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MAP OF QBEP CORE TOWNSHIPS AND SEVEN PILOT SITE/INSET TOWNSHIPS

Source: UNICEF (2012), MDEF 2 Linked Annexes, p. 91
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) pilot programme is a component under the Quality Basic Education Programme (QBEP), a joint partnership between UNICEF and the Multi Donor Education Fund (MDEF) partners comprised of Australia, Denmark, the European Union (EU), Norway, and the United Kingdom. QBEP is the second phase of this partnership, running from 2012 to 2015 and built upon the first phase (MDEF 1) that ran from 2007 to 2011. At the time of evaluation SITE was being implemented in a total of 17 townships in Myanmar; ten from Mon State, which piloted a whole state approach\(^1\), as well as seven other pilot townships. Since the start of the evaluation, a further seven townships from Kayah State have started receiving SITE training.

QBEP's overall goal is "improved access to and quality of basic education for all children in Myanmar" and its purpose is the development and implementation of "an inclusive and informed National Education Sector Plan (NESP) and supporting structures". SITE was one of two pilot activities expected to improve teacher performance (Output 3.3) by helping teachers move from theoretical to more practical learner-centred approaches in order to increase the number of children reached and learning in QBEP targeted areas (Outcome 3).

The SITE model focuses on strengthening teacher performance and increasing student-learning outcomes and its intended beneficiaries were teachers and head teachers. The Ministry of Education (MOE) through its Department for Basic Education (DBE) was responsible for the implementation of SITE in schools while the Department for Teacher Education and Training (DTET) was responsible for the technical training of the teachers. The role of QBEP was to assist MOE counterparts in planning and organising activities, provide technical assistance, monitor activities, and target advocacy at central level MOE departments, sub-national level education offices, universities of education and education colleges. At the time of writing, US$509,085 had been spent on SITE over the course of QBEP.

Evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience

In 2015, UNICEF contracted Montrose to undertake an independent final performance evaluation of SITE. The call for an evaluation was in response to a midterm review, carried out in 2014, which recommended that QBEP should review its monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management strategy. The evaluation of SITE also feeds into Output 2 of the QBEP results hierarchy, by enabling UNICEF, MOE and donor partners to learn from assessments, evaluations and studies.

The objectives of this final performance evaluation, per the terms of reference (TOR), were to provide:

- An objective assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and likely sustainability of the SITE pilot activities to date (2012-2015);
- A summative evaluation that will assess what results were achieved by SITE, as well as to assess what, if any, elements of SITE should be replicated in the future; and
- Provide a comparison of the SITE model against other national and regional in-service teacher training modules that, where possible, target teachers that are both trained and untrained, and who are from state, monastic and non-state schools.

The primary users of the evaluation are intended as MOE officials from the DTET, DBE, MDEF partners and UNICEF education staff. Secondary users include other partners and donors implementing similar

---

\(^1\) The whole state approach adopted in Mon State aimed at improving school readiness and primary-level education planning, delivery and quality at the state, township and school level through systematic capacity development that was inclusive of all key education actors. In addition, the whole state approach was hoped to support the Government of Myanmar’s progress in decentralisation by strengthening partnerships between education officials, non-state actors and civil society.
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in-service teacher training activities and other interested stakeholders in Myanmar and the broader region.

**Evaluation methodology**

The evaluation sought to provide a final performance evaluation of SITE pilot activities to date by answering the evaluation questions provided in the TOR, and based on Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria. The lines of enquiry and criteria developed by evaluators were reviewed and approved by UNICEF staff members as well by members of a Reference Group, comprised of officials from MOE and UNICEF.

The overall evaluation approach combined desk study, classroom observations using an 11-point checklist, visits to schools, meetings, stakeholder interviews, and focus groups. In addition, telephone and email interviews were conducted with relevant stakeholders who were out of the country or unavailable to meet in person. The evaluation methodology was qualitative in nature, although secondary sources were used to support findings with quantitative data, where available, and classroom and school observations have also been quantified where relevant. Data was collected from a total of 14 schools, 10 of which were SITE schools and 4 of which were non-SITE comparison schools. The sample frame included the 17 townships in the five States and Divisions (Mandalay, Shan, Magway, Sagaing and Mon) in which SITE is operational at the start of the evaluation. The sampling strategy was informed by the four broad categories of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training as identified in the enhanced desk review and UNICEF principles of equity and inclusivity in reaching worst off and hard to reach areas.

The qualitative data analysis was based on the construction of themes predetermined by the indicative lines of inquiry identified in the evaluation matrix. In the course of the evaluation, some other relevant themes, still in keeping with the evaluation objectives, emerged. In effect, the data collection and preliminary data analysis were conducted in parallel, and a number of emergent themes examined. Following the field data collection, the evaluation team discussed preliminary findings and prepared a summary matrix including evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, results, conclusions, and recommendations. This matrix was presented and discussed in the validation workshop with UNICEF and the Reference Group members.

Primary data sources included five strands of informants including those from the direct school and community context, to varying government implementation and policy levels, as well as from the programmatic level. This mixture of sources was used to capture a diversity of perspectives and ensure reliability of answers. Secondary sources included a range of literature on the broader QBEP programme as well as complementary studies.

Major limitations to the evaluation relate to programmatic issues such as lack of standalone project documents, monitoring reports, or SITE-specific indicators. In addition, the qualitative approach presented challenges in terms of sample size and reliability of answers. However, measures were taken to mitigate these challenges and the conclusions have been supported by secondary sources, where possible. Ethical considerations were taken into account in terms of the design and implementation of the evaluation.

**Main findings and conclusions**

Overall, the evaluation results have identified a number of positive aspects of SITE that are well suited to the current education climate in Myanmar. This is particularly important in the context of quickly and effectively upgrading large numbers of under-qualified teachers, relevant to the large numbers of newly recruited, untrained primary school teachers. What makes the SITE model particularly suited to this challenge is the in-school distance approach and, as evidenced by the evaluation results, the
enthusiasm of classroom teachers for the SITE content and approach. Also beneficial is the high level of ownership by the MOE and willingness to continue forward with SITE.

In terms of whether SITE activities were based on the needs of its target populations, SITE planning was a broadly top-down process that unintentionally addressed the learning needs of teachers in spite of the absence of a specific needs assessment being carried out to capture their stated needs. In this sense, the current SITE activities may not be strictly relevant to the learning needs of individual teachers. However, if looked at from a broader perspective there is evidence that SITE activities were aimed at addressing the gaps in teaching and learning, as outlined in a baseline assessment of teaching and learning practices in selected schools receiving QBEP funded training across the country. The links between SITE activities and the needs stated in the report align and therefore although the learning needs of individual teachers may not have been directly addressed, there is evidence that SITE activities are in line with the overall needs of Myanmar's teachers and classrooms.

The Output 2 target for 2015/16 (per the original QBEP design) was “35 per cent of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria.” Data from a Comprehensive School Checklists (CSC) compiled between 2011 and 2014 were analysed by the University of York in 2015 and the results were published in a 2016 report. Analysis indicates that on average, 37.8 per cent of teachers had increased their use of the 32 teaching and learning behaviours used in the checklist. These improvements were attributed to QBEP teacher education intervention. However, the measurement provided by the trend analysis is one of improvement rather than an actual proportion of teachers using improved methods. In this sense, the improvement of 37.8 per cent indicates progress toward achieving this indicator, but does not show whether or not the required 35 per cent of teachers has been met. It should also be noted that this indicator is not specific to SITE and also includes the influence of the Child Friendly Schools/Language Enrichment Programme (CFS/LEP) trainings.

The specific indicator of SITE success was for 1,000 teachers to have completed SITE training per year, leading to a cumulative total of 4,000 teachers receiving training by 2015/16. At time of the evaluation, a total of \(n=14,420\) trainees were reported to have enrolled in SITE, of whom 43.4 per cent (\(n=6,258\)) had completed the training by passing the written test. These findings show that SITE has met and exceeded this 2015/16 target in an efficient manner.

Inconsistent QBEP reporting challenged the evaluation of progress towards planned results. In addition, the only stated SITE result is the relatively high level output of improved teacher performance leading to increased number of children reached and learning in QBEP areas. However, in spite of this relatively poorly defined sub-objective, a number of positive findings from qualitative data collection and the CSC trend analysis strongly indicate that progress has been achieved nonetheless and QBEP-trained teachers have displayed evidence of more participatory, interactive and inclusive teaching methods in the classroom, resulting in more students reporting that they are enjoying school.

Particular areas of effectiveness have been highlighted as:

- **The strength of the peer-to-peer assessment and cluster group meetings.** These are considered to be key facilitating factors to the success and progress of SITE. Where they operated effectively, teachers were found to talk about these activities enthusiastically and it is clear that cluster group meetings provide the opportunity for very robust discussions on teaching practices;

- **The relative ease with which SITE can be introduced into schools and picked up by teachers** is a key factor in facilitating success and this is evidenced by the enthusiasm in which teachers have embraced SITE;
The observed and demonstrated frequent use of SITE training manuals, which were found present in schools and accessible to teachers. Inspections of teacher desks, school offices and libraries (where they existed) indicated that the SITE training materials were the only teacher training resources readily available to underqualified daily wage permanent qualified teachers, which is a very powerful factor in facilitating progress; and

An unanticipated benefit of SITE was found through secondary sources whereby the implicit impact of child friendly and learner-centred approaches was found to have had a positive influence on the role of teachers as facilitators of social cohesion in Myanmar; this is largely based on the principles of discussion, dialogue, and non-violence promoted by QBEP teacher trainings.

However, key factors hindering progress were:

- The high level of transfer and promotions, a standard feature of the Myanmar education system, which produce gaps in the number of head teachers and SITE teachers in any one school. Without a critical mass of SITE teachers in a school, the model was not found to function well and respondents reported that teachers lose motivation to continue their training under these conditions; and
- The finding that SITE learner-centric pedagogies were not supportive of the examination systems and created tension between the desire to implement improved teaching practices and the pressure to train students to pass examinations through traditional means of transmission teaching.

In terms of equity and inclusivity, SITE activities appear to have promoted some improvements within the classroom, particularly in terms of teachers’ behaviours in calling upon both girls and boys and providing feedback. However, the need for further training on how to address hidden gender norms on a societal and institutional level as well as further training on including children with disabilities was found necessary. SITE design and activities were not found to be discriminatory in terms of exclusion based on gender, disability or ethnicity; however, neither were they found to explicitly promote inclusivity or equity, and in keeping with the midterm review it is considered that these could have been built more visibly into programme design – for both SITE and QBEP as a whole.

It can be concluded on balance that if a number of areas identified in the evaluation are adequately addressed, SITE could be an effective model for in-service delivery, albeit one that does not appear to have had any objective monitoring and evaluation assessment of progress towards planned results for the current SITE activities.

The results indicate that SITE could be sustained following the end of the current QBEP funding in terms of ground support and buy-in from teachers, as there was obvious widespread support for SITE at all levels. The relative ease of SITE implementation also supports this. However, significant threats to sustainability that would need to be addressed are staff transfers out of SITE schools, teacher uncertainty on the SITE certification process and rewards, and school targeting.

Lessons learned

The following are the main lessons identified by the evaluation team:

- There is a need for project-specific design activities and documentation. The evaluation faced distinct challenges in being able to adequately ascertain project objectives and activities because of the absence of activity level planning or design documents. Although there was significant rationale provided for QBEP including teacher education and support, these did not clearly translate to clear SITE-specific objectives. This and lack of SITE activity level indicators hindered the measurement of effectiveness and has shown how the absence of these important planning and communication project stages can impede evaluation activities.
• **The importance of regular monitoring and progress reports.** The lack of regular SITE updates or progress reports made it challenging to evaluate the progress of the programme. The lack of reporting also meant that the popularity of SITE activities and the enthusiasm shown toward it by teachers were not captured or made known to important stakeholders like donors and education policy makers. These are issues that could be easily overcome and they show how levels of communication can impact perceptions of project success or weakness.

• **The need for patience and understanding of the country context.** The findings from this evaluation as well as the CSC trend analysis show that while change and improvement is occurring in terms of teacher understandings of learner-centered approaches and teaching pedagogies, the pace of behavior change is slow and dependent on the wider context of social and political change. It was also clear during the course of the evaluation that the process of decentralization has taken place without sufficient instruction or leadership from the central level. Such examples show that programme design should not rely on a fast pace of change or assume that new systems will be ready and functional according to a set time frame. This lesson shows the importance of incorporating such understandings in project documents for clear and realistic outcomes.

**Key recommendations**

The following main recommendations are based on the findings, conclusions and lessons learned and are organized in order of priority as follows:

**Recommendation # 1: for UNICEF programme staff**

Before any scale up of this pilot project, there needs to be a reconceptualization of basic SITE planning documents, theory of change and log frame.

The current QBEP theory of change needs to be revised to incorporate contemporary views of in-service teacher development as suggested above and in the enhanced desk review. This SITE conceptual framework should be clear and able to be articulated by stakeholders at all levels.

The current log frame is subsumed in the overall QBEP programme documentation and does not provide the basis for a clear summary of SITE activities or a robust management tool or basis for measuring performance. In any future scale up of SITE, a distinct log frame should be developed with clearly stated activities, outputs, outcomes and risk mitigation.

**Recommendation # 2: for UNICEF programme staff and fieldstaff, DBE central level**

In tandem with Recommendation # 1, a more rigorous approach to monitoring and evaluation needs to be established. This should be a long term objective and be applied throughout the entire lifespan of any scale up of SITE. A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system should be established at the beginning of any new phase of SITE based on the documents generated through Recommendation # 1, and should be followed throughout the new programme.

The evaluation results showed that SITE monitoring and reporting tools have not been used effectively to capture progress and results, and effective performance test-based loops were not in place. The lack of rigour and available SITE monitoring and evaluation data presented challenges to the evaluation team, and could be expected to impact on the effectiveness of SITE implementation. MDEF partners and DBE/DTET stakeholders raised this issue during focus group discussions. Appropriate feedback loops and protocols for all levels of participation in SITE activities need to be established and maintained with regular reporting.
Recommendation # 3: for MOE DBE and DTET, and UNICEF programme management
According to international contemporary best practice, a rigorous teacher training needs analysis should be undertaken to identify gaps in the current training materials. This should be undertaken at the beginning of any new SITE phase and be addressed before implementing and future scale up.

The training needs analysis should embrace contemporary conceptual frameworks of in-service teacher development incorporating for example recognition of teacher ownership, organization and delivery of professional development, and acknowledgement of the complexities of school environments and the different incentives and disincentives that teachers face.

Recommendation # 4: for MOE DBE and DTET, teachers
The SITE training materials should be reorganised into smaller units to allow teacher selection to meet their particular needs. This should be addressed during the period before any scale up of SITE is implemented.

Given the overall conceptual framework of the SITE approach where teachers work collaboratively in schools to peer assess and discuss their teaching, this teacher selection of learning materials would work best at the school level where they decide as a group what units of training are selected. This approach reinforces the active role that teachers should have in their own professional development, and acknowledges teachers' beliefs and feelings about teaching.

Recommendation # 5: MOE DBE and DTET decision makers, UNICEF programme staff, and teachers
The evaluation data from QBEP SITE schools where teachers had participated in child-centred approach (CCA) training prior to SITE indicated that teachers and Township Education Officers (TEOs) saw benefit in the linking of these two activities, with CCA providing skills in classroom teaching practices and SITE providing more depth, a broader understanding of children and their learning, and encouraging more teacher discourse on teaching and learning.

Any revisions of SITE should be conceptualised as long-term objectives within the four criteria for improving the effectiveness of teacher in-service training identified in the enhanced desk review. These four criteria are:
1. Activities need to be well aligned with government policy implicitly supporting improvements in classroom teaching;
2. Visible changes in schools and classrooms;
3. A well sequenced and coordinated whole school approach; and
4. A consideration of the wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms.

These elements need to be incorporated into a reconceptualization of basic SITE planning documents, theory of change and log frame as provided in Recommendation # 1.

