geweest zijn. Mag ik u ook een aantal vragen stellen over hoe u de trainingen ervaren heeft en wat u ervan geleerd hebt? Deze vragen zijn geen test om te kijken hoe ‘goed’ u alles onthouden hebt, maar bedoeld om te kijken hoe de trainingen ontvangen zijn, of ze nuttig geweest zijn voor u, en hoe ze verbeterd zouden kunnen worden. Omdat de trainingen gericht waren op de leerkrachten zijn juist uw ervaringen en mening van belang in deze evaluatie.

Het gesprek zal ongeveer een uur duren. Indien er vragen zijn die u niet wilt of kunt beantwoorden kunt u ervoor kiezen die vragen niet te beantwoorden. U kunt ook op elk moment besluiten te stoppen met het interview zonder voor u nadelige consequenties. Het interview is anoniem. We zullen uw antwoorden vertrouwelijk behandelen en dusdanig rapporteren dat de vragen niet terug te herleiden zijn naar uw persoon.

Bent u bereid een interview af te staan?

Instructies voor de interviewers staan tussen [VIERKANTE HAKEN]
Interview met leerkrachten (Zal mondeling worden afgenomen)

B. Algemeen

1. School: ___________________________  2. Dorp: ___________________________
   ☐ d. Hoofd kleuterleidster (HK)  ☐. Anders, nl: ___________________________

6. Welke trainingen heeft u gevolgd binnen het "Ik geloof in jou" programma? [NOEM OP]
   ☐ 1. Ik geloof in Jou (2010)
   ☐ 2. Krachtige leeromgeving (2010-11)
   ☐ 3. Activerende didactiek (2011)
   ☐ 4. Verdiepingstraining krachtige leeromgeving en activerende didactiek (2013-14)
   ☐ 5. Geen enkele training
   ☐ 88. Anders, n.l.: ___________________________

7. Hebt u behalve de "Ik geloof in jou" trainingen in de afgelopen twee jaar nog andere (didactische) trainingen gevolgd? Zo ja, door wie werden deze trainingen aangeboden? [NOEM VOORBEELDEN]
   ☐ 1. Bijscholing door MINOV - BEIP
   ☐ 2. Trainingen van EBG/RKBO
   ☐ 3. Anders, nl: ___________________________
   ☐ 4. Nee geen enkele andere training

8. Hoe vaak heeft u trainingen gevolgd in de afgelopen 2 schooljaren?
   ☐ 1. Ten minste 2x maal per jaar  ☐ 3. Om de zoveel jaar
   ☐ 2. Gemiddeld 1x per jaar  ☐ 4. Behalve Ik geloof in jou geen enkele training gevolgd

9. Indien u ook nog andere training gehad heeft, hadden de "Ik geloof in jou" trainingen ("Ik geloof in jou", Activerende didactiek of Krachtige Leeromgeving) een meerwaarde? Hebt u daar dingen geleerd die u op de andere trainingen of tijdens uw opleiding niet geleerd heeft?
   ☐ 1. Ja  ☐ 0. Nee

10. Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van nuttige lessen of waardevolle inzichten die u tijdens de "Ik geloof in jou" trainingen geleerd hebt? [ALS DE RESPONDENT INITIEEL AANGEeft "WEET NIET", VRAAG DAN EVEN DOOR]

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
C. De trainingen zelf: de trainers en de werkboeken

Bent u het eens of oneens met de volgende stellingen over de trainers van de trainingen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eens</th>
<th>Oneens</th>
<th>Geen mening</th>
<th>Weet niet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. De trainers waren goed voorbereid en kundig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. De trainers waren in staat mijn vragen te beantwoorden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. De trainers gingen te snel door de lesstof heen, waardoor ik het moeilijk kon volgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trainers konden de moeilijke termen niet goed uitleggen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. De trainers creëerden een leerklimaat waarin ik me veilig voelde en vragen durfde te stellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Indien u iets zou mogen veranderen aan de trainers en de manier waarop ze de training verzorgden, wat zou u willen veranderen?
   □ 1. Ik zou niets veranderen
   □ 2. Ik zou ..........................................................
   □ 99. Weet niet

17. Heb u het boek “Ik geloof in jou?” (hoorde bij de eerste training)
   □ 0. Nee ik heb het boek niet ontvangen.
   □ 1. Ja ik heb het boek
   □ 2. Ik had het wel maar ik ben het kwijt geraakt
   □ 99. Ik weet niet of ik dat boek heb
   □ 88. Anders; ..........................................................

18. Kreeg u bij de trainingen Activerende Didactiek en Krachtige Leeromgeving ook een werkboek?
   □ 1. Ja, een werkboek voor elke training. Ik heb die werkboeken nog.
   □ 2. Ja, bij sommige trainingen was er wel een werkboek, maar (misschien) niet bij allemaal
   □ 3. Ik heb geen enkel werkboek gekregen
   □ 4. Ik heb ze toen wel gehad maar ik ben ze kwijt
   □ 99. Ik weet niet meer of ik een werkboek gehad heb
   □ 88. Anders, nl: ..........................................................

19. Wat is de laatste training in deze serie “Ik geloof in jou” die u gevolgd heeft?
   □ 1. Ik geloof in Jou (2010)
   □ 2. Krachtige leeromgeving (2010-11)
   □ 3. Activerende didactiek (2011)
   □ 4. Verdiepingstraining krachtige leeromgeving en activerende didactiek (2013-14)
   □ 77. N.A. Geen enkele training gevolgd
   □ 99. Weet niet meer
Bent u het eens of oneens met de volgende stellingen over de werkboeken in de laatste training die u gevolgd heeft?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eens</th>
<th>Oneens</th>
<th>Geen mening</th>
<th>Weet niet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>De werkboeken waren onduidelijk en verwarrend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>De werkboeken zagen er verzorger en moei uit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Door het gebruik van werkboeken leerden we sneller en werd de tijd efficiënt benut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ik houd van de diversiteit aan oefeningen in de werkboeken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>De oefeningen in de werkboeken vond ik kinderachtig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ik kijk de werkboeken nog steeds regelmatig (maandelijks) in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Indien u iets zou mogen veranderen aan de werkboeken, wat zou u willen veranderen?
   - 1. Ik zou niets veranderen
   - 2. Ik zou …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

D. Training content en belangrijke concepten
27. Wat is naar uw mening de kern van het concept "Ik geloof in jou"? [MEERDERE ANTW. MOGELIJK]
   - 1. Onderwijs dat vertrouwen stelt in de potentiën en mogelijkheden van elk kind
   - 2. Onderwijs dat de unieke vaardigheden van elk kind respecteert
   - 3. Onderwijs dat rekening houdt met de leer-kracht van het kind
   - 4. Positieve aanpak, aanmoedigend, bouwen van zelfvertrouwen
   - 88. Anders, nl:
   - 99. Weet niet

28. Wat betekent voor u een "krachtige leeromgeving" (in eigen woorden)

__________________________________________________________

29. Wat betekent voor u de term "Activerende didactiek"? Kunt u dat in uw eigen woorden uitleggen?

__________________________________________________________

30. In het "Ik geloof in jou" boek stond een interview met Carl Breeveld, waarin hij zegt "Jongens schreeuwen om een andere aanpak". Bent u het met deze uitspraak eens en waarom of waarom niet? Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen?