As outlined in the enhanced desk review, by not taking into account factors such as the complexity of school environments, teacher incentives and motivations, and teacher resistance to new initiatives, teacher professional development is unlikely to be successful.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Object of evaluation: SITE pilot programme description

Context of SITE within QBEP

The School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) pilot programme is a component under the Quality Basic Education Programme (QBEP), a joint partnership between UNICEF and the Multi Donor Education Fund (MDEF) partners comprised of Australia, Denmark, the European Union (EU), Norway, and the United Kingdom. QBEP is the second phase of this partnership, running from 2012 to 2015 and built upon the first phase (MDEF 1) that ran from 2007 to 2011.

During the four years of QBEP's life-span, UNICEF Myanmar, with MDEF funding, planned to reach an estimated 5,500 primary schools and 650,000 children annually (1.1m cumulatively), in 34 core townships2 through a range of project components. At the start of evaluation, SITE was being implemented in a total of 17 townships; ten from Mon State, which piloted a whole state approach, as well as seven other non-core QBEP pilot townships. The whole state approach adopted in Mon State aimed at improving school readiness and primary-level education planning, delivery and quality at the state, township and school level through systematic capacity development that was inclusive of all key education actors. In addition, the whole state approach was hoped to support the Government of Myanmar's progress in decentralisation by strengthening partnerships between education officials, non-state actors, and civil society.3 The second phase of the whole state approach began in 2015 in Kayah State.

QBEP was designed in a rapidly changing operational environment, when steps were being taken toward decentralisation and where there was increasing openness to external assistance. Since QBEP inception, several changes to operational landscape have occurred and the opening up of Myanmar since 2011 has led to new opportunities to engage with the government and input into its national education strategy.

Activity description

The SITE model focuses on strengthening teacher performance and increasing student-learning outcomes. Under MDEF 1 and QBEP, there have been two types of in-service teacher education activities: face-to-face training and distance training. At the start of QBEP, distance in-service training was referred to as INSET. However, INSET appears to have been renamed SITE, although this change is neither documented nor explained in the available programme literature. It is understood that face-to-face in-service training activities were addressed under the Child Friendly Schools/Language Enrichment Programme (CFS/LEP) component, comprised of eight-day in-service training packages. Distance in-service training activities, also referred to as 'on-the-job' in-service training, were addressed through SITE. References to INSET and SITE are understood to be interchangeable.

SITE utilises a local network of state level training staff, including teacher educators at education colleges, and Township Education Office (TEO) staff providing cluster based in-service training sessions and monitoring visits. In support of SITE activities, participating head teachers attend a five-day course to prepare for their role in providing guidance to teachers during SITE activities. The SITE guidelines do not outline any feedback mechanisms expected of head teachers after completion of the course and fieldwork did not find evidence of any feedback instruments being used. These guidelines were...

---

2 Core townships were originally intended as those where teacher training, instructional leadership, school improvement and township planning would take place, in addition to some other components under original Output 1. Under QBEP, the number of core townships rose to 35 from 25 under MDEF 1.
produced in May 2014, but do not specify who the materials were designed for nor provide a rationale for their development and mode of implementation.

The centrepiece of SITE training is the set of "Effective Teaching and Learning" training materials which was originally in one volume made up of ten instructional units. Also included are instructions on self-assessment and peer assessment. There is both a Myanmar and English language version (374 pages) of this course book and recently the Myanmar version was broken down into smaller volumes. Two new training modules have also been developed, though SITE was originally intended to have 10 modules that townships could pick and choose from based on their identified needs.

The intended beneficiaries of SITE are teachers and head teachers who are expected to undertake self-study of the SITE teacher education modules without affecting their routine work. Head teachers and teachers are expected to conduct peer assessments through observing each other in the classroom and providing feedback. Teachers from schools implementing SITE are expected to form groups and study together, with support from the head teacher. In addition, clusters of schools are expected to join together in order that teachers from different schools within the cluster can share problems and experiences from their studies. A school cluster represents between five and ten schools.4

The SITE approach combines head teacher organised sessions, reading and reflection by teachers, and experiential learning. The course book outlines the time demands on participating teachers as follows:

- School Group Study – 2 hours per week (facilitated by head teacher)
- Individual Application – 1 hour per week (self-facilitation)
- Cluster Study Group – 4 hours per month (facilitated by cluster head)

It is understood that the training cycle for each participant teacher is six months, and within a township, half of the school clusters will participate in year one, and the other half in year two.

Expected results chain
A design strategy for the overall QBEP programme was developed in 2012 with the stated purpose of "increased number and proportion of children accessing and completing quality basic education in targeted townships". The second of the four key Outputs was, "improved quality of teaching and learning practices in basic education in targeted townships in government and monastic schools; and in both mono-grade and multi-grade schools," under which teacher education was an intended activity.5

However, changes were made to these expected results following a 2014 midterm review of QBEP, commissioned by the Government of Myanmar, MDEF partners and UNICEF. This review found that several key changes needed to be made to the programme, including, in particular, the causal logic in the theory of change and strategic orientations. In response to the midterm review recommendations, QBEP made changes to the "strategic vision and direction" of QBEP for the remainder of its funding cycle.6 The original theory of change and overall QBEP results hierarchy were revised.

The revised hierarchy, which can be viewed in Annex 2, depicts the altered overall QBEP goal as "improved access to and quality of basic education for all children in Myanmar" and its altered purpose

---

6 UNICEF, Joint Performance Improvement Plan (JPIP), 2014, p. 5.
as the development and implementation of "an inclusive and informed National Education Sector Plan (NESP) and supporting structures". The three new Outcomes/Objectives are as follows:

1. Evidence base for advocating and delivering quality basic education improved;
2. Systems supporting quality basic education strengthened; and
3. Number of children reached and learning in QBEP targeted areas increased.

SITE was one of two activities expected to improve teacher performance (Output 3.3) by helping teachers move from theoretical to more practical learner-centred approaches in order to increase the number of children reached and learning in QBEP targeted areas (Outcome 3).

No reference was made to a revised log frame following the midterm review, and it is assumed that the indicators for revised Outcome 3 (previously Output 2) and SITE remain the same. The overall indicator for achievement of Output 2 was described as the "Percentage of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria," and the target set was 35 per cent of sampled teachers. The instrument for the observations of classroom teaching methods is the Comprehensive School Checklist (CSC), which was used to capture the frequency of teacher and pupil behaviours occurring during the course of a lesson. Data captured from the CSC was shared with the evaluation consultants, as was a subsequent report, produced by the University of York (March 2016), and formed part of the triangulation process during the evaluation.

A cumulative indicator for SITE was for 4,000 teachers to have received distance in-service training over the course of four years.

SITE rationale
A rationale specific to the SITE component of QBEP was not evidenced in project documents. However, scattered information across project documents suggests that the overall rationale for addressing teacher education was based on the recognition that teacher education is a key strategy for improving the quality of basic education. The following influences are believed to have informed SITE rationale:

- A 2007 teacher education review highlighted several areas requiring reform and urged that teachers be trained to higher standards through more cost effective means. It also highlighted the benefits of shifting the emphasis away from formal teacher qualifications toward more focus on teacher classroom competencies;
- The lessons learned from MDEF 1 showed the need for a fundamental reform of teacher education as well as capacity building of teacher trainers. In addition, there was the need to address the gap between real classroom teaching situations and what is taught during training. This underpinned a move away from a theoretical to a more practical, learner-centred approach to teacher training, which provides real classroom experience; and
- A baseline study of child-centred approaches and teaching and learning practices in selected primary schools in Myanmar, conducted in 2012, found teaching methods to be highly teacher-centric with little student interaction and heavy dependence on textbooks; the learner experience did not allow for critical thinking.

---

7 Note that UNICEF language referring to results varies between documents. The JPIP refers interchangeably to programme Objectives and Outcomes. Outputs and Sub-objectives are similarly equated. This language differs from that in the 2012 design document.
11 Ibid, p. 35.
SITE objectives
According to the revised QBEP results hierarchy, the overall objective of SITE was to improve teacher performance. This is a shared objective with the CFS/LEP component. Somewhat more specific programmatic objectives of SITE were outlined in the SITE Guidelines, although these are still lacking the expected detail or measurable outcomes. They are as follows:

- To develop pedagogical skills of teachers while performing their regular teaching duties throughout the academic year;
- To bring about ways that will help teachers develop teaching practices while using school-based in-service teacher education programme;
- To make better of [sic] teaching duties of teachers with the help of efficient teachers who have not undergone teacher training courses; and
- To develop good habits of self-assessment among teachers.

SITE theory of change
The original linkage between inputs to teacher training and improved learning outcomes, as stated in the MDEF 2 Linked Annexes, was that if teacher capacity was built through improved pre-service training and developing instructional leadership skills through in-service training – accompanied by the provision of materials – then this would lead to improved teaching and learning processes.

This logic assumed that the main drivers for enhanced learning achievement were changes to teaching and learning processes, which might have led to higher attendance and more enjoyable classroom environments, which in their turn would reinforce the impact of better teaching and learning. It was not explicitly assumed that improved school management would lead directly to enhanced learning; rather, that it would contribute to improving teaching and learning processes by means of providing instructional leadership and better school planning which included a focus on learning.

Two hypotheses with measurable outcomes were proposed, although to date, no measurements are known to have actually been calculated; both hypotheses were caveated with acknowledgements that testing them would be either unfeasible in terms of data collection or of minimal benefit in terms of being unable to understand the reasons for anomalous results. These are:

Hypothesis 1: Training changes teaching practices.
Hypothesis 2: Exposure to teachers using Teaching and Learning Practice (TLP) improves learning.

As already mentioned, a revision of the original QBEP logic and its constituent components was made in response to the midterm review. The underlying linkages between the activities under Outcome 3 were reviewed and reconceptualised as:

**IF** QBEP supports activities reaching both those within and outside of school (pre-primary and non-formal) and supports the improvement of physical infrastructure and materials in schools, teaching delivered by teachers and oversight and management provided by head teachers and PTAs;

**THEN** QBEP will be able to increase both the number of children reached as well as help improve the quality of learning of children within its targeted areas.

This logic is based on similar assumptions to the original theory of change in terms of linking supply-side improvements in teaching and learning conditions to increased attendance of school children.

---

16 Ibid, p. 97.
Neither version takes into consideration the arguably more influential demand-side factors linked to structural, cultural, or socio-economic barriers to education at the household or societal level. Examples of which, in the Myanmar context, are often related to poverty such as the opportunity cost of sending children to school when they could be earning an income for their family, as well as inequity, discrimination and hard-to-reach locations often in ethnic areas.

A SITE programme-specific theory of change was not developed during the QBEP design stage, although a retroactive theory was created by UNICEF in response to the midterm review for the purpose of the evaluation. Its formulation does not appear to have been based on a political economy analysis and UNICEF staff have since clarified that it was developed based on QBEP design documents and discussion with programme staff.\(^\text{17}\) It does not appear to have undergone a rigorous validation process. The logic is conceptualised as follows:

**Table 1: Simplified theory of change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linkages as understood from the full theory of change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If SITE training highlights effective teaching pedagogies, then teachers and head teachers will learn new skills and put them into practice, because an internal review highlighted inadequate skills and knowledge of learner-centred pedagogies to support effective learning.</td>
<td>The rationale behind this linkage is grounded in evidence. The logic, overall, is relevant to the identified needs of improved and learner-centred pedagogies but it is simplistic and assumes that teachers would accept new methods in the face of decades of rote-learning practice and that broader societal acceptance would be given to new practice. It...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{17}\) Correspondence with UNICEF staff, May 2016.
If teachers and head teachers undergo SITE training, then this will provide participants with a demonstrated competency that could allow them to gain eventual certification, because this will provide teacher development for those lacking qualification. This assumes the possibility of certification upon completion of SITE training; however, this remained an area of contention at the time of evaluation and it does not seem likely that this assumption was tested at the time of formulating the theory of change. The rationale is awkwardly presented but the overall logic of addressing a lack of qualification stands.

If teachers and head teachers are supported by head teachers, peers, and cluster heads through on-going coaching and mentoring, then there will be strengthened relationships between school staff and visiting subnational government education staff, because in-service training accompanied by mentoring and coaching can strengthen the capacities of teachers who have already completed pre-service training. The linkages and logic as described in this theory of change are not intuitive and are unclear. Although the rationale can be found through reading project documents, the theory of change should be able to articulate this more clearly.

Overall, the in-service professional development premise adopted is that if there are clearly identified teaching skills then this should produce specific outcomes, and that professional development activities should be based around the acquisition of specified teaching behaviours. However, these types of approaches have historically not produced the desired results (Howe & Stubbs, 1996; Muijs et al., 201418). Approaches more in line with contemporary practice view teachers as independent professionals whose professional development is viewed as a process of individual empowerment (Fung, 2000; Gilbert, 199420).

Also not encompassed in the current theory of change is the low level of personal ownership that teachers have traditionally had for in-service professional development (Ingvarson, 1998; Cannon et al., 201423). More effective approaches recognise that in terms of benefits to teachers, schools and students, the impact of teacher development activities will be greater if teachers have ownership of the planning, organization and delivery of these programmes (Canon et al., 2014; Tisher & Wideen, 199024).

By not taking into account these factors, or the complexity and variety of school environments, and teachers’ own status, standing, feelings, ambitions and therefore potential resistance to new initiatives, teacher professional development is unlikely to be successful.

---

24 Canon, R., Arlianti, R., and Riu, I. Dissemination and Sustainability of DBE and USAID PRIORITAS Programs, USAID Indonesia, Jakarta, 2014.
Given these limitations, and the need to bring in-service teacher development in line with more effective approaches, a conceptual framework for this evaluation was adopted; this framework incorporates a holistic perspective on teacher professional development, focusing not only on individual teachers but also on the educational environment in which they operate. This perspective on the theory of change includes the acknowledgment of the complexities of school environments, consideration of teachers' beliefs and feelings, and the need for professional development programmes to consider schools in their entirety, not just individual teachers.

As outlined in the enhanced desk review carried out during the evaluation's inception phase, central to any evaluation of improved teaching methods are clearly observable changes in classrooms. This entails changes in teacher thinking and attitudes, and these changes should be supported by observable elements in the broader school and community environment. Based on these understandings, evaluators have conceptualised their approach to the evaluation strategy through the following rationale and logic, whereby:

**IF** teacher training activities are aligned with government policy; there is visible change in schools and classrooms in student and teacher behaviours; a well sequenced and coordinated whole school approach that includes improved school management, active parental participation, engaged school committees, and a clear and focused conceptual framework is in place; as well as positive external influences on teacher effectiveness in the classroom;

**THEN** this will provide an indication of effective teaching practices and an indication of an environment conducive to improved teaching;

**BECAUSE** the findings of the enhanced desk review that showed these to be key elements of effective and sustainable school based in-service teacher training.

### The role of key stakeholders

The key stakeholders in SITE are the MOE, specifically DTET, formerly the Department of Education Planning and Training (DEPT) and the DBE. Other stakeholders include teachers, UNICEF staff, and subnational level government education staff. QBEP’s role in SITE is to assist the MOE in their implementation of in-service teacher training. UNICEF staff involvement has included national and international Education Specialists and Education Officers as programme managers from 2012 to 2014.

**Table 2: Outline of key SITE stakeholders and their role within the programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Key roles within SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department for Teacher Education and Training (formerly DEPT)</td>
<td>Responsible for the technical training of the teachers, Chairman of the Central Supervising Committee, Inform and coordinate the procedures of the committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Basic Education (DBE)</td>
<td>Responsible for the implementation of SITE in schools, Member of the Central Supervising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region/State Minister for Social Affairs</td>
<td>Patron of the Region/State Supervising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Director (planning), Deputy State Education Director</td>
<td>Chairman of the Region/State Supervising Committee, Approves the draft work plan and townships chosen for the distribution of SITE textbooks, Submits the final report from the Supervisory Committee to the DBE and DPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal of Education College</td>
<td>Vice-Chairman of the Region/State Supervising Committee Handles the assessment questions to test trainees after completing the module studies Sign the certificates of recognition and submit them to the chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principals/Head of School Clusters and Heads of Education College Campuses</td>
<td>Chairman of school cluster level supervisory committee Assess teachers in the stages before, during and after studying the module Facilitate and observe the progress and effects of the programme Make comments to strengthen the programme and the teachers learning based on assessment and observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Education Officer (TEO), Deputy TEO and Assistant TEO</td>
<td>Chairman of the township level supervisory committee Initiate the formation of township level supervising committee and distribution of the tasks Draft a year-long implementation plan and then implement it Select and determine a place to open the resource school and supervise its long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Study each module regularly and complete studying the content prescribed per week Form groups and study together, as well as independently Hold group discussions with teachers from the different member schools and share problems and experiences relating to the module studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Assist MOE counterparts in planning and organizing activities Provide technical assistance, monitor activities Target advocacy at central level MOE departments, sub-national level education offices, universities of education and education colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEF partners</td>
<td>Provide funding and oversight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme expenditure
According to UNICEF, by the time of the evaluation, an estimated US$509,085 had been spent on SITE over the course of QBEP.\(^\text{26}\) This data was not disaggregated by funding source or contributor.

Implementation status
In the 2014/15 academic year, and at the time of evaluation, the SITE model was being implemented in all ten Mon townships as well as in seven pilot townships: Pauk in Magway Division; Pineblu and Khamti in Sagaing Division; Loilem and Namsang in Shan South; Thabeikkyin in Mandalay; and Kutkai in Shan North. Townships from Kayah State were also included in 2014 as part of the next stage in UNICEF’s whole state approach and SITE is expected to be implemented in a further three Whole States in the future – Chin, Kachin, and Rakhine.

QBEP funding is due to end on 30 June 2016. The continuation of SITE will be partly down to MDEF donors, who now have to decide whether or not to extend any remaining funding on QBEP and its components.

1.2 Context of basic education in Myanmar
In November 2015 the National League for Democracy (NLD) won a landslide victory in Myanmar’s national elections, and formed a new government in April 2016. Historically the NLD have emphasised delivery of education and healthcare as basic rights denied to the Myanmar people for decades through chronic underinvestment by the former military regime. The NLD-led government is set to make provision of higher quality education for all a top priority from 2016 and is likely to both invest heavily in teacher education and encourage donor organizations to follow suit.

Despite the country’s rise in GDP in recent years, public expenditure on education remains well below the regional low-income ASEAN average of 3.3 per cent, with Myanmar currently only sitting at 2.1 per

\(^\text{26}\) From UNICEF correspondence; evaluation team did not get access to first hand budget data to confirm this.
cent of GDP spending (tripling from 0.8 in 2011/12). However, the 2014 Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) determined that public expenditure on education will continue to increase and is predicted to reach 2.8 per cent of GDP by end of the 2015/16 fiscal year. Greater financial investment in the sector and solid economic management will be a foundational support for the country to create a higher standard of education.

The key education provider in Myanmar is the Government of Myanmar although significant other providers are the Monastic School System, the Ethnic Education Departments and other non-state providers. The Monastic School System assists in providing basic education for children from lower-socio economic families or orphans, with the goal of helping children acquire literacy and numeracy skills as well as passing on knowledge of Buddhist teachings. Ethnic Education Departments operate schools and education systems that focus on ethnic histories, languages and cultures as the focal point of their curriculum framework, with the aim of educating children on the values embedded in the historical struggle for cultural recognition and relative autonomy.

Within the MOE, grades 1-11 are administered by the Department of Teacher Education and Training (DTET), and regionally-based Departments of Basic Education (DBE). There are subnational Education Departments in all 14 States and Divisions, as well as at the District level, and Education Offices in all 330 Townships across the country. The Township Education Offices (TEOs) take on a range of functions including for example implementation of student stipends programs, school grants, staffing, and monitoring roles. Within the MOE, directives and communications tend to flow downwards and decision-making beyond the central MOE is restricted, in spite of moves toward decentralisation.

Figure 1: Key education policies and guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key education policies and guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) started in 2012 between the Government of Myanmar and development partners, is a key document that identifies the challenges, gaps, and strategic options of the education sector more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Framework for Economic and Social Reform (FESR) is another key national planning document part of the educational reform, and was released in December 2012. Decentralised planning and implementation are listed as priorities under this document. In spite of this, the overall governance of basic education remains highly centralised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The country’s 30 Year Education Development Plan (2001/02 to 2030/31) provides strategies to promote greater access and to improve the quality of basic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The National Education Law (Sept 2014; amended in 2015) is a key policy directive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MOE’s 30-Year Plan commits to promoting child-centred approaches for teaching, whereby traditional rote-learning methods are transformed into participatory and active learning approaches. However, evidence suggests that this transformation still has a long way to go and a 2012 baseline study of child-centred approaches (CCA) in Myanmar schools found that rote-learning and teacher-centric practices were still the norm. Within the Myanmar context, the concept of child-centred approaches is easily confused with the CCA project, which has been implemented by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) since 2002. When referring to the general approach of child-centred practices, this evaluation therefore uses the term learner-centred approaches.
The United Nations recognises education as a fundamental human right and links education with improved health and nutritional outcomes, social stability and national economic growth. Greater education levels across Myanmar will help the country to work toward achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the coming years. Myanmar became a State Party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1991 and to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW) Against Women in 1997 and has a body of national laws committing the State to the realisation of children's and women’s rights.

A 2012 report cited that there were around 40,000 schools in Myanmar with an estimated total of 150,000 school teachers. Each year around 10,000 teachers are produced by the 23 teacher training colleges and universities. In 2015, the Government of Myanmar recruited an estimated 80,000 new daily-wage teachers as part of a fast-track system, whereby the standard system of two-year pre-service teacher training at education colleges following completion of a preliminary university degree can be bypassed. Instead, graduates with Bachelor's degrees, or in some cases graduates from Grade 9 or 10, will be able to become fully fledged ‘permanent’ teachers after undergoing one year of condensed distance training; this would entitle them to the same pay grade and contracts as teachers who have been through the more conventional pre-service training at an education college. This policy makes SITE a particularly interesting model to assess in terms of its potential for addressing the training needs of newly recruited teachers.

The table below presents some basic education statistics for Myanmar based on the 2014 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Data</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>54,246,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child population under 18</td>
<td>&gt; 21 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate (persons aged 15 and over)</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male literacy rate</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female literacy rate</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net primary school enrolment</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of children aged 5-9</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of children aged 10-13</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of children aged 14-15</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of primary schools</td>
<td>28,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Myanmar’s estimated population of 53 million people is ethnically diverse and made up of 135 officially-recognised ethnic groups speaking a total of 111 languages. The majority ethnic group are Bamar, with seven other main ethnic minority groups: Chin, Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Mon, Rakhine, and Shan. Longstanding discrimination and neglect of ethnic areas on the part of the Bamar has led to the economic marginalisation of ethnic people who live predominantly in rural areas with the highest levels of poverty and the lowest levels of government education, health, and social services. Livelihood strategies in the most remote and marginalised border areas involve migration, agriculture, and dependence on children's contribution to household incomes.

The interplay between tradition, and structural, cultural and social barriers in these areas impacts on children’s opportunities to access and benefit from quality education. QBEP’s own contextual analysis found that high levels of inequity in terms of access to different types of education provision mean that

children in the poorest and most remote communities, particularly those in ethnic areas, are suffering disproportionately and have fewer opportunities to learn in supportive classroom environments or progress to secondary education. The associated linguistic diversity within Myanmar is another barrier to education, as many ethnic children grow up speaking their mother-tongue, and not Myanmar, which contributes to drop out and low learning attainment when they enter Myanmar-speaking government schools.

Figure 2: Ethnic composition of dominant minorities in Myanmar (2014)

At a glance...
- 135 different ethnic groups (and sub-groups) in Myanmar.
- Bamar language is a second language for many.
- Language of instruction must reflect the diverse context of ethnic groups in Myanmar.
- Non-state schools in minority states can and often do follow a different curriculum as state-run schools.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience

In 2015, UNICEF contracted Montrose to undertake an independent final performance evaluation of the SITE pilot programme. The call for an evaluation was in response to the midterm review, carried out in 2014, which found that QBEP would benefit from more independent evaluation of their projects and specifically stated that doing so would strengthen the credibility of QBEP successes.\(^{31}\) The review recommended that QBEP should review its monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management strategy with a more, "rigorous, reflective and critical approach" to monitoring and evaluation (M&E).\(^{32}\)

The evaluation of SITE should also feed into Output 2 of the revised QBEP results hierarchy, by enabling UNICEF, MOE and donor partners to learn from assessments, evaluations, and studies which in turn, supports Outcome 2 of an improved evidence-base for advocating and delivering quality basic education.

The objectives of this final performance evaluation, per the TOR, were to provide:

- An objective assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and likely sustainability of the SITE pilot activities to date (2012-2015). This is especially relevant as current QBEP SITE funding is due to end on 30 June 2016;
- A summative evaluation that will assess what results were achieved by SITE, as well as to assess what, if any, elements of SITE should be replicated in the future; and
- Provide a comparison of the SITE model against other national and regional in-service teacher training modules that, where possible, target teachers that are both trained and untrained, and who are from both state, monastic and non-state schools.

The primary users of the evaluation are intended as MOE officials from the DTET, DBE, MDEF partners and UNICEF education staff. Secondary users include other partners and donors implementing similar in-service teacher training activities and other interested stakeholders in Myanmar and the broader region.

2.2 Evaluation criteria and scope

The evaluation sought to provide a final performance evaluation of SITE pilot activities to date by answering the evaluation questions provided in the TOR, and based on OECD/DAC criteria. Using these criteria ties in the overall QBEP Assessment and Evaluation Plan, which specifies that OECD principles for evaluating development assistance be used to assess activities in all of QBEP’s sub-objectives.\(^{33}\)

The scope of the evaluation does not include an assessment of project impact as UNICEF and QBEP partners prioritised the four evaluation criteria outlined in the above section in light of the relatively short time-span of SITE implementation and in recognition of the lack of rigorous baseline data against which to measure impact or attribution. According to OECD/DAC interpretations of impact, however, unanticipated consequences (both positive and negative) are addressed where possible under the section on effectiveness. It is also noted that UNICEF intended impact level questions to be addressed by a separate study conducted by the University of York.

In addition, the main evaluation report does not include analysis and comparison of SITE with the JICA-funded, DTET implemented, CCA in-service teacher-training project, or the Monastic Education...

---


\(^{32}\) Ibid, p. 6.

Development Group (MEDG) Yaung Zin competency-based in-service teacher-training programme. This element of the evaluation was addressed in the enhanced desk review which was conducted during the evaluation’s inception phase and which can be viewed in full in Annex 8. The enhanced desk review was a preliminary piece of work that preceded the evaluation and reviewed the in-service teacher training modules of other South-East Asian countries, and compared them to training modules currently in use in Myanmar in order to draw out evidence of good practice in the delivery of in-service teacher training programmes.

The TOR set out four primary evaluation questions:

1. Are the current SITE activities relevant to the learning needs of the head teachers, teachers, staff they target?
2. Do the current SITE activities provide an efficient model for implementing in-service teacher training?
3. Based on the criteria developed during the Enhanced Desk Review, is SITE an effective model for delivering in-service training to trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools (MNEC)?
4. What is the likelihood that SITE activities will be sustained following the end of current QBEP funding?

There was no specific log frame developed for SITE and detailed indicators to measure programme achievement were therefore not available. The exceptions are two indicators from the overall QBEP log frame that pertain specifically to SITE, namely the percentage of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria and the number of teachers reached by SITE training over four years. These indicators were used to address efficiency in terms of the extent to which objectives were achieved within the expected timeframe.

One of the objectives of the enhanced desk review was to use the good practices identified through comparisons of in-service teacher training programmes from the South East Asian region and Myanmar to develop a list of key criteria for asserting the effectiveness of the SITE training modules. The enhanced desk review found that the most successful and effective teacher professional development trainings took into account the complexity of school environments and teachers’ personal feelings, as well as potential resistance to new initiatives. By not taking these factors into account, the findings showed that successful teacher professional development was not likely.

Effective approaches to teacher development view teachers as learners who have an active role in professional development; these approaches acknowledge the importance of teachers’ beliefs and feelings, their economic and social situation, and the impacts of educational and administrative contexts. This is in contrast to more traditional approaches that assume that clearly identifiable teaching skills are able to produce specific student learning outcomes, ignoring the complexity of school and classroom environments, and the wider contextual setting.

It appears that QBEP recognises the progressive conceptualisation of teacher professional development outlined above. This demonstrated in the ‘whole school catchment’ approach that was adopted as part of the Child Friendly School (CFS) model as well as in the ‘whole township’ approaches intended for the Non-Formal Education (NFE) and Township Education Management Information System (TEMIS) QBEP components. In these approaches, QBEP sought to address the capacity needs

34 UNICEF, SITE TOR, 2015, p. 2.
of all management levels (township, cluster and school) with training in instructional leadership, school management and school improvement, planning skills and information systems.

Central to the evaluation of improved teaching methods is that the above elements must be observable in classrooms and must entail changes in teacher thinking and attitudes. In adopting a whole school approach to promote these changes in classrooms, the broader supportive school and community environment must also display clearly observable elements linked to improved teaching practices.

The enhanced desk review identified four broad categories of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training as follows:

1. Activities need to be well aligned with government policy implicitly supporting improvements in classroom teaching;
2. Visible changes in schools and classrooms;
3. A well sequenced and coordinated whole school approach; and
4. A consideration of the wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms.

In the absence of other SITE indicators, lines of enquiry were developed by the evaluation team that corresponded to accepted OECD/DAC questions and related to the benchmarks established during the enhanced desk review. The lines of enquiry and criteria developed by evaluators were reviewed and approved by UNICEF staff members as well by members of a Reference Group, comprised of officials from MOE and UNICEF.\(^\text{38}\) A full evaluation matrix with all lines of enquiry and accompanying rationale is provided in Annex 3.

The evaluation lines of enquiry, data collection, analysis and reporting included considerations of gender and equity, per UNEG report guidelines and as appropriate. The QBEP design document addresses how the programme, and by association its project components, are informed by principles of equity and gender, but a human rights perspective is not made explicit. This evaluation therefore demonstrated a similar focus. The lack of disaggregated indicators on gender in the QBEP log frame also meant that there were no benchmarks against which to measure SITE gender achievements.

---

\(^{38}\) The purpose of the Reference Group was to provide a forum for key stakeholders to convene and discuss the design, progress, and outputs of the evaluation. Another key motivation for establishing the group was to develop MOE capacity in evaluation processes.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overall approach
The overall evaluation approach combined desk study for the undertaking of an enhanced desk review, classroom observations using an 11-point checklist, visits to schools, meetings, stakeholder interviews, and focus groups. In addition, telephone and email interviews were conducted with relevant stakeholders who were out of the country or unavailable to meet in person. The evaluation was qualitative for a number of combined reasons; this approach was set forth in the inception report and was decided upon for a number of reasons:

- The prime advantage in using this approach is the richness of data that observations of classroom teaching provide, and the tangible impressions of classroom learning environments. The detailed longitudinal data that was collected through the Comprehensive School Checklists (CSC) from 2011 to 2014 and the questionnaire surveys administered to head teachers, teachers, and students for the complementary research being conducted by the University of York will provide much more meaningful quantitative data than fieldwork from this study could capture. The qualitative data from this study will therefore be able to be triangulated with other data to form a more comprehensive picture of the SITE model as a whole.

- The relatively tight timeframe in which to conduct fieldwork, combined with issues of logistics and accessibility, the sample of schools was relatively small. Given this small sample number, combined with the complex environment in which school-based teacher development occurs, qualitative approaches are considered more appropriate.

- The culturally and ethnically diverse nature of Myanmar means that SITE participants come to the programme with widely differing existing conceptions based on prior experiences as students and teachers. These may assist or hinder the acquisition of new conceptions. These types of complexities are best captured and analyzed with qualitative tools.

3.2 Data collection

Data sources
In the course of the evaluation, the evaluation team referred to a range of secondary sources including available programme design documents as well as academic papers and reports. Primary data sources included five strands of informant; these are outlined in the table below. This mixture of sources was used to capture a diversity of perspectives, from the direct school and community context, to varying government implementation and policy levels, as well as from the programmatic level.

*Table 4: Primary sources used for data collection (October-December, 2015) with number of interviewees in brackets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; community level</th>
<th>Township level</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Central level</th>
<th>Programmatic level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers (26)</td>
<td>Township Education Officers (5)</td>
<td>DFAT (1)</td>
<td>Senior decision makers at DTET (4)</td>
<td>Education Specialist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (68)</td>
<td>Deputy/Assistant Deputy Township Education Officers (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior decision maker at DBE and other officer (2)</td>
<td>Current SITE Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (12)</td>
<td>Assistant Township Education Officers (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former staff member of DEPT (1)</td>
<td>Field Education Officer (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastics schools (3)</td>
<td>Cluster heads (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous SITE consultants (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would have been preferable to have met more of the donor partners, but unfortunately only one out of the four members who were scheduled to meet was able to attend the discussion. Due to staff turnover, several key members of the UNICEF education team involved in SITE were no longer in Myanmar. In these cases, questions were sent by email or interviews were conducted over the telephone, as relevant. The limitations of this method are outlined below.