__________________________________________________________

31. Is er tijdens de trainingen aandacht besteed aan hoe je als leerkracht jongens en meisjes op verschillende manieren kunt betrekken bij de lessen en stimuleren?
   - Nee, helemaal niet
   - Ja, namelijk op deze manier: …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   - 99. Weet niet, kan me niet meer herinneren
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32. Is er tijdens de trainingen aandacht besteed aan toepassing van de lessen binnen de culturele context van dit dorp? Bv. Cultuur van specifieke Inheemse of Marron groepen, of in het algemeen de culturen van binnenlandbewoners?
- Nee, helemaal niet
- Ja, namelijk op deze manier: ________________________________
- 99. Weet niet, kan me niet meer herinneren

33. U heeft geleerd over verschillende werkvormen. [INDIEN DE LEERKRACHT HET VERGETEN IS KUN JE REFEREREN NAAR DE 50 WERKVORMKAARTEN]. Kunt u drie werkvormen noemen die u vooral voor kinderen in het binnenland (of van uw school) geschikt vindt? (zie werkvormenkaarten)
1. ________________
2. ________________
3. ________________

34. Waarom kiest u voor deze werkvormen?
__________________________________________________________

E. Toepassing in de klas

35. Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van iets wat u, geïnspireerd door de trainingen, veranderd heeft in uw manier van lesgeven of het klaslokaal?
__________________________________________________________

36. Welke strategieën heeft u in het afgelopen schooljaar gebruikt om een positief leerlomtaat te creëren?
[AANTWOORDOPTIES NIET OPNOEMEN, WACHT OP EIGEN INBRENG VAN DE RESPONDENT]
- 1. Complimenten geven
- 2. Positieve beoordelingen geven
- 3. Positieve communicatie
- 4. Kinderen bij het binnenkomen van de klas vriendelijk aanspreken
- 5. Klas anders inrichten
- 88. Anders, n.l.: _____________________________________________
- 99. Weet niet

37. Werkt u in uw klas met leerhoeken?
- 1. Ja
- 0. Nee, GA NAAR 33

38. Zo ja, waar hebt u dat idee gekregen?
- 1. Van de ik geloof in jou training
- 2. Via mijn opleiding (SPI, IOL, etc)
- 3. Heb het zelf bedacht
- 88. Anders, n.l.: ____________________________________________
- 77. Niet van toepassing
39. Zo nee (vr. 38), waarom niet? [NOEM OPTIES INDIEN DE RESPONDENT GEEN ANTWOORD WEET]

- 1. De situatie in de klas laat het niet toe
- 2. Ik heb er de ruimte/ middelen niet voor
- 3. Ik heb niet genoeg tijd ervoor
- 4. Gewoon rooit over nagedacht
- 5. Ik weet niet hoe ik het moet doen
- 88. Anders, nl: ____________________________________________
- 77. Niet van toepassing

40. Op welke manier houdt u rekening met de individuele kwaliteiten en talenten van elk kind? Kunt u voorbeelden noemen? [ANTWOORDOPTIES NIET ONOPNOEMEN]

- 1. Kind observeren en leren kennen
- 2. Sterke kanten benadrukken
- 3. Individuele aandacht voor het kind
- 4. Kinderen elkaar laten helpen
- 88. Anders, nl: ____________________________________________

U heeft in de trainingen geleerd over verschillende leervoorkeuren die leerlingen en leerkrachten kunnen hebben. Nl. "kunst afkijken, participeren, kennis verwerven, oefenen en ontdekken". Kunt u van elke van de leervoorkeuren die u gebruikt een voorbeeld noemen van toepassing tijdens de lessen? [LICHT DE CONCEPTEN KORT TOE INDIEN DE LEERKRACHT ZE NIET (MEER) KENT]

- 41. kunst afkijken: _______________________________________
- 42. participeren: ________________________________________
- 43. kennis verwerven: ____________________________________
- 44. oefenen: ____________________________________________
- 45. ontdekken: __________________________________________

U heeft tijdens de trainingen geleerd over meervoudige intelligentie en manieren waarop die acht typen intelligentie tijdens de lessen gebruikt kunnen worden (denkslim, mensenslim, zelfslim, muziekslim, woordslim, beeldslim, natuur.slim, lichaamslim). Kunt u drie voorbeelden noemen van leeractiviteiten die u in het afgelopen schooljaar (2014-15) uitgevoerd heeft om deze verschillende soorten intelligentie in kinderen te ontdekken of stimuleren? [LICHT DE CONCEPTEN KORT TOE INDIEN DE LEERKRACHT ZE NIET (MEER) KENT]

46. _______________________________________________________

47. _______________________________________________________

48. _______________________________________________________

49. Tijdens de training krachtige leeromgeving heeft u geleerd over alternatieve manieren van gedrag corrigeren (straffen) en belonen. Kunt u twee manieren noemen waarop u in het afgelopen schooljaar op ongewenst gedrag gereageerd hebt?

a. _______________________________________________________

b. _______________________________________________________
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50. Is de manier waarop u nu kinderen corrigeert of bestraft anders dan voor de training?
   □ 1. Helemaal anders
   □ 2. Een klein beetje anders
   □ 3. Hetzelfde
   □ 4. Ik heb de training niet gevolgd

51. Indien u nu anders handelt bij het corrigeren van kinderen, kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van iets wat u voorheen deed en u niet meer doet, of omgekeerd?

__________________________________________________________________________

52. Kunt u twee manieren noemen waarop u in het afgelopen schooljaar kinderen gemotiveerd hebt?
   a. ____________________________________________
   b. ____________________________________________

53. Is de manier waarop u nu kinderen motiveert anders dan voor de training?
   □ Helemaal anders
   □ Een klein beetje anders
   □ Hetzelfde
   □ Ik heb de training niet gevolgd

54. Indien u nu anders handelt bij het motiveren van kinderen, kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van een manier van belonen die u nu gebruikt en voorheen nooit, of andersom?