The Reference Group members were an important resource in terms of informing the evaluation design and sampling. The Reference Group also played a role in the selection of data sources, whereby they suggested the inclusion of parents and students in order to seek their perspective on teacher and classroom changes. As this had a strong triangulation rationale, the evaluation team were keen to add these sources; however, including children posed several challenges as the team were sensitive to the disturbance they would cause by taking children out of class and fieldwork timetabling meant that interviewing children after school was not feasible. For these reasons, students were not included as a data source. However, parents who were not members of parent teacher associations (PTAs) were interviewed where possible. The benefit of including these parents was to mitigate selection bias in terms of the type of people most likely to be part of a PTA and therefore gain a more 'normal' parent perspective.

Prior to finalising findings and writing the final report, a combined debrief meeting was held with the Reference Group and MDEF stakeholders to obtain feedback on the initial findings. This was a good opportunity to test the trustworthiness and objectivity of these initial findings. Responses from the debrief participants did not suggest any credibility issues with the research methods adopted, the triangulation approaches were not questioned, and the evaluation shortcomings were accepted. There was wide acceptance of the findings.

**Data collection**
Data was collected using the following tools:
- Interview question guide for TEO officers, head teachers, cluster heads and head monks;
- Interview question guides for classroom teachers;
- Interview question guides for PTA members;
- Classroom teaching observation checklist;
- General school observation checklist; and
- Tailored questions for email and telephone correspondence.

The development of interview question guides was informed by the enhanced desk review, the indicative lines of inquiry identified in the evaluation matrix, as well as the combined expertise and contextual understanding of the evaluation team. The classroom and general school observation checklist were adapted from a standardised World Bank instrument, first used in Cambodia. These instruments have useful and reliable through previous use by the team technical lead and were found suitable for the lines of inquiry developed for this evaluation.

Qualitative tools were further developed and refined by the evaluation team, and informed by the enhanced desk review and other documents identified in the course of the inception report development. Reference Group members and UNICEF staff reviewed and approved the tools for relevance and validity before field work. This allowed for queries and changes regarding meaning, wording, ambiguities, areas of potential misunderstanding, and other factual errors. A period of
preliminary testing took place before the main fieldwork began in order to check that the tools were relevant to the targeted stakeholders and setting. This resulted in minor rewording of questions. English tools were translated into Myanmar and then back-translated into English to ensure the accuracy of content.

Data collection involved three technical members and one non-technical member. The technical evaluation team was made up of the technical team lead who led the questioning and further probing based on the interview protocols agreed to during the instrument development phase; the second team member acting as interpreter; and third team member in the role of note taker. These two positions were rotated between interviews. A fourth team member, who was not an education expert, acted as a secondary note taker for all interviews and focus groups as a means of cross checking the information recorded.

Data was collected from a total of n=14 schools, n=10 of which were SITE schools and n=4 of which were non-SITE comparison schools. A full table of sampled schools can be found in Annex 4.

**Analysis methods**
The qualitative data analysis commenced in the field soon after each engagement with participants. An emergent process was adopted where each preliminary analysis of field notes informed the next engagement. Field notes recorded participant responses to the set interview questions, observations and any key points raised, new issues and general impressions during contact with participants.

Preliminary analysis occurred during a daily de-brief session including all team members where impressions, points of interest, interview responses and other data were discussed. Here, consensus was reached on major themes and trends, in addition to interpretations and understanding of interview responses and observations. During these sessions, team members sought to ensure objectivity of qualitative responses by discussing, accepting or rejecting the credibility of responses from participants; this required triangulated comparison of responses as well as knowledge of both subject matter and local context. Written summaries in electronic format were prepared at the end on each day and consolidated in appropriate folders by the technical lead.

The qualitative data analysis was based on the construction of themes predetermined by the indicative lines of inquiry identified in the evaluation matrix. In the emergent nature of the evaluation some other relevant themes, still in keeping with the evaluation objectives, emerged. In effect then, the data collection and very preliminary data analysis were conducted in parallel, and a number of emergent themes examined.

As part of qualitative data analysis, interviewee responses were sorted into categories on summary sheets bringing together the main responses to interview questions. Mid-point during the data collection a half-day was set aside for the team to review the data collected against the evaluation questions and evaluation matrix.

Following the field data collection, the evaluation team discussed preliminary findings and prepared a summary matrix including evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, results, conclusions, and recommendations. This matrix was presented and discussed in the validation workshop with UNICEF and other key SITE stakeholders to present tentative findings and conclusions, as well as identify any factual inaccuracies or other issues.

**Sampling strategy**
The sample frame included the 17 townships in the five States and Divisions (Mandalay, Shan, Magway, Sagaing, and Mon) in which SITE is operational.
The strategy was to sample eight townships across Sagaing, Mandalay, Shan North, Mon and Yangon. The sample selection was purposive in order to capture data from a wide range of participants from varying contexts. This maximum variation approach deliberately sought to interview a range of different people and in doing so, ensure that an average was obtained from their aggregate answers. Covering a diversity of school types and locations was also in line with the principles of equity underlying the evaluation.

The sampling strategy was informed by the four broad categories of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training as identified in the enhanced desk review. In addition, criteria for diverse site selection included State and non-state schools (monastic and Mon National Education Committee (MNEC)), townships with high and low 2014 SITE examinations results, areas of ethnic and religious diversity, a mix of socio-economic circumstances, areas with vulnerable populations such as internally displaced people (IDPs) and conflict areas, SITE townships in QBEP core townships vs. SITE pilot townships, and 2012/13 and 2014/15 cohort townships. Two non-SITE townships are included.

Purposive sampling does not generally claim to be representative, but by using the above criteria to sample a diversity of townships, and therefore capture an aggregate of the populations sampled, and by sampling almost half of townships within the sample frame (n=8 out of n=17), the results should be considered robust enough to draw meaningful conclusions.

An important point to note is that distinctions between Core Township and pilot townships schools must be contextualised against the fact that all the Core Townships are within Mon State. This state piloted UNICEF’s whole state approach, as described in the opening sections of the report, and therefore has received a greater degree of support to education administration and schools than other states. In addition, Mon State is not considered representative of the other pilot townships or other ethnic regions within Myanmar. Mon is relatively prosperous, accessible, and with relatively stable security and functional governance systems. Non-state education provision is well developed. These conditions are far better than those of the pilot township areas and therefore more advanced school conditions and learning outcomes in Core Townships would be expected.

Ethical considerations
In the data analysis, the issue of confidentiality was important, and data was stored in a manner that did not identify individuals. All transcripts remained under evaluation team control, unnecessary copies were not made, and a good record was made of the location of all copies (in both electronic and other formats).

The fieldwork followed United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines as well as UNICEF Ethics Procedures. While conducting interviews, focus group discussions, and observations, the evaluation team ensured that there was always a minimum of two people present, and informed consent was sought from all respondents, who were assured of the confidentiality of answers. Respondents were free to opt out of participating at any time. Participants were assured that the data collected will remain secure and confidential, and that the names of respondents will be removed before any notes are submitted to UNICEF.

Language was an important consideration in areas with a high concentration of ethnic groups who do not speak Myanmar. The majority of the populations in the areas visited spoke Myanmar, and given that the field team is comprised of Myanmar nationals with strong English skills in speaking and writing,
language was not a serious challenge. However, the team was conscious of this potential challenge, and in one case it was necessary to use an intermediary translator.

3.3 Limitations and mitigation strategies

Sampling
It is recognised that there are some limitations and risks in the methodology adopted. The sample of townships and schools selected is small and could not be considered random. Coupled with this, although a variety of townships and schools were sampled, it must be accepted that some types within the SITE project may be underrepresented.

However, although purposive sampling does not generally claim to be representative and the sample size of eight townships was not large, by sampling a diversity of townships and ensuring that criteria based on effectiveness and equity were applied to site selection mitigated these limitations and ensured credibility. The strategies used enabled the team to capture an aggregate of the populations sampled, which although not representative in a statistical sense, cover a broad enough range of perspectives to be considered robust and meaningful. In addition, although the n-value of sample sites is small, proportionally, almost 50 per cent of the sample frame was included (n=8 out of n=17), which mitigates this seeming limitation.

Reliability of answers
Stakeholders were expecting the arrival of the evaluation team, and some were very well prepared for the visit in ways that are not representative of what normally occurs in schools during SITE activities. In activities such as classroom observations, this would obviously have some impact on what was observed. This factor was mitigated by the extensive combined experience of the evaluation team members, and here the classroom observation checklist asked specifically if, in the opinion of evaluation team member conducting the evaluation, “What impression is there that the lesson observed was a ‘typical’ lesson?” In other situations, some stakeholders, in response to interview questions, were responding with what they thought the evaluation team wanted to hear. Measures were taken to verify responses and ensure credibility, such as following interview protocols that required examination of items such as SITE teacher workbooks, training manuals and Township Office records to corroborate question responses. Additionally, within the context of the interview protocols, additional probing questions were asked to clarify and support credible responses.

Limited SITE project documentation
As discussed later in the results section, significant limitations in the SITE monitoring, evaluation and reporting produced challenges to the evaluation team in efficiently identifying documented and validated information on the state of any changes to the original SITE strategy, significant changes that have been incurred over-time, total resources allocated from all sources, including human resources and budget; and the impact on their classroom teaching practices (the prime focus of SITE activities). Requests for documentation were made to UNICEF, which produced mixed results.

A significant challenge and limitation was the lack of a detailed stand-alone SITE design document, which is a usual expectation. The broad parameters of SITE are embedded within the QBEP design document, which is unsatisfactory. Documents provided by UNICEF that were suggested as SITE design documents included the “MDEF 2 Programme Document – Section 1: Analysis and Rationale,” and two PowerPoint presentations “MDEF 2 Sampling Design,” and “MDEF 2 M&E Presentation 2012.” In the opinion of the evaluation team, these documents fall well short of what would normally be expected of a design document for an activity such as SITE.

In any proper design document the evaluation team would expect to see a standalone document covering a number of SITE-specific elements including, but not limited to, a full justification including an analysis of relevance, a clear set of SITE-specific goals, purpose, expected outputs, specific activities,
inputs, assumptions and risks, a clear targeting of beneficiaries, a clear description of the links to QBEP, a SITE conceptual framework, causal relations between activities and results, specific and sufficiently detailed SITE log frame, and a clear M&E strategy.

In the opinion of the evaluation team, the QBEP design document itself is a poor guide to programme planning and implementation, and this concern was echoed in the QBEP midterm review report. The QBEP document contains very little specific information on the design of SITE. UNICEF officers involved in the SITE programme suggested that the SITE Programme Guidelines be used as the programme design document. Again, this document was considered as insufficient, and is designed more as an implementation and guideline for the in-service activities in schools. In the opinion of the evaluation team, none of the documents presented by UNICEF constitute what could normally be accepted as a design document for this type of activity.

In an attempt to overcome these limitations, broader design documents relating to the overall QBEP programme were reviewed to extrapolate SITE-specific details. Former programme staff were also approached to fill in missing details on programme logic and design.
4. FINDINGS

In the discussion below, the evaluation questions are presented under the four primary questions of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The findings are discussed in detail under the individual lines of inquiry for each evaluation question.

4.1 Relevance

Are the current SITE activities relevant to the learning needs of the head teachers, teachers, staff they target?

**Summary of key findings:**

No specific assessment of teacher needs was conducted to inform the SITE planning process. In the absence of stated teacher needs, evaluation of the relevance of SITE activities to addressing these needs is difficult. Qualitative data collected suggested that teachers generally considered SITE activities to be in line with their needs, and classroom observation data supported this. However, the capacity of teachers to employ SITE methodologies varied. Respondents at multiple levels considered SITE design to be top-down, based on government policies rather than researched teacher needs from the ground level. However, while not clearly a result of direct intention in the planning process, SITE activities are broadly in line with the overall needs of teachers in Myanmar.

Was SITE based on a planning process that enabled teacher needs in selected townships to be identified, prioritised, and then addressed?

Although a baseline assessment of teaching and learning practices in schools receiving QBEP funded training did take place, the lack of planning documents and opaque design process meant that the extent to which the baseline assessment informed SITE design is unclear.

Sources contacted via personal interview, telephone interview, or email, including a range of former SITE personnel, consultants, module developers, project managers, and a former staff member of DEPT, were able to provide various opinions on, and rationales for, the planning process that occurred, but none could point to any documentation supporting these, or any that had informed the SITE planning process. None could point to what could be clearly considered a planning process, based on an assessment and identification of teacher needs that was used to inform the SITE development process.

From what can be determined from telephone interviews and email responses, the content and objectives for the SITE learning materials were decided at a workshop based on draft teacher competencies in place at that time and influenced by the content of the Child Friendly School (CFS) cascade training programme. Participants in the initial Reference Group meeting were able to clarify that in 2011 a group consisting of three DBE members, two from education colleges, an international consultant hired by UNICEF and five members form DEPT was formed in order to develop SITE. A limited trial of the materials using the first few modules over a few weeks and schools was conducted in Nyaung during the module development.

In the opinion of an MOE official, the SITE planning process was top-down, and the point was made that only a feasibility study was undertaken, which is different from an analysis, to explore teacher needs. In order to substantiate this opinion, the same question was put to another respondent (a SITE training materials developer) who reiterated the opinion of a top-down process by stating that they felt the main role of SITE was to implement the Government policy on teaching methodologies based on defined teacher competencies. If this is correct, then the identification and prioritisation of teacher needs would, therefore, be unnecessary; after receiving similar responses from different sources and reviewing the SITE training materials, there appears to be some evidence that this is what happened.
The question “was SITE based on a planning process that enabled teacher needs in selected townships to be identified, prioritised, and then addressed” was also put by the evaluation team to three focus groups of TEOs, head teachers, and cluster heads at SITE locations in Khamti (Sagaing), Kutkai (Shan North) and Thaton (Mon State). The response in two cases was a clear “No,” and in the third a “Yes”. However, in spite of further questioning and probing, the team could not uncover any further information to substantiate the “Yes” response, whereby respondents could not identify or explain any of the planning processes that they claimed had been in place; this therefore puts the reliability of these answers into question.

An examination of training materials and SITE programme approach reveals that it is based on a top-down and policy oriented “one-size-fits-all” model that does not account for teachers’ actual needs. Such uniformity does not allow for diversity or inclusion. This approach, therefore, is in keeping with the findings above where the SITE planning and implementation do not address varying and identified teacher needs.

Are SITE activities and outputs in line with the stated learning needs of target populations?

From the results of the previous line of inquiry above, it appears that SITE activities were not designed along identified and stated needs of target populations. The approach appears to have been “one-size-fits-all” based on defined teacher competencies driven by broad Government policy and defined by experts outside of the classroom environment.

Responses from a range of different sources were assessed, including from former SITE personnel, consultants, module developers, and project managers. Again, responses to this line of enquiry were mixed. Responses from all respondent types emphasised a top-down approach and included, for example, that, “the SITE programme was a pilot developed to support implementation of MOE policy,” and that the, “content of the Effective Teaching and Learning module was based on the MOE draft teacher competencies of the time... These draft competencies were developed by MOE teacher training personnel based on their long experience in teacher training and through researching competency frameworks from other countries.” This does not indicate the inclusion of actual teacher needs as identified by the target populations themselves.

Discussions with eight SITE teacher focus groups were held to investigate whether the SITE activities met their needs as classroom teachers, and participants were asked to provide examples of how this had been done. All groups responded positively and the conclusions were that SITE activities had met their needs; they were all able to provide evaluators with examples to support this. These responses were cross-checked with classroom observation data collected by the evaluation team, which supported the idea that activities were meeting teacher needs and demonstrated that teachers did in fact have the capacity to use SITE student-centred methodologies. This was particularly true in the classes observed in Khamti (Sagaing) where the observation scored 43 out of a possible 55, and overall, observations suggested positive behaviours regarding involvement of students in class and feedback given to students.

In response to questioning on ways to improve SITE to help teachers become more effective in the classroom, one group suggested that SITE approaches require moveable furniture (not available in many classrooms), another group that more methodologies were required to handle large class sizes, and another cited the need for more instruction on making teaching aids. When groups were asked to identify challenges when engaging in SITE activities, the issue of large class sizes was raised again, plus the difficulty of completing student focussed activities within the allocated class times. These methodologies are in fact covered in the SITE training materials, and therefore, these responses suggest that perhaps these were either not fully understood, or more variety in these methodologies is required to meet varying classroom challenges. Responses from some teachers confirmed the need for more
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methodologies in these areas, and some teacher and TEO groups indicated difficulties in understanding some of the training materials.

An apparent contradiction is that from the classroom teacher observations, focus group discussions, and general school walk-arounds by the evaluation team, it appears that the general teacher perception of student-centred approaches is that classrooms must be noisy including, for example, a lot of student choral responses and animated teacher-talk. On the other hand, these same teachers complained of noise disturbances from adjacent classrooms.

Collectively, these results indicate that teachers have mastered to some extent the prescribed SITE methodologies, but that these are either not fully in line with their particular teaching environments and needs, or that they lack the capacity, flexibility or authority to modify and adapt methodologies to suit their particular needs. In this, a top-down culture is seen throughout the education system, even within the school level.

Overall, given the lack of specific needs analysis for SITE, there are no stated needs against which to assess relevance of SITE activities. However, there are gaps outlined in the CCA baseline study and comparison of these gaps against SITE activities on a broader systemic level, beyond the level of individual teachers, provides another means to assess relevance. The baseline study found that primary school teachers in Myanmar relied on pedagogies based on rote and recitation, and that they required assistance in moving away from these approaches to more learner-centred pedagogies involving better use of group work and alternative classroom interaction. The findings outlined several key lessons that would be important to address in order to improve pedagogical practices and bridge the gap in learner-centred pedagogies. Some of the key lessons are listed as follows:

- Sustained professional development programmes are needed, rather than one-off courses;
- Teachers need to work together at the school level to learn from one another through mentoring and peer coaching;
- The school, through whole school training and school-based activities, is the most effective level of intervention to improve the quality of teaching and learning as it takes into consideration the contextual realities in which teachers work;
- Transforming teacher beliefs, knowledge, understandings, skills and commitments in their individual and shared responsibilities is central to professional development;
- Teacher education needs to respond the realities of the circumstances of the broader national education system and ensure that training aligns to the policy environments, cultural mores, and school conditions of the country; and
- Teachers ingrained ideas about the student-teacher relationship and nature of teaching and learning can be a barrier in changes to pedagogic practices.

These findings closely mirror those of the enhanced desk review and the study’s conclusions determine that in order to bring about changes to teaching and learning, school-based teacher development programmes need to help teachers, “reflect on their classroom discourse practices as a way of enhancing expert thinking and problem solving so as to bridge the gap between theories and actual classroom practice.”39 Working at the school and cluster level was recommended as an effective way of providing support and development to teachers as well as ensure that teacher education is a part of a broader capacity development strategy. Addressing the needs of mentors and coaches was also necessary.

It appears that these findings were strong influences in the design and rationale for SITE activities, to the extent that all the above elements are described in the QBEP design document and linked annexes.

However, a clear strategy and description of how SITE activities were planned is still missing from the project documents.

The SITE Guidelines and theory of change, which both appear to have been developed mid-way through the programme rather than at its inception, provide indications of activities and intentions. Their retrospective nature is problematic as it is difficult to verify that these were indeed the objectives and activities intended at the start of the programme. Both the Guidelines and theory of change evidence elements of the baseline findings in terms of recognising:

- The need for sustained professional development;
- The importance of self-assessment and self-reflection to improve pedagogic skills;
- The relevance of mentoring and coaching, and the provision of training to develop those skills amongst mentors and coaches; and
- The utility of cluster-based support and activities.

Two stated tasks for QBEP were to, "build the capacity of head teachers, school cluster heads and TEOs/Assistant TEOs in ‘instructional leadership’ and to strengthen the embryonic school cluster system as a means of institutionalising a teacher support system" as part of the means to support teachers and their continuing professional development. The activities, logic, and stated tasks all contain recognisable concepts from the baseline study and feed into the concept of individualisation through continuing professional development suggested by the report.

Therefore, in terms of stated activities and aims, although these activities and tasks do not necessarily align with the stated needs of teachers, there is evidence that activities are grounded in response to broader needs identified in the CCA baseline report. Activities should therefore be considered broadly relevant and in line with teacher needs.

**To what degree is SITE coordinated as a whole school approach?**

A co-ordinated whole school approach is stated as a component of QBEP activities. Within the QBEP design, ‘whole school’ and ‘whole township’ approaches were adopted whereby the capacity needs of various management levels (township, cluster, and school) were addressed through training in instructional leadership, school management and school improvement, planning skills and information systems. These inputs were designed to provide a strengthened institutional environment in which teachers could operate more effectively.

However, the programme design documents for QBEP do not provide a clear view of how these whole school initiatives were to be implemented. Similarly, QBEP annual reports do not provide a clear sense of how various packages are integrated, and it was therefore not possible to clearly determine if SITE was coordinated as a whole school approach from available documentation.

Due to the incomplete picture provided by the literature, the responses of TEOs, head teachers and cluster heads were important to investigate this question more thoroughly. Focus group interviews with these respondent types, across three townships implementing SITE, included lines of enquiry as to whether SITE was coordinated as a whole school approach. Across the three groups asked, two did not understand the whole school concept, and the third was more definitive in stating that this was not the case. These responses indicate that the likelihood of SITE being coordinated in such a manner is low.

As outlined in the enhanced desk review, a crucial element and indicator of whole school approaches is the involvement of parents and parent teacher associations (PTA) in school activities. Teacher focus

---

41 Hardman, F. CCA Baseline Study, 2012, p. 16.
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Groups were asked if there was an active PTA in their school and if these were helpful in their role as a classroom teacher. Seven out of the eight teacher groups interviewed indicated that PTAs were active in their schools and that they were of some assistance to their role as classroom teacher. N=4 schools presented visible evidence of parental involvement in helping or volunteering around the school; however, half (n=2) were the non-SITE comparison schools, suggesting that parental involvement is not necessarily related to the influence of the QBEP whole school approach.

To triangulate findings further, data gathered from focus group interviews conducted with five PTAs in SITE schools were analysed. Across all groups PTA activities were generally restricted to school renovations, repairs, and fundraising. Responses were mixed on who attends meetings, with only two schools indicating that meetings were actually attended by parents, and all responded that apart from the PTA, parents were generally not very active in schools. Responses from the PTA members suggested that they are good barometers of classroom changes, with four PTAs citing observable changes in teaching/learning as a result of SITE activities.

Responses from the PTA groups indicated that they faced a number of challenges including, for example, fund raising, and parent distrust on how funds are allocated. There also did not appear to be any consistency across PTAs on how meetings and their general affairs were conducted. The general impression the evaluation team gained during these meetings was that PTA committee members were not well equipped to deal with these sorts of challenges.

In summary, the results did not show any significant differences between the operation and challenges faced by PTAs in SITE schools and non-SITE schools. This suggests that PTA capacity building may not have been an actioned focus of QBEP capacity building, and none alluded to having received any capacity building as a result of QBEP activities. Given the central importance of parental involvement in schools as part of whole school approaches, while not conclusive, the results suggest that SITE activities were not coordinated as a whole school approach in QBEP schools, which may also be indicative of broader levels of unclear whole school policy.

**How supportive are the SITE learner-centric pedagogies of the local/national examination system?**

The 2012 CCA baseline study found that teacher instruction was highly influenced by the dominance of end-of-unit tests and examinations; this exerted pressure on teachers to employ transmission forms of teaching that focus on memorisation and factual recall. This study found that teachers needed to supplement such testing norms with alternative means of assessment and that teachers require a more thorough understanding of competency-based assessments.

In investigating whether SITE practices are helpful for student learning, including whether or not they are supportive of students in terms of passing tests and examinations, the evaluation team found that across the teacher focus groups, responses to this question were clearly divided by the category of school. Teachers in the four comparison schools not exposed to SITE but exposed to CCA training found that student-centred approaches were generally conducive and helpful to student learning; however, they cited challenges in completing the crowded curriculum, and that most teachers adopted a mix of student-centred and teacher-centred approaches in preparing students for examinations. Similar responses came from teachers in SITE schools in Mon State, who also had received CCA training.

However, in stark contrast, teachers in SITE schools in pilot townships and who had not undergone CCA training were evasive in answering this question, and when pushed, indicated that SITE supported student learning through improving “thinking skills”. That said, they were unable to elaborate on this answer in a way that demonstrated genuine understanding of what such skills actually entailed or their importance. It is notable that these schools, while having received SITE training, had not received CCA
training. The findings suggest that there was a better understanding of the impact of student-centred approaches on learning amongst those who had received supplementary training prior to SITE training.

In responses from the four focus groups for TEOs, head teacher and cluster heads, the overall consensus was that the SITE learner-centric pedagogies were not supportive of the examination system, which largely rewards rote memorisation, and that teachers generally resorted to teacher-centred approaches to prepare students for examinations. This finding is supported by the analysis of classroom data by the University of York, which found that teachers were still orienting classes toward chapter tests and continuing the emphasis on passive learning through textbooks. Notable from the focus groups was one case; however, where members suggested that SITE was in fact having an impact on improving the quality of examination questions due to inclusion of more questions focussing on student thinking skills.

### 4.2 Efficiency

**Do the current SITE activities provide an efficient model for implementing in-service teacher training?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of key findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SITE-specific success indicator (number of SITE trained teachers) of 1,000 teachers per year was met and exceeded within target timeframe. Trend analysis by the University of York suggests that teachers had increased their use of improved teaching practices, but does not support increased proportion of teachers using these, as per target outcome in the QBEP log frame. SITE objectives in terms of implementation of training, as stated in the QBEP log frame and revised work plan, have been achieved, and in a timely manner. However, inconsistent QBEP reporting challenged the evaluation of progress towards planned results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have the stated SITE objectives been completed in a timely manner?**

The prime objective of SITE is strengthening teacher performance and increasing student-learning outcomes. The QBEP annual reports for 2012, 2013 and 2014 were examined to gauge if SITE objectives have been completed in a timely manner.

A baseline study on classroom practices in 229 primary schools was developed to measure improved teaching methods. Analysis of these results showed a high prevalence in schools of teacher-centred methodologies, with 80 per cent of lessons observed showing teacher-directed lessons and with only 4 per cent being student-centred. It was reported that this study was to be repeated in 2015 to confirm changes in teaching practices as a result of QBEP-supported interventions. The log frame indicator of Output 2 (per original design, now Outcome 3 per revised hierarchy) was defined as “% of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria.” The target for 2015/16 was “35 per cent of sampled teachers.”

The 2012 baseline study set out 32 observable practices covering teaching and learning behaviours, teacher approaches to questioning, teacher feedback and follow up to questions and teacher management of the class. The frequency of the 32 observable practices were rated on a 4-point scale whereby 1 = never observed; 2 = rarely observed (i.e., once or twice); 3 = occasionally observed (i.e., 4 or 5 time); 4 = consistently observed. Baseline findings showed that 50 per cent (n=16) of these practices were ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ observed in over 90 per cent of the lessons.

---


43 Note that this log frame refers to the overall QBEP log frame designed in 2012. No indication was given that this log frame had changed as a result of the midterm review, therefore it is assumed that these indicators remain the same.
CSC data from 2011 to 2014 was analysed by the University of York in 2015 and the results were published in a 2016 report. Analysis indicates that on average, 37.8 per cent of teachers had increased their use of the 32 teaching and learning behaviours, and this was attributed to QBEP teacher education intervention. Little change was observed in teachers’ use of paired or group work, peer tutoring, using open questions, or getting students to answer questions, suggesting that interactive teaching approaches still require improvement. However, there was also evidence of improved gender participation, effective student management and chalkboard usage, as well as movement around the classroom to interact with individual students.44

The measurement provided by the trend analysis is one of improvement rather than an actual proportion of teachers using improved methods. In this sense, the improvement of 37.8 per cent indicates progress toward achieving this indicator but does not show whether or not the required 35 per cent of teachers has been met. It should also be noted that this indicator is not specific to SITE and also includes the influence of the CFS/LEP trainings.

The specific indicator of SITE success within the overall QBEP log frame was for 1,000 teachers to have completed SITE training per year, leading to a cumulative total of 4,000 teachers receiving training by 2015/16. The QBEP 2013 annual report indicates that SITE surpassed the 2013 annual target of 1,000 teachers with nearly 1,700 teachers participating. The QBEP 2014 annual report indicated that 5,739 teachers were enrolled in SITE.

According to data provided by UNICEF, from 2012 until the time of the evaluation, a total of n=14,420 trainees had enrolled in SITE, of whom 43.4 per cent (n=6,258) had completed the training by passing the written test at the time of the revised evaluation report. The table below outlines the progress and number of beneficiaries reached to date.46 These figures show that SITE has already exceeded the 2015/16 target.

Table 5: Number of SITE beneficiaries reached by township, number of enrollees, and number of completed trainees (2012-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Project areas (Township)</th>
<th>Number of trainees enrolled</th>
<th>Number of trainees completed (passed written test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Kutkai, Namsam (S), Loilem Thabeikkyin</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>Kutkai, Namsam (S), Loilem Thabeikkyin</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Pinlebu, Khanti, Pauk 10 Mon</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>4,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>Pinlebu, Khanti, Pauk 10 Mon 7 Kayah</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>Not available yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,420</td>
<td>6,258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An updated work plan for each revised Outcome was included in the 2014 annual report and Joint Performance Improvement Plan (JPIP). This plan reflected the revisions to be made to the final phase of QBEP following the recommendations of the midterm review and in recognition of changes within the overall Myanmar operating context. The revised work plan for Outcome/Objective 3 states that,

45 Figures were provided through email correspondence meaning that evaluators could not verify the source or reliability of the data.
46 Data from UNICEF correspondence, not from a progress report.
under the section on improved teacher performance, SITE training was to be conducted in all Mon Townships as well as pilot Townships in Sagaing and Magwe Divisions. In addition, two new SITE modules were to be developed and field tested. The data provided by UNICEF suggests that trainings in all thirteen intended townships were carried out. The development of two new SITE modules was also completed.

These findings indicate that the SITE objectives, as stated in the QBEP log frame and revised work plan have been achieved, and in a timely manner. In terms of the objectives set out in the SITE Guidelines, it is less easy to come to a conclusive statement as these objectives were not clearly defined in the first place. However, taking a loose interpretation of the combined objectives as improved pedagogical skills and better teaching habits, the evidence from the University of York findings suggests that these too have been achieved.

**Have monitoring and reporting tools been used effectively to capture progress and results, and have they allowed for feedback loops on the model?**

The SITE Guidelines require that all teachers do self-assessment using the checklist provided, and self-assessments after each module. On completion of the programme, teachers must do self-assessment again to determine what they have learned from the programme. These checklist processes are to be arranged by townships, school clusters, and schools. The Guidelines define the assessors as the headmaster at school level, heads of school cluster at school cluster level, and township education officer or deputy township education officer or assistant township education officer. The Guidelines further stipulate that the headmaster should assess every teacher before, during, and after studying the training materials. This process was described in the Guidelines as “a tool for observing the progress and effect of the programme.” Annually, the township level Supervising Committee is required to forward the checklists of individual teachers and minutes of school cluster meetings to the respective education college. Additionally, there is in place a formal system for SITE teacher evaluation and certification, which includes a “performance test” based on the module studies and evaluations and a written test.

From cross-referencing responses from three focus group meetings including TEOs, head teachers and cluster heads of SITE activities, and examination of records, there were indications that what the evaluation team considered to be robust peer assessment was not occurring, as evidenced by the lack of documentation as outlined in the SITE Guidelines. In one group, peer assessment in the form of teacher-formed study groups was occurring per the Guidelines. Noted were variations in how records were processed, and this was confirmed in the teacher focus group Discussions outlined below. In two of these townships, respondents indicated that high levels of teacher transfers presented a challenge in maintaining the required M&E.