__________________________________________________________________________

55. U heeft ook geleerd over verschillende werkwijzen. Hebt u de werkvormkaarten uit de training gebruikt?
   0. Nee  1. Ja  99. Weet niet

56. Kunt u een voorbeeld geven van een werkvorm(kaart) die u in het schooljaar 2014-15 gebruikt hebt?

__________________________________________________________________________

57. Indien u de werkvormkaarten niet gebruikt hebt, waarom niet?
   □ situatie in de klas laat het niet toe
   □ Ik heb er de ruimte/ middelen niet voor
   □ Ik heb niet genoeg tijd ervoor
   □ Gewoon nooit over nagedacht
   □ Ik weet niet meer hoe ik het moet doen
   □ Anders, nl: ____________________________________________
   □ Ik heb de training niet gevolgd
58. Tijdens de training activerende didactiek is er gesproken over zelfstandig werken en samenwerkend leren. Bij zelfstandig werken is er gewerkt met kleurenblokjes en -plankjes. Hebt u die methode toegepast in uw klas?
   □ 1. Ja
   □ 0. Nee, ga naar 60

59. Zo ja, was dat nuttig? Waarom wel of niet?

____________________________

60. Zo nee, waarom niet?
   □ 1. situatie in de klas laat het niet toe
   □ 2. Ik heb er de ruimte/middelen niet voor
   □ 3. Ik heb niet genoeg tijd ervoor
   □ 4. Gewoon nooit over nagedacht
   □ 5. Ik ben er onzeker over/weet niet hoe ik het moet doen?
   □ 6. Ik vind het geen goede of bruikbare methode omdat: __________________________
   □ 88. Anders, nl: __________________________________________
   □ 77. Niet van toepassing

61. Hebt u gebruik gemaakt van contractwerk met leerlingen tijdens het zelfstandig werken?
   □ 1. Ja
   □ 0. Nee, ga naar 63
   □ 99. Weet niet

62. Zo ja, was dat nuttig? Waarom wel of niet?

____________________________

63. Zo nee, waarom niet?
   □ 1. situatie in de klas laat het niet toe
   □ 2. Ik heb er de ruimte/middelen niet voor
   □ 3. Ik heb niet genoeg tijd ervoor
   □ 4. Gewoon nooit over nagedacht
   □ 5. Ik ben er onzeker over/weet niet hoe ik het moet doen?
   □ 6. Ik vind het geen goede of bruikbare methode omdat: __________________________
   □ 88. Anders, nl: __________________________________________
   □ 77. Niet van toepassing

64. Welk resultaat ziet u in het algemeen in uw klas ten gevolge van de nieuwe aanpak en manier van lesgeven?
   □ 1. Geen opvallend resultaat
   □ 2. De kinderen zijn rustiger
   □ 3. De kinderen begrijpen de stof beter
   □ 4. De kinderen leren van elkaar
   □ 5. De kinderen participeren actiever tijden de les
   □ 6. De kinderen halen betere cijfers
   □ 88. Anders: __________________________
   □ 99. Weet niet
65. Hoe vaak hebt u dit schooljaar (2014-15) de lesvoorbereidingsformulieren gebruikt?

☐ 1. Dagelijks
☐ 2. Wekelijks
☐ 3. Elke maand wel een keer
☐ 4. Minder dan maandelijks
☐ 5. Voorheen gebruikte ik ze wel maar dit schooljaar niet meer
☐ 6. Nooit gebruikt
☐ 88. Anders, nl:

66. Denkt u aan het eind van de dag of week na over wat goed en fout gegaan is, en wat u een volgende keer anders zou doen? Zo ja, kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van de manier waarop u dat doet? (bv schriftelijk, alleen reflectie, structureel met het POP)

☐ 0. Nee, ik evalueer niet
☐ 1. Ja, ik evalueer per ____________________________ (tijdsperiode), op deze manier:

[Blank Space]

67. Hebt u een Persoonlijk Ontwikkelings Plan (POP) ontwikkeld tijdens of na de training?

☐ 0. Nee ik heb nooit een POP gemaakt
☐ 1. Ja, na de training
☐ 2. Ja, tijdens de training
☐ 99. Weet niet

68. Hebt u in het schooljaar 2014-15 nog gebruik gemaakt van uw POP, of er aandacht aan besteed?

☐ 1. Ja ik gebruik het als leidraad en update het regelmatig
☐ 2. Ja ik kijk er naar en gebruik het al leidraad, maar update het niet
☐ 3. Ik kijk er soms naar maar doe er verder weinig mee
☐ 4. Ik doe er niets mee
☐ 99. Waat niet
☐ 88. Anders:

69. Is er op school begeleiding aanwezig indien u met een vraag zit betreffende de nieuwe leermethoden en activerende didactiek?

☐ 1. Ja, door het schoolhoofd
☐ 3. Ja, door: ____________________________
☐ 2. Ja, door personeel dat hiervoor special op school is
☐ 4. Nee, geen begeleiding

70. Wordt u vanuit de school of vanuit de onderwijsorganisatie gestimuleerd de IGJ methode toe te passen? En zo ja, op welke manier?

☐ 1. Ja, door het schoolhoofd
☐ 2. Ja, door collega’s
☐ 3. Ja, door organisatie (BOB, EBGS, RKBO)
☐ 4. Nee, geen stimulans
☐ 5. Anders:

Door middel van: ____________________________

71. Wanneer u nu terug kijkt, wat is het belangrijkste dat u geleerd hebt tijdens de workshops "Ik geloof in jou"? (Incl. Activerende didactiek en krachtige leeromgeving)

☐ 1. Het kind centraal stellen
☐ 2. Verschillende leermethoden om iets over te brengen op een leuke manier
☐ 3. Betere relatie leerkracht-leerling
☐ 88. Anders, nl:

72. Wat gaat goed in uw klas of op uw school, waar bent u trots op?

[Blank Space]

73. Wat vindt u nog lastig?

[Blank Space]
# Interview guide key stakeholders in Paramarib

Datum: __________________________ Naam: __________________________

Instantie: __________________________ Contact nr: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Functie in de organisatie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Betrokkenheid bij het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; programma. Specifieke rol en</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken gerelateerd aan het programma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Als u terug denkt aan het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; programma; wat is uw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eerste reactie of gevoel? Hoe heeft u het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; programma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in het algemeen ervaren?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relevante. Was het nodig dat er een programma zoals &quot;ik geloof in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou&quot; geïmplementeerd werd op scholen in het binnenland – in het licht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van alle andere trainingen die leerkrachten al krijgen van BEIP,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOV, RK/EBG etc? Waarom? Wat was de toegevoegde waarde?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relevante. Was de inhoud van het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; programma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afgestemd op de toenmalige en huidige problemen van onderwijs in het</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binnenland? Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview guide key stakeholders in Paramarib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Effectiviteit. Wat zijn naar uw mening de drie belangrijkste resultaten geweest van het IGU programma en geeft aan wat de rol van IGU hierin was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Effectiviteit. Welke uitdagingen staan het behalen van dit doel in de weg?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. De trainingen zelf: de trainers en de werkboeken

Bent u het eens of oneens met de volgende stellingen over de trainers van de trainingen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eens</th>
<th>Oneens</th>
<th>Geen mening</th>
<th>Weet niet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. De trainers waren goed voorbereid en kundig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. De trainers waren in staat mijn vragen te beantwoorden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. De trainers gingen te snel door de lesstof heen, waardoor ik het moeilijk kon volgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trainers konden de moeilijke termen niet goed uitleggen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. De trainers creëerden een leerklimaat waarin ik me veilig voelde en vragen durfde te stellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Indien u iets zou mogen veranderen aan de trainers en de manier waarop ze de training verzorgden, wat zou u willen veranderen?
   □ 1. Ik zou niets veranderen
   □ 2. Ik zou .................................................................
   □ 99. Weet niet

17. Heb u het boek "Ik geloof in jou?" (hoorde bij de eerste training)
   □ 0. Nee ik heb het boek niet ontvangen.
   □ 1. Ja ik heb het boek
   □ 2. Ik had het wel maar ik ben het kwijt geraakt
   □ 99. Ik weet niet of ik dat boek heb
   □ 88. Anders; .................................................................