Supporting these findings was evidence from focus group meetings with teachers in ten SITE schools that revealed a number of inconsistencies in peer assessments and how records were processed. Generally, responses indicated that the peer assessment protocols were not rigorously followed; these findings were predominantly from schools in the seven pilot townships. In one school, oversight of these processes was assigned to a Junior Teacher who did not participate in SITE and had not attended the training. In another, there was some adherence to the required practices, but teachers were unable to elaborate on how these were used or how they impacted on their classroom teaching practices.

In SITE schools in Mon State there appeared to be more rigour in these processes, but with variations in reporting. In one school the peer assessment occurred among teachers but was not submitted to the head teacher, in two other schools the checklists were retained by the head teacher but not submitted to the TEO. In only one school did the processes follow the SITE Guidelines where assessments were submitted to the TEO. To what extent, and whether or not at all, the more impressive rigour of peer
assessment in these schools is attributable to the whole state approach or the contextual uniqueness of Mon State, as outlined in the opening sections, is not distinguishable; however, it is likely that both elements will have overall contributed to a more conducive environment for good administrative practice between schools and TEOs.

The issue of M&E tools being used effectively to capture progress and results to provide feedback loops was raised in a meeting with DBE and DTET on 30 October 2015. DBE highlighted the importance of systematic monitoring of SITE, which they felt was currently missing, in addition to a reported lack of an effective feedback loop. Further discussion revealed that since decentralisation, there has been an overall lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities within the MOE and its subnational departments, and this was raised as being particularly the case in the areas of M&E. TEOs and their assistants are meant to be responsible for monitoring at the State level; however, uncertainty amongst these officials of their expected roles is unclear. Consequently, rigorous M&E for SITE, amongst other areas, is not being conducted. DBE responses also indicated that while the central government is happy to push this responsibility to the State level they have not provided sufficient guidelines or coordination for subnational departments to carry out their monitoring duties well.

The results therefore indicate that SITE monitoring and reporting tools have not been used effectively to capture progress and results, and there are not in place any effective feedback loops.

4.3 Effectiveness

Based on the enhanced desk review criteria identified, is SITE an effective model for delivering in-service training to trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools?

Summary of key findings:

The CRC trend analysis report suggests that teacher performance and student learning outcome indicators have improved coinciding with SITE timeframe. Evaluation school observation data obtained suggests that, while learning indicators in SITE schools were improved in comparison with 2012 QBEP baseline data, non-SITE comparison schools actually showed better practices. However, the above CRC results are considered more comprehensive. Peer-to-peer assessment and cluster group meetings were found to be key facilitating factors and respondents demonstrated enthusiasm for these aspects of SITE. SITE was picked up by schools and teachers with relative ease, and SITE training materials were frequently observed to be in use. The SITE model did not function well where transfer or promotion of trained teachers out of schools was an issue. SITE learner-centric pedagogies were not supportive of existing examination systems due to pressure to train students to pass exams through traditional teacher-centric approaches. SITE design and activities were not found to be discriminatory in terms of exclusion based on gender, disability or ethnicity; however, neither were they found to explicitly promote inclusivity or equity.

What is the level of progress toward planned programme results?

As reported above, the QBEP log frame documentation sets SITE timelines for planned programme results (the strengthening of teacher performance and increasing student-learning outcomes) and recent data\(^{47}\) has evidenced that these milestone indicators have been achieved. However, at a focus group discussion with an MDEF partner held on 27 November 2015, a lack of SITE specific reporting was identified as a major frustration on the part of the donors. The annual QBEP

\(^{47}\) The CRC Trend Analysis Report from the University of York was only released after submission of the first draft of the SITE Evaluation Report.
reports were criticised as not being helpful, only containing updates on SITE spending and activities without any proper assessment on the programme quality, impact, or effectiveness. This meant that donors were unable to assess the progress of SITE. It was noted that informal and anecdotal reports were reaching donors that highlighted positive feedback on SITE, in terms of its popularity among teachers and influence in improvements in the classroom; however, without any verifiable reports, this remained hearsay only and was a lost opportunity to promote progress and improve perceptions of programme effectiveness.

Taking a broader, qualitative perspective of progress towards planned programme results, comparisons can be made between the evaluation team classroom observation data and QBEP baseline data. Results reported in the QBEP 2012 annual report of the baseline on classroom practices in 229 primary schools reported a high prevalence in schools of teacher-centred methodologies, with 80 per cent of lessons observed showing teacher-directed lessons and with only 4 per cent being student-centred. The SITE evaluation school observation data collected in November 2015, while not a rigorous study on teacher performance and lacking control data, does indicate some strengthening of teacher classroom performance compared to the QBEP 2012 baseline data.

An 11-point classroom teaching practice observation scale was used, where the lowest score would be 11 and highest 55. The approach was for the evaluator to observe a randomly selected classroom for at least 15-20 minutes without disturbing or distracting the teacher and students. Following the observation, the evaluator was required to make an assessment on how or if students reacted to their presence in the classroom. Importantly, the assessor was also required to comment on if they felt that the lesson observed was a "typical" lesson, and give reasons. The mean score across all eight classroom observed was 33. The seven SITE classrooms scored an average of 31, whereas the two comparison schools mean score was 41.

The average scores for each indicator are presented below; they show that in general, the non-SITE comparison schools, which were in Kyauk Se Township in Mandalay Division, were found to have demonstrated better practices. This was especially the case in terms of use of questions by teacher, whereby the highest score of 5 was awarded when teachers asked student questions to concept check and ensure their understanding; the medium score of 3 was awarded where teachers were observed to ask questions to check student understanding, but did not follow up with a response. Non-SITE schools were also found to be noticeably better at producing well-structured and clear lesson plans that were followed either throughout or most of the lesson (scores of 4 to 5) as opposed to other SITE schools scoring an average of just under 2, where teachers had incomplete lesson plans that they did not follow. For more details on the scoring system, please refer to the checklist listed in Annex 7.
While the above findings point to better performance among the non-SITE comparison schools, these are indicative only and the more comprehensive findings from the CSC trend analysis provide evidence of strengthened teacher classroom performance in QBEP trained schools. These findings suggest that although there is room for further improvement, there has been gradual improvement of teachers’ use of effective teaching behaviours, which are starting to have an impact on classroom processes. The CSC findings show that QBEP-trained teachers are displaying more participatory, interactive and inclusive teaching methods in the classroom, and more students are reporting that they are enjoying school. The only stated SITE result within programme documents is the relatively high level output of improved teacher performance leading to increased number of children reached and learning in QBEP areas; the CSC findings have positive implications in terms of progress toward these results.

It should be noted that CCA training is being undertaken on a national scale and information provided by a DBE official indicated that CCA training had already covered 258 out of 330 towns in Myanmar. In response to the question “Why is SITE needed if CCA has already been provided?” the response from the DBE was that SITE is a more comprehensive in-service teacher development activity, not only covering classroom methodologies but including “education psychology, reflective thinking skills, self-assessment methodology and self-capacity development.” CCA involves only nine days training, whereas SITE runs over a six-month period.

These comments were supported by responses from SITE teacher and TEO focus group discussions when asked about linkages between the SITE and CCA activities. Responses indicated that teachers saw linkages between SITE and CCA in terms of their personal professional development. SITE was seen as adding more depth to what had been in covered in CCA and examples provided by teachers were open-ended and closed questions, and a deeper understanding of children and their learning. Another aspect highlighted in these discussions was that SITE encouraged and cemented relationships and communication between teachers, which was not an element of CCA activities.

---

48 University of York, Institute for Effective Education, Final Report Trend Analysis of Comprehensive School Checklist, 2016, p. 34.
The limited classroom observation data collected by the evaluation team is substantiated by the findings from the CSC trend analysis, as well as other points raised in discussions with teachers and TEOs, in suggesting that progress has been made in understanding teaching/learning process and methodologies. In addition, there appears to be appreciation of SITE in providing detailed and comprehensive training, and this is perceived as being more substantial than, although still complementary to, the CCA training funded by JICA.

What were the key factors that facilitated or hindered progress toward planned results?

Key factors hindering progress: Across the focus group discussions with TEOs, head teachers, cluster heads, two of the three groups indicated that the most significant factor hindering SITE activities were transfers and promotions that produced gaps in the number of head teachers and SITE teachers in any one school. Without a critical mass of SITE teachers in a school the model does not function well, and respondents reported that teachers lose motivation to continue under these conditions. Transfers of SITE head teachers was said to produce leadership gaps, especially for new incoming teachers. These factors were particularly noticeable in the SITE schools in pilot townships outside Mon State, and where significant numbers of daily wage teachers are employed.

In some of the teacher focus group discussions there were noticeable gaps as a result of teacher and head teacher transfers, with for example non-SITE trained teachers taking on mentoring roles normally assigned to head teachers. From the focus group discussions there was less evidence of this occurring among the permanent qualified teachers in the SITE schools within Mon State; however on this small sample this may not be representative of the teacher population as a whole. Additionally, here it must be kept in mind that schools in Mon State are under the whole state approach; therefore, if transfers are made within the state new teachers coming into a school would probably be SITE trained, and thus gaps less likely to occur.

Generally, teachers value the cluster meetings, which are an integral component of SITE, and they attend in their own time and cost. Where transportation to these cluster meetings is easy, meetings were said to be more frequent, but diminished in frequency if travel challenges existed. Any reduction in cluster meetings could be expected to have an impact on the effectiveness of SITE activities, and thus hinder progress and results as discussed below.

One factor that was very noticeable to the evaluation team were the significant differences in openness, and the capacity of teachers to discuss classroom-teaching practices, and SITE generally. Teachers in SITE schools in pilot townships were generally evasive in answering questions, and conceptually had difficulties in understanding and confidently responding to focus group questions. In these schools, as discussed above, peer assessment protocols were not rigorously followed and the evaluation team did not get a sense of very robust participation in cluster group meetings. In contrast, the SITE teachers from schools in Mon State displayed far more confident and open responses to focus group discussion questioning, and the evaluation team had a sense from teachers that cluster meetings embraced a number of important issues in classroom teaching that were vigorously discussed and analysed. However, this may also have been due to the fact that these teachers were more qualified and had previously undertaken CCA training, and possibly also due to the whole state environment which has been found to facilitate interactions between schools and local government.

For the teachers in the pilot township SITE schools, the apparent lack of participation in rigorous peer assessment processes and vigorous engagement in cluster meeting discussions could be expected to have an impact on their confidence in SITE approaches, and capacity to confidently discuss publically aspects of teaching and learning. This therefore could be expected to impact on the effectiveness of SITE activities.
As discussed above and through triangulating the responses from multiple sources, the general consensus among teachers and TEOs was that the SITE learner centric pedagogies were not supportive of the examination system, and that the pressure on students and schools to perform well in exams, especially in the latter years of primary school, would be a factor hindering SITE progress. For less experienced teachers this produced a dilemma. On the one hand they realised the benefits of student-centred approaches, however most reverted to teacher-centred approaches under exam pressure. With more experienced teachers, responses indicated that they had the capacity to use a mix of teacher-centred and student-centred approaches based on their analysis of lesson learning objectives. Another perspective from a TEO officer was that teachers were not actually weak in student-centred teacher practices, but with the pressure from students, parents and schools to perform well in examinations they reverted to teacher-centred approaches that were often seen to be better matched to the rote-learning expectations of the examination system.

Results from the focus group discussions with TEOs, head teachers and cluster heads were cross-referenced, and in general showed that none were able to clearly articulate the overall concept and rationale of SITE. Some could simply not respond and in one case talked about the benefits of SITE and in another they saw it as a means of increasing teacher qualifications. Similarly, the teacher focus group discussions generally saw difficulties in teachers being able to clearly articulate influences outside of teacher training that can influence teaching effectiveness, with only three out the eight teacher groups being able to answer this question convincingly. Influences outside of teaching identified by teachers included teacher attitude towards teaching, parental support and attitude towards schooling. Similarly, in identifying any indirect consequences of SITE, only two teacher groups responded to this question convincingly. These results together suggest that SITE operates in an environment where there is not a good understanding of a clear and focussed conceptual framework linking all components of the SITE programme to the broader school environment and purpose of in-service training. Contemporary approaches to teacher in-service training, as outlined in the enhanced desk review, recognise these elements as being important enabling factors in teacher professional development, and if not present, could be expected to hinder progress toward the desired outcomes of SITE.

Key factors facilitating progress: Emerging from focus group discussions with teachers, as discussed above, was that the peer-to-peer assessment and cluster group meetings were considered to be a key factor in facilitating progress in SITE outcomes. Where they operated effectively, teachers talked about these activities enthusiastically. As one teacher explained, where once she was fearful of others observing her teaching, she now welcomes feedback plus the opportunity to observe others. It was apparent from some of the discussions with teachers that cluster group meetings provided opportunity for very robust discussions on teaching practices, which sometimes produced vigorous debate, and the opportunity for more experienced teachers, head teachers and TEO staff to contribute ideas. In one case, a teacher expressed some frustration that after long debate some discussions could not be resolved, however from an in-service teacher training perspective the evaluation team saw this type of robust debate about teaching practices as a very positive outcome, even if issues are not immediately resolved.

In discussions with teachers, TEOs, head teachers and cluster heads, it was clear that at the school level the relative ease with which SITE can be introduced into schools and picked up by teachers is a key factor in facilitating success, and this is evidenced by the enthusiasm in which teachers have embraced SITE as discussed in other sections of the report. A good indicator of the ease at which SITE was picked up by teachers was that in all school visits where focus group discussions were held with teachers, an inspection was made of the SITE training materials in the possession of teachers. Of eight schools, six showed that the training materials were being very well utilised by teachers with signs of wear and
Putting aside any discussion of training material content and structure, the fact that teachers were provided with common training materials and that these were observed by the evaluation team to be well utilised must be considered as a key factor facilitating progress towards SITE progress. The evaluation team observations showed that the SITE training materials were kept at schools and were generally on-hand to teachers. Inspections of teacher desks, school offices and libraries (where they existed) indicated that the SITE training materials were the only teacher training resources readily available to under qualified daily wage permanent qualified teachers, again a very powerful factor in facilitating progress.

From the findings of the CSC data, it appears that working at the cluster level is evidenced as ensuring teacher education is part of broader capacity development strategies that support all actors in the education system. Although this link was not clearly articulated in the theory of change, it appears that by encouraging TEOs and school cluster heads to work together, they have been better able to support head teachers and teachers at the school level.

In a broader perspective, the enthusiasm of teachers for SITE and their willingness to engage in these activities unrewarded in their own time, coupled with the obvious support for the programme at senior Government levels are also important facilitators of progress towards planned results.

**What, if any, have been the unintended consequences of SITE, particularly on teaching methods and school performance?**

This question was addressed to focus discussion groups of TEOs, head teachers, cluster heads and teachers. Conceptually for all groups, this was a very difficult question for all groups, with very limited meaningful responses.

Across the three SITE areas outside of QBEP, the TEO, head teacher and cluster head focus discussion groups identified unintended consequences as an increased interest from parents in schooling as a result of changes in teaching styles; lack of support from parents due to perceived threats to examination results; and complaints from teachers regarding the extra workload associated with SITE and requests to transfer away from SITE schools.

Of the eight teacher focus group discussions, five groups could not provide a response to this question. One group responded that there were not any unintended consequences; another that the level of rote learning was reduced; and one group indicated an increased level of interest from parents as a result of changes in teaching styles.

Across all groups, the most consistent theme was an increased interest in schooling as a result of SITE activities. This theme was echoed in parent and PTA focus group members who were well aware of classroom changes as a result of SITE activities.

From the evaluators’ perspective, the most striking unintended consequences of SITE were the very high levels of teacher enthusiasm for the SITE approach and desire to improve teaching practices. Coupled with this level of enthusiasm was the strong commitment from TEOs and the high level of ownership by MOE. Combined, these provide a very good environment for effective in-service teacher development.

Although this was not identified through evaluation fieldwork, secondary sources have highlighted an implicit and unintended impact of SITE training on peacebuilding and roles of teachers as facilitators of
social cohesion within Myanmar. A UNICEF study on teacher synthesis and social cohesion found that teachers undertaking SITE training had identified elements of the course content that they found relevant to the interpersonal and communication skills required for peacebuilding within their communities. The SITE emphasis on approaches that avoid discrimination, avoid corporal punishment, and aims to promote problem solving techniques such as discussion were all found to be positive behaviours that led to teachers becoming implicit actors within peacebuilding in conflict areas.