18. Kreeg u bij de trainingen Activerende Didactiek en Krachtige Leeromgeving ook een werkboek?
   □ 1. Ja, een werkboek voor elke training. Ik heb die werkboeken nog.
   □ 2. Ja, bij sommige trainingen was er wel een werkboek, maar (misschien) niet bij allemaal
   □ 3. Ik heb geen enkel werkboek gekregen
   □ 4. Ik heb ze toen wel gehad maar ik ben ze kwijt
   □ 99. Ik weet niet meer of ik een werkboek gehad heb
   □ 88. Anders, nl: .................................................................

19. Wat is de laatste training in deze serie "Ik geloof in jou" die u gevolgd heeft?
   □ 1. Ik geloof in Jou (2010)
   □ 2. Krachtige leeromgeving (2010-11)
   □ 3. Activerende didactiek (2011)
   □ 4. Verdiepingstraining krachtige leeromgeving en activerende didactiek (2013-14)
   □ 77. N.A. Geen enkele training gevolgd
   □ 99. Weet niet meer
## Interview guide key stakeholders in Paramarib

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Impact. Wat is de belangrijkste verandering die u bij leerlingen in het binnenland ten gevolg van het &quot;ik geloof in jou&quot; programma bemerkt heeft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sustainability. Hoe groot acht u de kans dat de getrainde leerkrachten de aangeleerde methoden in de toekomst blijven gebruiken? Datz ook als er geen nieuwe of 'spiris' trainingen gegeven worden?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sustainability. Op welke manier zal uw organisatie de vaardigheden die tijdens het IGIJ programma aangeleerd zijn verder stimuleren, versterken en overdragen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cross-cutting contributions Jongens en meisjes kunnen het onderwijs op verschillende manieren ervaren en binnen de leeromgeving verschillende behoeftes hebben. Op welke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview guide key stakeholders in Paramarib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manier heeft het programma met gender-verschillen rekening gehouden?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24. Cross-cutting contributions.</strong> Reageren, uw ervaring, jongens en meisjes verschillend op de nieuwe didactische aanpak en leeromgeving?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25. Uitdagingen. Wat zijn voor uw organisatie de belangrijkste uitdagingen geweest wat betreft participatie binnen het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot;programma?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26. Uitdagingen. Wat waren naar uw mening de belangrijkste uitdagingen voor leerkrachten m.b.t. toepassing van de nieuwe vaardigheden in het binnenland?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. Flexibiliteit. Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen van een tussentijdse aanpassing van het programma naar aanleiding van feedback door uw organisatie of de leerkrachten?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28. Flexibiliteit. Welke verbeteringen of aanpassingen zou u aanraden indien het programma herhaald (bv in Guyana) of verlengd zou worden?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. Geleerde lessen. Wat zijn de belangrijkste lessen die u als organisatie geleerd heeft van het &quot;Ik geloof in jou&quot; programma en het ratraject?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. Opvolging. Wat is de volgende stap(pen)? Wat voor opvolging van het IGJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview guide key stakeholders in Paramarib</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programma zou u graag zien?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welke ondersteuning is verder nog nodig om de doelstelling van het IGU programma te realiseren?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5. Conclusions with regard to the main Evaluation Criteria and Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation questions</strong></td>
<td>All involved stakeholders agreed that it was necessary to make education more pupil-oriented and child friendly. Virtually all teachers and school leaders emphasized that the training was relevant. Teachers indicated that they had acquired skills and tools that they had not learned elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project goal correspond with the development goals and needs of the target group (schools, schoolchildren)?</td>
<td>The desk review revealed that even though Suriname performs well on selected international educational indicators, repetition and drop-out rates continue to be high—particularly in the interior. Stakeholders agreed that investment in upgrading teachers' skills was needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were the objectives of the in-service teacher training programme relevant in the local culture context of the target community?</td>
<td>Child Friendly Education is relevant for all children, and perhaps more so for children in the interior who face many additional challenges in their educational careers, such as lack of a supportive home environment, limited use of the school language at home, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do the objectives of the “I believe in You” vision align with the objectives of Suriname’s National Strategic Plan and in achievement of MDGs?</td>
<td>The vision is in line with the MDGs, the Suriname government vision on education in the interior—as described in the Implementation Plan Education Interior 2008-2015—and with Suriname’s Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How coherent were the “I believe in You” components with teacher and school leaders’ formal career paths?</td>
<td>The trainings were in line with curriculum at teacher’s college and other MINOWC trainings (e.g. BEIP). Teachers at the teachers’ college were also trained, thus enhancing consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Did the executing organizations work with a functional administrative system with clearly stated, measurable objectives, a log frame (or comparable system), project indicators and baseline data?</td>
<td>No. The programme had not be able to develop a log frame. The programme goals and measurable indicators were no well-defined or unrealistic. Neither was there a baseline that could serve as point of departure. Data from MINOWC research and planning for the interior districts have been used as a baseline, but these data do not provide detail about teaching approaches or teacher’s knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the outputs of the training programme? How many people and institutions have been affected? (# trained teachers, # trainers, # schoolchildren receiving CFE, # schools)</td>
<td>UNICEF reports that in total, 814 teachers and 92 school leaders of 92 schools in the interior of Suriname were trained. However, the registration records are incomplete and not analysed therefore it is hard to say how many of these teachers followed what (number of) trainings. The number of schoolchildren receiving CFE could not be established in the context of this evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have the objectives of the teacher training programme been realized? Do outcomes vary between different comm., among groups of teachers/school leaders or between boys and girls?</td>
<td>The training programme was not in line with indicators of “Quality inclusive” education (e.g. parent and community involvement), which was the primary programme goal. Quality of the school leader strongly affects outcomes. Differences in programme outcomes between boys and girls could not be assessed. Teachers indicated that they had no tools for different approaches of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent have the teachers in the interior schools gained knowledge and skills in implementing the &quot;I believe in You&quot; approach?</em> To what extent has the programme led to a child-friendly mind-set among teachers? <em>To what extent are teachers applying these knowledge and skills?</em></td>
<td>To what extent has the UNICEF-supported programme provided sufficient support to achieve the “I believe in You” goals in the interior schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the “I believe in you” training, teachers have become more aware of CFE and some of the main concepts. Teachers have started to implement small changes in teaching methods, class management, and their teaching environment but it remains unclear to what extent these changes can be attributes to the “I believe in you” programme. Moreover, changes are small and isolated, and typically not part of a more inclusive new teaching approach. Some specific tools are used but other reported behaviours are still out of line with CFE (e.g. corporal punishment, threatening).</td>
<td>The programme provided a good start and useful tools. However, the training sessions were too few, too short and too far apart in time to steer a complete change of long internalized teaching approaches and teachers’ habits with regard to interaction with schoolchildren.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To what extent have the “I believe in You” interventions (the in-service teacher training programme) contributed to the improvement of teaching and learning in the interior schools?</em></td>
<td><strong>Have the project goals been reached within the dictated timeframe?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See previous. There are small improvements in teaching. For example, teachers appear to have gained consciousness of classroom decoration, creating learning and reading corners. Furthermore, several specific methods have been adapted by teachers, such as work with colour blocks, group work, and playing games. These small changes may positively affect the school experience of children.</td>
<td>The input goals have largely been reached, though with substantial delays. The output, outcome and impact goals have mostly not been reached. This conclusion is based on the reconstructed log frame.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the (timely) achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?</td>
<td><strong>Could the activities and outputs have been delivered with fewer resources (human and financial) without reducing their quality and quantity? Has the UNICEF-supported ‘Realization of ‘I believe in You!’ programme been cost-effective? Are there more cost efficient ways for deliver the teacher training? ‘Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic processes and changes in administrative systems and staff caused substantial delays. Furthermore, the organizations involved did not re-adjust the project where and when necessary because there was no monitoring system or follow-up of recommendations from progress reports and the mid-term evaluation.</td>
<td>This evaluation did not focus on financial aspects of the programme and therefore there is no cost-analysis presented nor data about financial contributions. However, the data suggest that UNICEF worked cost-efficient by making use of existing logistic structures to distribute materials and organize trainings, through collaboration with Stg. EBGS, RKBO, and MINOB/BOS. Although not based on financial data; the trainers model was probably the most cost effective way to train all teachers in the interior. Training entire school teams rather than just 2-3 teachers per school probably enhanced programme impact. On the down side, due to long time lapses between trainings much time of the training sessions was taken up by refreshing knowledge from the earlier training(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent were the school management, the MINOWC's guidance staff, regional administration and MINOWC involved in programme execution.</strong> The MINOWC Bureau for Education of the Interior delivered trainers. Staff of the Nucleus centres, teachers at teachers' colleges and</td>
<td>MINOWC was involved in programme design and responsible for various elements of programme execution. The MINOWC Bureau for Education of the Interior delivered trainers. Staff of the Nucleus centres, teachers at teachers' colleges and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How efficient is the level of coordination between UNICEF and other partners, including government and local partners?</td>
<td>The results suggest that good collaboration and frequent communication between the partners UNICEF, EBGS, RKBO and MINOWC/BOB positively affected programme efficiency. On the other hand, staff turn-over in all organizations involved hampered programme efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the in-service teacher training programme improved learning outcomes and performance in interior schools? Do outcomes vary between interior schools in different communities and between girls and boys?</td>
<td>MINOWC school data from the interior districts suggest no change (improvement or worsening) in educational performance between 2009 and 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important changes in didactic knowledge and approach among teachers at interior schools as a result of the Project?</td>
<td>Most teachers gained basic understanding of key concepts such as “powerful learning environment” and “activating didactics”, but other concepts (e.g. multiple intelligences) remain poorly understood. Implementation of the concepts in practice is, apart from a few cases, minimal. Moreover, changes are often partial. For example, there may be a reading corner, but this corner is not attractive and children are not stimulated (or allowed) to use it/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have schools created a powerful learning environment, where children participate more actively?</td>
<td>Teachers adopted small changes in teaching tools and classroom decoration but on a higher, structural level, schools have been unable to create a powerful learning environment. Too many critical elements are lacking. For example, class-based rattling out lessons without understanding their meaning and mindless repeating after the teacher remain common, and contradict the principal ingredients of a powerful learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of the in-service teacher training in realization of “I believe in You!” and the reform process of basic education?</td>
<td>It is difficult to establish the net impact of the programme because of the lack of a baseline. It is likely that changes in teacher awareness and teaching methods, albeit small, have positively affected progress towards the “I believe in you” vision and the increased knowledge and understanding of the concepts might be in some extents the beginning of a mind-sets change of teachers in education approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any unintended (positive or negative) consequences from the programme?</td>
<td>None were recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>To what extent are the outcomes achieved sustainable? What are the recommendations to the MINOWC, UNICEF and other stakeholders in promoting child friendly and</td>
<td>Sustainability is limited; it appears that teachers mostly reverted to their accustomed teaching approaches after the trainings. Close follow-ups and in-class guidance/coaching for implementation of new methods could have enhanced sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management involved in supporting the “I believe in you” initiative?**

School leaders in the interior were trained. Regional administration was not involved. However, limited follow ups were carried out by the MINOWC staff, neither field visits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sustainability</strong></th>
<th>Measures whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding is withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>quality education in Suriname as a whole, and for both urban and interior contexts?</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are teachers still using the newly acquired teaching skills in educational year 2014-15?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What reasons do teachers have for continued use or discontinuation of use of the new skills and tools?</strong></td>
<td>Teachers would have liked more practice in a real classroom setting, and missed continued support once they were back at their school. Teachers also lamented that they lacked the means for implementation of desired changes and that the circumstances in interior schools were not always adequate (large classes, small classrooms etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project? (Where are the risks?)</strong></td>
<td>Major factors that influenced the non-achievement of programme sustainability include:  - Limited in-class practice during the trainings  - Lack of follow-up and coaching; teachers feel left alone to figure out how to translate the theory to practice  - Structured approach to innovation in schools was lacking; few schools have a School Development Plan or a strong school leader to drive innovation  - Teachers and school leaders often do not form a team but rather are accustomed to using an individual approach in teaching and management  - Limitations in the professional background of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What good practices and lessons learned have been derived from the programme, which could contribute to further reform child education in interior?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Good practices included:</strong>  - Trainings were on location  - Teaching materials were attractive, and trainers were skilled  - The programme proved to be adaptive to the specific circumstances of education in the interior. For example, the 4th training was replaced by a deepening training to reiterate what had been learned.  <strong>Lessons learned:</strong>  - Follow up, in the form of remote guidance and/or coaching on the spot (incl. telephone support), is critical.  - Strong and motivated school leaders are drivers of educational innovation.  - The implementation of educational reform needs to occur more structurally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cutting contribution</strong></td>
<td>Have gender dimensions and other differences between children on the basis of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and so forth been taken into account in project design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cutting issues</strong></td>
<td>Cross-cutting issues –primarily gender– have been integral to the training materials. In the trainings, did not explicitly pay attention to gender differences – even though most teachers were of the opinion that boys call for another approach. The trainings did address cultural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the programme responded to the needs of both girls and boys? To what extent the different strategies were used to address the challenges of all girls and boys?</td>
<td>The programme respond to the needs of boys and girls without distinguishing between the gender groups. Specific challenges of boys and girls were not addressed, even though they are very real and possibly more so in the interior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Project affect human rights, indigenous rights and/or children’s rights</td>
<td>The project has a potentially positive effect on children’s right to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Project respect the general principles of good governance and a sustainable environment?</td>
<td>Yes, by underlining the principles of equal chances to good education for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6. Evaluation Terms of Reference

EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title: Local Consultant (individual or institutional) for the evaluation of the UNICEF-supported Education Programme in promoting Child Friendly School approaches in the interior of Suriname

Background:
Primary school education in Suriname achieved relative high level of enrolment along the years. According to the data in the Education Indicators Yearbook 2008-2009, around 97% of children of primary school age (6-12) were attending school with no significant difference between boys and girls at this stage. However, significant geographical disparities exists. In the urban and rural coastal areas 4% of children of primary school age are out of school, while in the rural interior areas more than 14% of children are out of school. In the school year 2008-2009, nationally only 51% of children of primary completion age (12 years) were attending the last grade of primary education (grade six), and only 20% of the children entering secondary school have never repeated.