To what degree have SITE activities been inclusive and equitable?
The evaluation scope and TOR do not provide for a detailed analysis of equity, gender, and human rights issues. The focus is on the identification only of any inclusivity and equity issues in SITE classrooms, and among SITE participants. The Myanmar evaluation team members were provided with an inclusivity and equity issues checklist for all school visits, which was submitted as a summary at the end of the fieldwork. Their findings are provided below and supplemented with data from the CSC trend analysis and other relevant secondary sources.

**Gender equity in classrooms:** There was little visible evidence of gender inequity within classrooms. Eight classroom teaching sessions were observed using a scored checklist of classroom composition, teaching, and learning behaviours. One of the observation criteria was to note how boys and girls were seated, with the highest score of 3 for classrooms where boys and girls sat together with no obvious gender separation, a middle score of 2 for classrooms where boys and girls sat together but with some grouping by gender, and the lowest score of 1, for classrooms clearly separated by gender.

N=5 out of the total observed classrooms scored the highest level of 3, while only n=1 classroom in Khamti scored 1; this was a monastic school where the classroom was clearly separated by gender, which is not unexpected, given religious gender norms in Myanmar. There was no observable difference between SITE and non-SITE classrooms in this respect and it is unlikely that QBEP interventions would have impacted this mixed gender seating.

However, evidence from CSC data suggests that QBEP trained teachers have contributed toward more equitable gender practice in the classroom through demonstrably improved behaviours regarding gender participation and student-teacher interaction. Since 2011, equal gender participation showed a 51 per cent improvement, teachers calling upon both boys and girls had improved by 50 per cent, and equal amounts of feedback given to girls and boys had improved by 49 per cent.

In spite of the positive findings surrounding gender equity in the classroom, it should be noted that the classroom observation indicators show improvement only; this does not necessarily provide an indication of actual levels of gender inequality, which, given broader trends of social norms, are likely to be widespread but unrecognised. The recommendations within the CSC trend analysis report suggest that further training on gender sensitive interactive approaches be emphasised in QBEP teacher training. This message is also echoed by a report on gender norms in Myanmar by the Gender Equality Network, which specifically recommends that in-service teachers and community teachers are given the chance to discuss and reflect on gender norms, including deeply held norms at a personal level as well as within school textbooks, in order to provide practical tools to address gender equality in schools.

In line with trends across Myanmar, almost all teachers encountered in SITE and non-SITE schools were women while head teachers were mainly men. Gender ratios among the focus groups are summarised

---

as follows: teachers focus groups (93 per cent female); across the TEO, head teacher, and cluster head focus discussion groups (63 per cent male); the PTA focus groups (90 per cent male); and parent focus groups (75 per cent female). From this data it could be argued that there are gender imbalances in decision-making groups such as the PTA’s and at the TEO, head teacher and cluster head level.

This is typical of the education sector in Myanmar, which, in spite of the high numbers of women working in education, continues to be under-represented in terms of women in positions of leadership. At the school level, therefore, while SITE activities do not appear to be actively discriminating against women nor deliberately contributing to inequity, neither do they appear to be actively promoting positive attitudes towards women and girls or facilitating opportunities or environments for women in leadership.

**Disability inclusiveness:** Discussions with teachers revealed that there were disabled students in some of the schools visited, however none were directly observed by the evaluation team during classroom observations. Student disabilities highlighted by teachers included poor eyesight, polio, intellectual disability, and other physical disabilities. Discussions with teachers concluded that there was no evidence of active discrimination against disabled students in schools; however, neither was there evidence of proactive attempts at improving inclusion of disabled children within the classroom and broader school environment. Wheelchair ramp access was only observed in one school and findings from the CSC trend analysis suggest that slow progress has been made in teachers including students with special education needs, among whom are included children with disabilities. Since 2011 some improvement has been made, but at 37 per cent, there is scope for SITE and other QBEP teacher training to promote better practice in this regard.

The midterm review also found that although QBEP focuses on disability and gender in the discussions regarding design and rationale of the differing QBEP components, there are no disaggregated indicators for either variable in the log frame. The midterm review did not find evidence of QBEP realising its stated intention of raising awareness of issues relating to disability nor had it put into place capacity or structures that would allow for the inclusion of disabled children. Although this was a broad level comment on QBEP activities, this finding appears true at the activity level too and this is further evidence that improvement is needed to make SITE trainings more equitable and inclusive for students.

**Ethnicity:** From the classrooms and schools observed, there was no visible evidence of biased behaviour against ethnic minority students in terms of teacher questioning or feedback. Among the teacher focus groups the team observed Naga, Shan Ni, (Kham Ti Township) Shan, Palaung (Kut Kai Township), Mon (Thaton, Mawlamyaing and Than Byu Zayart Townships). The team did not encounter any evidence of bias among SITE teachers in promotion or deployment based on ethnicity. Ethnic minority parents were found participating in PTAs and as Board of Trustee members. (Kham Ti Township) Shan, Palaung (Kut Kai Township), and Mon (Thaton, Mawlamyaing and Than Byu Zayart Townships). This is suggestive of inclusivity of SITE activities.

However, it should also be noted that all schools visited used Myanmar language as the medium for teaching and the SITE course book is in Myanmar only. Almost three-quarters (74.2 per cent) of students in schools sampled for the CSC data collection speak a local language other than Myanmar, as reported by head teachers, and of these children 41.3 per cent reported ‘never’ receiving additional help at school in spite of their non-Myanmar mother tongue. Such reported lack of support has increased since 2012 when only 23.8 per cent of students reported ‘never’ receiving such help. This change is not necessarily an indication of SITE or QBEP activities being discriminatory, and is more likely to be indicative of changing and more relaxed social and political contexts in which students and head teachers feel more comfortable acknowledging the existence of different ethnicities, compared to the
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Bamar rigidity of past years. The University of York report suggests that such changes may indeed be reflective of growing recognition of ethnic and linguistic diversity in the education system.

The issue of language of instruction continues to be an area of serious contention between the Government of Myanmar and ethnic peoples. The prevalence of multi-lingual children and the dominance of Myanmar as the language of instruction in classrooms and within SITE trainings, highlights an element of SITE and broader QBEP teacher trainings that is not inclusive of Myanmar’s multiple ethnicities. As has been well recognised, teaching young children at preschool or early primary age in a language other than their mother-tongue is an intense barrier for their continuation in education and this is an important exclusionary factor for many of Myanmar’s ethnic children.

The results indicate that, overall, SITE activities may have promoted some improvements in equity and inclusivity within the classroom, particularly in terms of teachers’ behaviours in calling upon both girls and boys and providing feedback. However, further training on how to address hidden gender norms on a societal and institutional level as well as further training on including children with disabilities was found necessary. Addressing issues of equity relating to language is a contentious area of debate but the findings of the CSC analysis strongly suggest that there are benefits to using mother tongue in the early stages of education.

**Are there ways in which activities can be improved for better performance at the strategic and project levels?**

The three TEO, head teacher and cluster head focus discussion groups cited a number of areas for improvement. One group suggested that more time was required for head teacher training, but a clear rationale or reason was not provided. This same group, plus teacher focus groups, indicated concern that some sections of the teacher training materials were difficult to understand. Another TEO group cited what was the apparent contradiction between education college trainees and their teacher centred approaches, and the SITE approach, with suggestions that SITE could be improved if this contradiction was resolved. To investigate this further, this issue was raised during an interview with senior staff at an education college who stated that there was not in place any Government legislation dictating what teaching methodologies were to be used in schools. These education college staff added that at their college they emphasised student centred approaches, however their teachers adopted approaches as they saw fit depending on student needs. It was not possible to investigate any further the suggestion that education college trainees were utilising teacher centred approaches, and the apparent conflicts with SITE activities.

From the eight teacher focus group discussions, suggestions for improvement from four groups mainly focussed around improved or expanded numbers of teaching methodologies to be included in the training, including, for example, group methods suited to large class sizes that do not require moveable furniture, which in many classrooms is not available. Other teachers identified the need for more training on producing a broader range of teaching aids. Another challenge were teacher difficulties with Myanmar language where the recommended one-hour reflection time was insufficient, which then started to encroach on teaching time. Another group suggested that SITE activities could be improved if all teachers in a school participated and there was more direct support from parents, for example in providing teaching aids.
4.4 Sustainability

**What is the likelihood that SITE activities will be sustained following the end of the current QBEP funding?**

**Summary of key findings:**

Results indicate that SITE could be sustained beyond the end of current QBEP funding. There was support at all levels for the continuation of SITE activities, and capacity of TEOs, teachers, head teachers and cluster heads for continuation was evident. Support for SITE continuation was not universal, owing in part to the following issues: high transfer rates of SITE-trained teachers out of schools; uncertainty around the SITE certification process and associated rewards; and aspects of SITE appropriate for replication or scale up were school based mentoring and peer-to-peer assessment, and cluster meetings.

The school selection process could benefit from assessment of individual teacher needs and a whole state approach to concentrate activities.

**Is there capacity and interest for SITE activities to be continued following the end of QBEP?**

From the contact the evaluation team had with the TEO, head teacher and cluster head focus groups it was generally demonstrated to the evaluation team that these personnel, under what sometimes can be difficult conditions, have the capacity to manage SITE activities if the programme was to be continued following the end of QBEP.

The question of interest in continuing was put to three focus groups, and one group clearly did not have an appetite for the continuation of SITE as it had not worked well in their area, which was outside of QBEP. The main challenge faced by this particular township was the high level of staff transfers, which was seen as significantly contributing to the lack of success with SITE and its demise. Another group were positive in continuing with SITE, but not under QBEP funding (reasons not provided), while the third group were tentative on the proviso that the issues of transfers out of schools be resolved along with difficulties in forming and maintaining clusters in conflict areas.

An interview with MOE, reflected what generally a very positive Government attitude towards SITE and its continuation is. The personal opinion of this interviewee was that Government generally would be happy to see the continuation of SITE, and a significant attribute of the programme was that it provided an opportunity to evaluate teacher performance as they worked through and completed the SITE programme. This was seen, in the opinion of this interviewee, to provide opportunities to grade teachers based on teaching performance and link this to salaries, which was seen as having motivational advantages for primary school teachers.

In meetings and discussions held with DBE and DTET personnel, and during their participation in the Reference Group meeting, there has been a strong interest in the continuation of SITE following the end of QBEP, particularly in addressing the in-service training needs of the large numbers of under qualified daily wage teachers being recruited.

In addition, focus group discussions with teachers clearly demonstrated a capacity and interest for the continuation of SITE and the introduction of more training materials.

**What are the key enabling or preventative factors in long-term sustainability?**

**Key enabling factors in long-term sustainability:** Across all of the data collected and discussed above, three critical key factors stand out in support of the long-term sustainability of SITE. Firstly, the relative ease of SITE implementation. Secondly, from the evaluation team contact with Government there appears to be strong support for SITE as a means of addressing in-service teacher training challenges,
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especially for the large number of under qualified daily wage teachers. Thirdly, the demonstrated enthusiasm of teachers in undertaking the SITE training and applying improved teaching methodologies.

**Key preventative factors in long-term sustainability:** Across a number of the data collection elements discussed above, school targeting and the issue of high proportions of SITE trained teachers being transferred out of schools stood out as the key preventative factors in long term sustainability. These transfers were clearly impacting on the quality of implementation, as to be effective in schools, the model requires the majority of teachers to be SITE trained.

While the enthusiasm of classroom teachers for SITE is well demonstrated, the long-term sustainability of this enthusiasm may wane if uncertainty around the SITE certification process is not clarified. Outlined in the SITE Guidelines is an evaluation and certification process involving two components, one based on their performance and evaluation while working through the course materials and classroom observations, and the second based on a written test. The SITE Guidelines set 60 points for the performance assessment and 40 points for the written test, and responsibility for testing teacher performance is with the School Cluster Supervising Committee, and with TEOs for administration of the written test. Additionally, the SITE Guidelines stipulate that only those teachers “who have scored 50 per cent of the total marks in the performance test must be allowed to take the written test.”

However, discussion with various SITE participants and administrators revealed a number of different understandings of this process. Also, there appeared to be some delays in issuing certificates to teachers, and a lack of clarity on who was setting the written test and if in fact this was supportive of SITE teaching and learning processes. The evaluation team was unable to obtain a sample copy of this test instrument. The expectation among teachers is that somehow the certificate may be linked to promotion along salary scales but there was no clarity among teachers on when and how.

A focus group discussion with the staff, principal, deputy principal and a department head of an education college revealed some tensions around the test paper administered to SITE teachers. In this case, while initially the education college understood that they would set the test, later this was done by DEPT/DBE. There was some disappointment expressed that the education college was not involved, as they had delivered SITE training, and the point made that testing needs to fit with the SITE content and approach. In an interview with DEPT, the opinion was expressed that this certification process should focus on teaching practice and the application of teaching skills and not on theory.

**What aspects of the current design are appropriate and viable for replication/scale-up and should they actually be replicated?**

The SITE design is not one that should be broken down into individual components for replication, as it is intended to be implemented as a whole unit. Without the individual SITE components working together in a supportive environment, including components identified in the enhanced desk review, it is unlikely to have positive impacts on classroom teaching practices.

However, in addressing this line of inquiry, and from the data and findings discussed above within the context of delivering effective in-service teacher training, there are two elements of the SITE model appropriate for scaling up and replication. First is the school based mentoring and peer-to-peer assessment, and second is the cluster meetings. The focus group discussions with teachers generally demonstrated a strong enthusiasm for these two activities, both of which are done in their own time without reward or compensation. These two SITE elements provide teachers with an opportunity to have an active role in professional development, and acknowledge the importance of their beliefs and feelings. As outlined in the enhanced desk review, these two elements are critical components in modern approaches to teacher development.
What was the school selection process and how might inherent selection bias impact on sustainability of SITE model in other schools?

In the absence of a SITE-specific design document, or regular reporting on evolving selection processes in QBEP annual reports or other documents, a former UNICEF SITE Project Manager provided insights into school selection. From this source it appears that initial selection was based on an assessment of the performance of townships and schools using CFS criteria and student learning achievements. Selection was not based on any assessment of teacher needs. The logic applied here was that in schools displaying low student achievement, teachers were viewed as being deficient in teaching capacity, and therefore requiring acquisition of specific teaching skills as defined by the SITE training materials designed externally. Within the context of contemporary approaches to in-service teacher development, and as outlined in the enhanced desk review, these types of approaches viewing teachers as deficient in particular capacities and adopting the premise that predetermined programmes will produce specific student learning outcomes are likely to not produce the desired results, and in the longer term are unsustainable.

SITE is a component of QBEP, which by design was scattered geographically around the country. Since initial SITE implementation, the programme has been geographically broadened further to include townships outside of QBEP. From a sustainability perspective, there are benefits in the fact that many parts of the country have experienced SITE initiatives. However, as outlined above, there are sustainability challenges presented with this wide spread of schools with staff transfers out of SITE schools and incoming new staff who are not SITE trained. This would be less of a challenge if SITE activities were more concentrated in say a whole state approach.
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Relevance

Are the current SITE activities relevant to the learning needs of teachers?

SITE planning was found to have adopted a generally top-down training approach, with little flexibility to meet individual needs across a variety of classroom learning environments. There is, however, some evidence that the CCA baseline study was used to inform SITE planning to address teacher learning needs meaning that in spite of an opaque planning process, teacher needs were addressed by SITE activities. The broader components of the SITE activities (reflective practices, self-assessment, and individual capacity development) have also been embraced by most teachers, and can therefore be assumed relevant to their learning needs.

In a broader consideration of relevance, the evaluation results indicate teachers generally understood and agreed with the SITE student-centred teaching approaches. However, in practice they adopted more didactic methods in response to curriculum constraints and external examinations pressures. These teachers are therefore in the unenviable situation of realising the cognitive benefits of student-centred teaching practices, but at the same time under pressure to have students perform well in national examinations that require factual recall. Their response is to put into practice the didactic teaching approaches and rote learning that they used prior to exposure to SITE. From the teachers’ perspective, this is a sensible approach as these more prescriptive and top-down classroom methodologies are seen as being a lot less time consuming than student-centred approaches, especially when confronted with large class sizes. A general conclusion among the more experienced SITE teachers was that adoption of mixed teacher/learner-centred approaches worked best and in this sense if teachers are able to adopt this approach then it could be concluded that SITE is relevant to the learning needs of teachers.