In addition a baseline assessment and analysis of the education sector supported by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) clearly indicated that inefficient systems including outdated legislations and curricula, teachers lacking continuous specific training to support them in their daily tasks and a very teacher centered class room style, were some main factors contributing to the performance of the education sector.

In May 2009 the book "Ik geloof in jou!" ("I believe in you!") was launched in Suriname. It was the result of a unique collaboration between the Ministry of Education and Community Development, V/OB (PROGRESS) and UNICEF. It wanted to make a positive contribution to the pupil-oriented and child friendly education in Suriname. The development process increased the common understanding, improved coordination and facilitated better partnerships to work towards the same results in basic education services for all children in Suriname as defined by the MINOV. Around this concept, several subthemes were identified as being the major themes in what is called a “holistic approach”. It includes: inclusive education, effective teaching, a healthy, safe and protective environment, gender sensitivity in education, student/community and family participation in education and enabling environment. In short these elements are referred to as “krachtige Leeromgeving” (powerful learning environment).

The vision document of “I believe in you” presented an inspiring image of what Surinamese education might look like in the future. On the basis of this vision, starting from 2009, two major international development partners, UNICEF and V/OB, jointly supported the MINOV in implementing the “I believe in you” approach. During the implementation process, V/OB focused on primary schools in urban and coastal areas and UNICEF focused on all (currently 92) primary schools in the four interior districts (Brokopondo, Marowijne, Para and Sipaliwini)\(^4\), including public primary schools, Roman Catholic primary schools and Moravian primary schools.

For the last few years UNICEF supported the MINOV with the implementation of the “I believe in You” approach mainly through in-service teacher training programmes based on the “I believe in

\(^4\) Suriname is divided in ten (10) districts Brokopondo, Commewijne, Coronie, Marowijne, Nickerie, Para, Paramaribo, Saramaca, Sipaliwini and Wanica
The overall goal of the UNICEF supported programme was that “At least 50% of girls and boys in the interior have access to quality inclusive pre-primary and primary education”. The expected outputs included:

1. All primary school teachers and school leaders in the interior with knowledge and skills to implement child-friendly concepts and methodologies.
2. At least 50% of schools in the interior have a School Development Plan and functioning Parent Teacher Association.

The key strategies utilized in the programme are through (1) Broad participatory process creating commitment, ownership and consensus of relevant stakeholders and (2) training of all teachers, key stakeholders in the education sector and managers, in the principles of pupil-centred education.

UNICEF’s support to the MINOV included technical and financial support to the development and implementation of three in-service teacher training modules.

The training of trainers approach resulted in the training of a group of trainers who trained (in different clusters) all teachers of all primary schools in the interior in the modules (i) ‘I believe in you’ (2010/2011), (ii) “Powerful learning environment” in 2010/2011 and (iii) Activating didactics” in 2012. A powerful learning environment is defined as followed: “an environment in which the required learning processes can be established in order to maintain the motivation and create effective learning with the desired outcomes”. This main theme was further broken down in the pedagogical, organizational and physical environment of the school. The second main theme in the training is the “Activating didactics” which is defined as follows: “the set of conditions that the teacher creates in order maintain a well-organized class”. Teachers in the interior of Suriname were supported in developing a Personal Development Plan with learning objectives and action points for Child Friendly Education which would fit within their teaching environment.

In 2011, an intermediate evaluation was conducted on the training sessions of “Ik geloof in jou” and “Krachtige leeromgeving”. Based on the evaluation recommendations, in 2012-2014 UNICEF’s support to the MINOV has been to provide a deepening in service teacher training programme on activating didactics and powerful learning environment for all teachers in the interior. This training programme included also the training of school guidance staff and coordinators of the 2 Nucleus Centres (Education centers in the interior), and staff of the Bureau for Education in the interior.

In that same year (2011) the MINOV acknowledged the importance of ‘I believe in you’ as the MINOV Basic Education Improvement Programme (MINOV-BEIP) supported by the IADB presented the new curriculum framework for primary education in Suriname, which was developed in collaboration with Stichting Leerplan Ontwikkeling (SLO) from the Netherlands. Based on the ‘I believe in you’ document, within this framework specific attention is also paid to the education learning environment, care for pupils, the pedagogical didactical climate and professionalization of the teachers.

Currently, the MINOV is reviewing the situation of education in the interior, the strategies and interventions, with the plan to reorganize the institutional structure on education for children in the interior. According to the Minister of Education, the new Education Law is to be approved and a new Education Strategic Plan is under discussion.
Purpose of the evaluation:

Between 2010-2014 MINOV, with the support of UNICEF, has been implementing three (3) rounds of in-service teacher training sessions 1) I believe in you/Powerful learning environment; 2) Activating didactics and 3) the deepening in-service teacher training programme. This evaluation aims to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the in-service teacher training programme in the interior, identifying challenges and opportunities, and provide recommendations on future national policy and programme priorities to the primary education in the interior of Suriname. The main audiences will include officials of the MINOV, national institutions, relevant education stakeholders and partners, NGOs and UNICEF. More specifically, the key purposes of the evaluation include:

1. To assess the results achieved during the in-service teacher training programme period, in line with proposed objectives, targets and strategies, through a reconstructed LogFrame (Inputs-Activities-Outputs-Outcomes-Impact).
2. To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, Impact and sustainability of the in-service teacher training programme in achieving CS6 and pupil-centred schools in the interior.
3. To identifying specific good practices and bottlenecks on demand, supply, and enabling environment encountered and solutions applied during the implementation process.
4. To provide recommendations to the MINOV, national institutions, and development partners including UNICEF, for the future initiatives on achieving Child Friendly Education and pupil-centred education in (the interior) Suriname.

Scope and criteria:
The evaluation will focus on the UNICEF-supported education programme from 2009-2014, in the context of the broad environment of implementation of the “I believe in you” vision including the government’s inputs and the work of VVOB in the urban – and coastal schools. The evaluation will primarily cover the interior schools only which was the focus of UNICEF’s interventions.

The evaluation criteria will include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability. The Evaluation will also assess the level of the application of the human rights based approach, results based management and gender mainstreaming in the programme.

Key evaluation questions

Relevance
- To what extent have the programme interventions aligned with the priorities in interior schools, head-teachers, teachers, children and community? To what extent were the objectives of the in-service teacher training programme relevant in local culture context of the target community?
- To what extent do the objectives of the “I Believe in You” vision align with the objectives of Suriname’s Ontwikkelingsplan (National Strategic Plan) and in achievement of MDGs?
- To what extent were the program beneficiaries, including teachers, school leaders and staff of MINOV involved in the planning, designing and implementation and assessment of project activities?
- How coherent were the “I Believe in You” components for teachers and schools leaders, with teacher and school leaders’ formal career paths?
Effectiveness

- To what extent have the objectives of the in-service teacher training programme been realised in the interior schools? Do outcomes vary between different interior communities, among group of teachers/school leaders or between boys and girls?
- To what extent have the teachers in the interior schools gained knowledge and skills in implementing the "I Believe in You" approach? To what extent has the programme led to a child-friendly mind-set among teachers? To what extent are teachers applying these knowledge and skills?
- To what extent the "I Believe in You" interventions (the in-service teacher training programme) have contributed to the improvement of teaching and learning in the interior schools?

Efficiency

- To what extent has the UNICEF-supported programme provided sufficient support to achieve the "I Believe in You" goals in the interior schools? Apart from UNICEF's support, are there any other interventions that also contributed to the "I Believe in You" goals in the interior schools? What are the gaps, constraints and challenges in implementation of the "in-service teacher training programme"?
- Could the activities and outputs have been delivered with fewer resources (human and financial) without reducing their quality and quantity? Has the UNICEF-supported realization of "I believe in you" programme been cost-effective? Are there more cost effective ways for deliver the teacher training?
- To what extent the school management, the MINOV's guidance staff, regional administration and MINOV management were involved in supporting the "I believe in you" initiative?
- How efficient is the level of coordination between UNICEF and other partners, including government and local partners?
- Have interventions been delivered in a timely manner?

Impact

- Has the in-service teacher training programme improved learning outcomes and performances in interior schools? Do outcomes vary between interior schools in different communities and between girls and boys? What factors may have contributed to this?
- What is the impact of the in-service teacher training in realization of "I Believe in You!" and the reform process of the basic education?
- Are there any unintended (positive or negative) consequences from the programme?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the outcomes achieved sustainable? What are the recommendations to the MINOV, UNICEF and other stakeholders in promoting child friendly and quality education in Suriname as a whole, and for both urban/semi and interior contexts?
- Where are the risks?
- What good practices and lessons learnt are there in the programme that could contribute to the further education reform to support child education in interior?

Cross-cutting contributions

- To what extent has the programme responded to the needs of both girls and boys? To what extent were the different strategies used to address the challenges of all girls and boys?
Existing information sources:

As a background the following materials listed below will be made available to the consultant and are expected to be reviewed and referenced, as relevant, in the inception and final report.

- I Believe In You!
- Book, DVD's
- Basic Education Improvement Project 1, IDB
- Education Sector Plan 2004-2008
- The Multi Annual Work Plan, 2006-2011
- Multiple Indicators Survey (MICS) 2006, 2010
- The Situation Analysis of Women and Children in Suriname, 2010
- Project proposal "I Believe in You!", training manuals, CFS scoping documents, case study Vision Suriname
- All progress reports of the "I Believe in You!" trainings from 2009 to 2014.
- Donor reports
- Reports from feedback of workshops
- VVOB progress reports 2008, 2009, 2010 and Final Annual reporting
- Bergman, S. (2011) Report regarding evaluation study of the training sessions 'ik geloof in jou en 'Krachtige leeromgeving'.

The consultant is expected to review all documents relevant to the programme of realization of the "I Believe in You!" from its inception to the current implementation. This will include but is not limited to studies, reports and previous assessments.

Evaluation process and methods:

This is a participatory evaluation mainly based on a qualitative methodology. The consultant will design, conduct, and analyse participatory In-Depth Interviews (IDIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with duty bearers and rights holders. Data will be collected from 10-15 selected schools in the districts of Sipaliwini, Marowijne, and Brokopondo with pupils, their teachers who were involved in the implementation of the in-service teacher training programme and those who were not. Head teachers/ managers of schools which are familiar with "I Believe in You!", Key persons involved in the development of the "I believe in you!" book, and other key stakeholders (inspection, guidance and other key departments) of the Ministry of Education will also be involved. The consultant is expected to work closely with the key officials of the Ministry of Education, UNICEF and other partners such as the VVOB.

Phase 1: Desk review, interviews with key stakeholders, development of research instruments, submission of inception report (10 working days, 5 days home based work on desk review and 5 days in-country discussion with UNICEF and the MINOV)

- Desk review: Review will include but is not limited to 2009-2014 progress reports and the here below mentioned list of literature. Reports from feedback workshops, and monitoring documents of the trainings which were submitted to UNICEF.
- Key stakeholder interviews: MINOV management, Officers of key MINOV departments, UNICEF, key stakeholders and main players in the whole process.

2 The home-based and in-country arrangement will be only applied when an international consultant is recruited.
• An Inception Report must be submitted comprising of the detailed workplan. The Inception report will include an evaluation matrix i.e. a table showing each evaluation question which will be answered and how (i.e. the research instruments) the information will be collected. Any amendments to the evaluation questions or schedules should be agreed at this stage.
• Development of data collection instruments including In-Depth Interview Guides (IDG’s), Focus Group Discussion guides (FGD’s), Classroom Observation checklist, School Statistics (student enrolment, attendance and performance)
• Meetings with other national stakeholders

Phase 2: Data collection (20 working days, in-country)
The consultant is expected to work with selected in-country facilitators (for interpretation and logistics arrangement) to conduct IDs with key personnel of the MINOV, UNICEF, VVOB and school teachers and managers. S/he is also expected to;
  ▪ Conduct IDI, FGD’s with teachers, head masters, pupils and key stakeholders involved in the process
  ▪ Classroom Observations of “I Believe in You” in service teacher training programme implementation in selected class rooms in all selected schools
  ▪ Individual interviews with management of MINOV/ heads of departments/ VVOB/ UNICEF
  ▪ Meet with Stakeholders

Please find a draft schedule attached to the Terms of Reference

Phase 3: Data Analysis, Sharing of findings and writing of report (15 working days, home-based)
• The consultant will be responsible for the data analysis, writing the report and presentation of findings to partners
• For the data analysis the grounded theory methodology will be used, involving transcription, coding of data, comparison and contracting of themes and recording of findings and theoretical propositions
• The safety of data during the data collection phase will be the total responsibility of the consultant; all information gathered for this evaluation is the property of MINOV and UNICEF. No data collected and or reviewed for this evaluation or data to which the researcher is privileged during time of the evaluation as direct or indirect result of being the researcher for this evaluation, can be shared and /or used by the researcher neither can s/he approve the use of the whole or any part of it for personal or professional purposes without approval in writing from Ministry of Education and UNICEF.
• The main findings will be presented by the consultant to National Stakeholders and sufficient time will be allocated for comments
• The writing of the report should be done in constant communication with UNICEF and MINOV.
• The first draft report will be submitted no later than 45 working days from the date on which the contract is signed.

Phase 4: Review, revise and finalize the report (5 working days, home-based)
• Four weeks will be allocated for review and comments by the MINOV and UNICEF after the first draft is submitted.
• 10 working days will be assigned to the consultant to integrate the comments into the final report. The final report will be submitted within three months after the contract is signed.
• The final report will be approved by UNICEF and MINOV
The consultant will commence work for 3 months with 50 working days. The consultant would have concluded and submitted the final report after incorporation of the recommendations based on the review by MINOV and UNICEF. The evaluation report must be compliant with UNICEF-Adopted UNICEF evaluation report standards. It is foreseen that the consultant will gather information which will be obtained through FGD/IDI or school completed self-assessment questionnaires in 10-15 selected schools in the interior, for which field visits to the interior districts will be required.

**Ethical Considerations:**

To ensure that the key ethical principles for the conduct of evaluation involving human subjects are followed, the evaluation will follow UNES norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines. Each potential respondent will be given full information about the evaluation including the purpose and potential benefits of the evaluation, their rights, and how the information collected will be used. They will also be informed that all data will be kept confidentially, being only accessible by members of the assessment team. Verbal consent will be collected from all those who agree to participate. All participants will be informed on their right to discontinue their participation at any point, and approaches for ensuring confidentiality will be described.

**Stakeholder participation:**

The national level stakeholders will comprise of the following:
- MINOV Senior Management
- MINOV department heads
- VVOB
- Others involved in the development of ‘I believe in you’
- Other partners in the process (DB/ NGO PCOS responsible for development of training manuals)

**Evaluation consultant/team composition:**

This consultancy is for one consultant (Person/team) who must possess the following competencies:
- At least a Master’s Degree in the Social Sciences preferably Sociology, Education or related field
- A minimum of eight (8) years’ experience in designing, implementing and supervising Monitoring and Evaluation programmes
- Proven experience in leading and managing outcome and impact evaluations. Good understanding of HRBA, RRM and gender mainstreaming, knowledge and skills in evaluation methodologies and UNEG norms and standards for Evaluation.
- Proven analytical skills and experiences lending to the ability to identify and evaluate best practices and innovative approaches to be utilized by the project
- Excellent English writing skills. Knowledge of Dutch language is an asset.
- Excellent and proves analytical skills
- Strong organizational, writing and presentation skills

Travel to interior areas for field work is expected from the consultant. Local assistance will be provided for translation and facilitation if necessary.
Accountabilities:

UNICEF will:
- Draft the TOR and share with the MINOV
- Provide the consultant with all the “I Believe in You!” materials which will include past progress reports from 2009 to 2013, and any other relevant documents as listed in the TOR
- Review inception report and provide feedback for adjustment
- Review data collection instruments (interviews/questionnaires) prepared by consultant
- Attend briefing meetings
- Review draft report
- Review and approve final report before final payment is made to consultant

MINOV will:
- Initiate meetings with MINOV officials, UNICEF and other stakeholders
- Prepare and send letters to (head) teachers outlining the purpose of the consultancy and the role they are expected to play
- Provide the consultant with letters to be presented to key stakeholders including head teachers, pupils, inspection, Guidance and other key departments
- Provide the consultant with all the “I Believe in You!” materials which will include past progress reports from 2009 to 2013, and any other relevant documents as further requested by the consultant
- Review consultants inception report and data collection instruments Attend briefing meetings
- Review draft report
- Review the final report and provide feedback on time.

The consultant will:
- Design the evaluation methodology and develop evaluation tools.
- Meet initially with officials from the MINOV and UNICEF to discuss the consultancy and timelines in detail.
- Review all documents as provided by the UNICEF
- Submit inception report which will include desk review, instruments, workplan for the evaluation and the outline for the final report. Incorporate feedback from UNICEF and MINOV and finalise inception report before proceeding for fieldwork
- Make contact with support from UNICEF, with head teachers, teachers and other key stakeholders
- Coordinate all activities including field visits with UNICEF.
- Prepare draft period reports for discussion with UNICEF and MINOV
- Discuss Preliminary findings with UNICEF, key Ministry of Education Officials
- Prepare and submit comprehensive final report.
- The consultant shall act in a manner within the laws of the country of Suriname.

NB: The MINOV and UNICEF shall assume no liability for health and safety of consultant, nor will UNICEF assume responsibility for the loss or damage of equipment or transport vehicles or any injury done to a third party used in conjunction with this work.
Procedures and Logistics:
- UNICEF will provide funds for all travel cost including DSA if necessary. UNICEF will closely monitor the progress of the consultant’s work. The UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist will be involved in providing quality assurance.
- Consultant will use his/her computer and other equipment if necessary.
- Consultant will submit final report in an electronic format in English. Translation into Dutch could be done in a later stage if needed.

Products/Deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable (timeframe and tasks)</th>
<th>Main components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inception Report (two weeks/5 days home-based and 5 days in-house) with desk review and development of methodology and tools, preparation of the Inception Report | - Clearly outlined work plan including timelines and strategies for each phase of the study including sampling methodology
- An evaluation matrix i.e. a table showing questions to be answered by the research and how the information will be collected to answer each question, including which data collection tool will be utilised to collect the information
- Comprehensive document review report
- Reconstructed programme logframe
- Interview schedule, data collection instruments i.e. FDG guides, IDI guides and classroom observation checklist
- Outline of final report
- Any amendments to the evaluation questions or schedules should be agreed at this stage. |
| Draft Report, in line with UNEG and UNICEF’s Global guidelines on reporting standards (four weeks/20 working days field work and 15 days home-based draft report) | - Report based on the agreed outline in the inception report, using collected data transcription of interview, coded transcripts of data and notes on observations and field visits
An Oral presentation of main findings to UNICEF and MNO on:  
- Key findings and recommendations
- Constraints, challenges and other critical factors of research implementation
- Outline of the next steps |
| Final Report in English with a PowerPoint presentation (Allow four weeks for review and comments, and two weeks (10 days) home-based revision and finalization of the final report). | - Final report based on comments on the draft report, together with the Executive Summary
- PowerPoint presentation |
Conditions:

- The contract will be temporary and will be between UNICEF and the Consultant.
- The consultant is expected to conduct all work independently of UNICEF with the exception of those cases where support may be needed to attend any high-level meetings.
- Prior to commencing the contract, the individual consultant will be required to sign a Health Statement for consultants/individual contractors, and to document that he/she has appropriate health insurance, if applicable.
- Consultant will adhere to UNEG norms and standards and UNICEF’s global guidelines on reporting standards

Application Process and Requirements:

All applications should include:

- cover letter: A short (maximum 1 page) letter addressing the consultancy/institutional contractor criteria.
- A short proposal, including:
  - Brief explanation about the Consultant, with particular emphasis on the previous experience in this kind of work and your understanding of the TOR.
  - Technical proposal: includes the proposed methodology, work plan with key steps and timeframe, any possible additional human and financial resource items required apart from the consultant’s work, and the final deliverables.
  - Financial Proposal (in US$): includes the estimates for services either a daily rate or a lump sum cost and travel cost.
  - Other additional consideration(s) and requirement(s) of clarification based on the TOR.
- Examples of previous work

Interested persons should submit the application by email to: vasanye@guyanasuriname@unicef.org
with subject line: “Evaluation Child Friendly School approaches”.

Addressed to: The Representative
Guyana and Suriname
United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
72 Brickdam
Georgetown

Closing date is 10 April 2013