Important in the consideration of relevance is that the SITE activities include areas of educational psychology, reflective practices, self-assessment, and individual capacity development. The results indicate that the elements of reflective practices, self-assessment, and individual capacity development were embraced by teachers, suggesting therefore that they are relevant to the learning needs of teachers.

The general conclusion that can be drawn from the evaluation results is that the prescriptive top-down approach and current format of SITE training materials relating to specific teaching methodologies may not be relevant to and meet the learning needs of all teachers, and that teacher needs may be better met with a broader range of learning materials and some choice to meet individual needs. However, the evaluation also acknowledges evidence that links SITE activities to teaching and learning gaps outlined in a baseline report on teaching and learning needs.

The SITE materials do not resolve the examination pressure dilemma.

5.2 Efficiency

Do the current SITE activities provide an efficient model for implementing in-service teacher training?

This line of inquiry was defined by an examination of timeliness, and how effectively monitoring and reporting tools were used to capture on-going progress and provide feedback loops. CSC data indicates progress in achieving the intended milestone of 35 per cent of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria. However, the measurement provided by the trend analysis is one of improvement rather than an actual proportion of teachers using improved methods. In this sense, the improvement of 37.8 per cent indicates progress toward
achieving this indicator but doesn’t show whether or not the required 35 per cent of teachers has been met.

Overall, SITE activities were found to have been completed in an efficient manner whereby the stated targets for teachers trained were met and in fact exceeded the target set, and whereby two new SITE modules have been developed.

The QBEP annual reports have inconsistencies in SITE targets and reporting of key indicators. The QBEP reporting focus for SITE is on spending, the number of teachers trained, and training books printed, and there is no consistent and regular reporting on improved teaching practices. Effective monitoring and evaluation tools are not in place and effective feedback loops have not been established. Under these conditions therefore, an objective assessment of efficiency related to the prime purpose of SITE, that is to strengthen teacher performance, is not possible.

5.3 Effectiveness

Based on the enhanced desk review criteria identified, is SITE an effective model for delivering in-service training to trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools?  
The evaluation measured effectiveness on the basis of progress towards planned results, key factors facilitating or hindering progress, unintended consequences and inclusiveness/equitability. As with the measure of efficiency above, the lack of consistent and robust QBEP reporting hindered the objective assessment to be made of progress towards planned results.

If effectiveness is informed on the basis of factors facilitating or hindering progress, then the results show that issues of staff transfers out of SITE schools, examination pressure and the lack of understanding of a clear and focussed conceptual framework linking all components of the SITE programme to the broader school environment need to be addressed. However, several key factors are recognised as evidence of SITE as an effective model, namely the success of peer-to-peer assessment and cluster group meetings; the relative ease with which SITE can be introduced into schools and picked up by teachers; and the evident access to and use of the SITE training book within classrooms. All of these factors, combined with the very obvious enthusiasm of teachers for the SITE activities leads to the conclusion that in spite of some areas requiring further improvement, SITE was overall a very successful model.

This conclusion is substantiated by CSC data that found QBEP-trained teachers to display more participatory, interactive, and inclusive teaching methods in the classroom with more students reporting that they are enjoying school. Furthermore, the SITE model was found by teachers to be much more substantial and comprehensive than the JICA funded CCA training.

Similarly, the results show that the unintended consequences and issues of inclusiveness/equitability were not having negative impacts on effectiveness.

It can be concluded on balance that if those areas identified above are adequately addressed, SITE could be an effective model for in-service delivery, albeit in the absence of any objective assessment of progress towards planned results for the current SITE activities.

5.4 Sustainability

What is the likelihood that SITE activities will be sustained following the end of the current QBEP funding?  
The evaluation measured sustainability on the basis of capacity and interest for SITE activities to be continued, key enabling or preventative factors in long term sustainability, aspects of the current design appropriate for replication or scale-up, and the school selection process.
It can be concluded from the results that SITE could be sustained following the end of the current QBEP funding. This conclusion is primarily made on the basis of the obvious widespread support for SITE at all levels and the relative ease of SITE implementation. However, the significant threats to sustainability that would need to be addressed are staff transfers out of SITE schools, teacher uncertainty on the SITE certification process and rewards, and school targeting.

A SITE stand-alone model would probably not be sustainable. This is because of the reasons identified above, and the absence of whole school elements designed to support SITE initiatives as outlined in the enhanced desk review including for example improvements in school management, active parental participation, engaged school committees, and a recognition of the wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms.

5.5 Lessons learned

A number of lessons were learned through this evaluation, both in terms of project design as well as in terms of subject matter and context. These lessons can be used to inform better practice in the future, not only for any potential extension of SITE, but for all projects in general.

The need for project-specific design activities and documentation: The evaluation faced distinct challenges in being able to adequately ascertain project objectives and activities because of the absence of activity level planning or design documents. Although there was significant rationale provided for QBEP including a teacher education strategy and support, these did not clearly translate to clear SITE-specific objectives. The lack of a theory of change, or alternative means of an activity vision and strategy at the start of the project meant that the logic, linkages and rationale behind activities was unclear. The retroactive theory of change developed after the midterm review attempts to piece together the threads scattered throughout the QBEP background documents; while it is clear that there is grounded rationale behind SITE, the lack of a consolidated activity strategy resulted in convoluted and unclear linkages when the ToC did attempt to draw project information together. This and lack of SITE activity level indicators hindered the measurement of effectiveness and has shown how the absence of these important planning and communication project stages can impede evaluation activities.

The benefits of and need for regular monitoring and progress reports: The lack of regular SITE updates or progress reports made it challenging to evaluate the progress of the programme. Improving this practice should be considered part of general good practice and will be of benefit institutionally, especially where there has been a history of absent other project documents and staff turnover, as well as to future evaluations and continuous learning.

The lack of reporting also meant that the popularity of SITE activities and the enthusiasm shown toward it by teachers were not captured or made known to important stakeholders like donors and education policy makers. The interview with an MDEF partner suggested that they were aware of anecdotal evidence that SITE was having positive impacts, but there was no formal monitoring or progress reporting to verify this. This was a source of frustration that fed into general uncertainty of the programme's activities and success. This is an issue that could be easily overcome and shows how levels of communication can impact perceptions of project success or weakness.

The need for patience and understanding of the country context: The findings from this evaluation as well as the CSC trend analysis show that while change and improvement is occurring in terms of teacher understandings of learner-centred approaches and teaching pedagogies, the pace of behaviour change is slow and dependent on the wider context of social and political change. The example of results showing that Myanmar language being spoken as children's first language has increased significantly since 2011 is indicative of how the changing political environment is having an impact on attitudes and
what people are comfortable talking about, and therefore addressing. Recognising this is important so that setting targets of changed behaviour are done realistically.

In a similar vein, it was also clear during the course of the evaluation that the process of decentralisation has taken place without sufficient instruction or leadership from the central level. While the top levels of government may understand their roles and the intended roles of subnational departments, it is clear that the lower levels of government do not share this understanding. This is impeding monitoring efforts for SITE, amongst other many other areas, and it will be important to recognise that structural changes to longstanding systems require time and high levels of guidance in working toward new structures and systems. This shows that programme design should not rely on a fast pace of change or assume that new systems will be ready and functional according to a set time frame. This lesson shows the importance of incorporating such understandings in project documents for clear and realistic outcomes.

**Avoid assumptions of sustained financing:** MDEF funding for QBEP will end on 30 June 2016 and will not be renewed. Alternative funding options do not appear immediately available. The sustainability of all QBEP programmes is therefore in question and should have been anticipated in good time. Weaknesses in overall QBEP component design and the limitations raised in the midterm review have contributed to negative perceptions of programme success; this has not been helped by the lack of regular monitoring and communication on the part of UNICEF, even where there have been positive findings to report. These are important lessons to bear in mind for the sustainability and success of any future programme.
6. RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are based on evaluation findings and are listed in order of priority.

Recommendation #1: for UNICEF programme staff
Before any scale up of this pilot project, there needs to be a reconceptualization of basic SITE planning documents, theory of change and log frame.

The current QBEP theory of change needs to be revised to incorporate contemporary views of in-service teacher development as suggested above and in the enhanced desk review. This SITE conceptual framework should be clear and able to be articulated by stakeholders at all levels.

The current log frame is subsumed in the overall QBEP programme documentation and does not provide the basis for a clear summary of SITE activities or a robust management tool or basis for measuring performance. In any future scale up of SITE, a distinct log frame should be developed with clearly stated activities, outputs, outcomes and risk mitigation.

Recommendation #2: for UNICEF programme staff and field staff, DBE central level
In tandem with Recommendation #1, a more rigorous approach to monitoring and evaluation needs to be established. This should be a long term objective and be applied throughout the entire lifespan of any scale up of SITE. An M&E system should be established at the beginning of any new phase of SITE based on the documents generated through Recommendation #1, and should be followed throughout the new programme.

The evaluation results showed that SITE monitoring and reporting tools have not been used effectively to capture progress and results, and effective performance test-based loops were not in place. The lack of rigour and available SITE monitoring and evaluation data presented challenges to the evaluation team, and could be expected to impact on the effectiveness of SITE implementation. MDEF partners and DBE/DTET stakeholders raised this issue during focus group discussions. Appropriate feedback loops and protocols for all levels of participation in SITE activities need to be established and maintained with regular reporting.

Recommendation #3: for MOE DBE and DTET, and UNICEF programme management
According to international contemporary best practice, a rigorous teacher training needs analysis should be undertaken to identify gaps in the current training materials. This should be undertaken at the beginning of any new SITE phase and be addressed before implementing and future scale up.

The training needs analysis should embrace contemporary conceptual frameworks of in-service teacher development incorporating for example recognition of teacher ownership, organization and delivery of professional development, and acknowledgement of the complexities of school environments and the different incentives and disincentives that teachers face.

Recommendation #4: for MOE DBE and DTET, teachers
The SITE training materials should be reorganised into smaller units to allow teacher selection to meet their particular needs. This should be addressed during the period before any scale up of SITE is implemented.

Given the overall conceptual framework of the SITE approach where teachers work collaboratively in schools to peer assess and discuss their teaching, this teacher selection of learning materials would work best at the school level where they decide as a group what units of training are selected. This approach reinforces the active role that teachers should have in their own professional development, and acknowledges teachers' beliefs and feelings about teaching.
Recommendation # 5: MOE DBE and DTET decision makers, UNICEF programme staff, and teachers

The evaluation data from QBEP SITE schools where teachers had participated in CCA training prior to SITE indicated that teachers and Township Education Officers (TEOs) saw benefit in the linking of these two activities, with CCA providing skills in classroom teaching practices and SITE providing more depth, a broader understanding of children and their learning, and encouraging more teacher discourse on teaching and learning.

Any revisions of SITE should be conceptualised as long-term objectives within the four criteria for improving the effectiveness of teacher in-service training identified in the enhanced desk review. These four criteria are:

1. Activities need to be well aligned with government policy implicitly supporting improvements in classroom teaching;
2. Visible changes in schools and classrooms;
3. A well sequenced and coordinated whole school approach; and
4. A consideration of the wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms.

These elements need to be incorporated into a reconceptualization of basic SITE planning documents, theory of change and log frame as provided in Recommendation # 1.

As outlined in the enhanced desk review, by not taking into account factors such as the complexity of school environments, teacher incentives and motivations, and teacher resistance to new initiatives, teacher professional development is unlikely to be successful.
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Terms of Reference
Final Performance Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) Pilot Programme

**Section in Charge:** Education

**How does the consultancy relate to education portfolio:** Aligns with renewed effort for QBEP to systematically review and assess its pilot activities before they are considered being implemented in other areas.

**Objective reference:** Objective 3: No. of children reached and learning in QBEP targeted areas increased.

**Sub-Objective reference:** Sub-Objective 3: Teacher performance improved.

**Outcome 105:** BEGE

**Output 4.6:** Planning and Management

**Background:** As part of its larger Quality Basic Education Programme (QBEP), UNICEF and its Myanmar Multi-Donor Education Fund (MDEF) partners have designed and implemented a number of in-service teacher training programs focused on strengthening teacher performance and increasing student learning.

Among these training programs is a pilot application of a School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) model. SITE is a framework for in-service teacher training which uses a blended learning approach combining head teacher organized school-based sessions, reading and reflection by teachers, and experiential learning. SITE builds on the more traditional workshop delivery modality by providing extensive coaching and mentoring; reduced cost of delivery; and reduced loss of teacher classroom time to attend extended training events.

A wider local network of state level training staff is involved in SITE, including teacher educators at education colleges, along with Township Education Office (TEO) and District Education staff providing cluster based in-service training sessions, as well as monitoring visits. All head teachers from participating schools receive a five-day course to support them in providing guidance to teachers throughout the SITE process. Upon completion of the training, all SITE participants are expected to complete a written exam capturing what they have learned over the course.

During the 2014/15 academic year, the SITE model was implemented in 17 townships with over 4,000 teachers and 1,000 head teachers participating, including qualified government, daily wage, monastic and Mon National Education Committee (MNEC) teachers. Currently under SITE, only one module is being deployed in full, “Effective Teaching and Learning”, in which 10 units are conducted over a period of six months at a pace of approximately one unit every two weeks. Two other modules, “Learning in the Early Years” and “Teaching in Multi-Age and Multi-Lingual Classrooms” are currently being developed. The Ministry of Education (MOE) has discussed developing a series of 10 modules covering various topics aligned with teacher competencies, which has the potential to lead untrained teachers to certification.

The specific theory of change guiding the activities can be conceptualized as follows:

**IF** head teachers and teachers are provided with on-the-job in-service training highlighting new effective teaching and learning pedagogies and are supported through ongoing coaching and mentoring by peers, head teachers and cluster school heads;

**THEN** head teachers and teachers will learn new skills and be more likely to apply those skills directly in their classrooms; coaching and mentoring visits will strengthen relationships between head teachers and teachers.
and their visiting township and district education office staff; and participants successfully completing the course will have a demonstrated competency that can be used for their eventual certification;

BECAUSE several studies, including an internal 2012 UNICEF review, have highlighted that teachers across Myanmar have inadequate skills and knowledge of learner-centered pedagogies to support effective learning at the primary level. The provision of additional in-service training accompanied by mentoring and coaching can help strengthen the capacities of teachers who have already completed their pre-service training, as well as provide teacher development for those lacking qualification.

2. Purpose/Objectives of the Evaluation: The objective of this final performance evaluation is to provide an objective assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and likely sustainability of the SITE activities to date. It will include both summative and formative elements; providing an assessment of results achieved as well as insight into how to improve the activities during future implementation. The evaluation should also include a comparative assessment of the SITE model compared to other similar national and regional in-service teacher training - targeting both trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from other non-government schools. The primary intended users of this evaluation are MOE’s Department of Teacher Education Training staff and MDEF partners. Secondary audiences include other partners and donors implementing similar in-service teacher training activities and other interested stakeholders in Myanmar and the broader region.

Scope: The evaluation should include a review of SITE across all four cohorts to date (2012-2015). As the evaluation is expected to offer a comparative assessment of similar in-service models, the team will also be expected to travel to non-SITE townships. While the team is not expected to visit all 17 SITE townships, their proposed sampling is expected to include a selection of townships across all four SITE cohorts. Given UNICEF’s focus on equity, the sampling should also consider how to include “worst off” townships and engage stakeholders that may be excluded from SITE activities despite otherwise meeting the requisite criteria for participation.

Primary Evaluation Questions: The evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and likely sustainability of SITE’s activities and its modality of delivery. Specifically, the evaluation report will need to answer the following questions:

1. Are the current SITE activities relevant to the learning needs of the head teachers, teachers and staff they target?
2. Does the current SITE modality of delivery provide an efficient model for implementing in-service teacher training?
3. Based on the criteria developed during the enhanced desk review, is SITE an effective model for delivering in-service training to trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools (MNEC)?
4. What is the likelihood that SITE activities will be sustained following the end of current QBEP funding?

The evaluation team is encouraged to develop their own sub-questions which will help them answer the primary evaluation questions above.

The evaluation will be divided into two parts: (1) an enhanced desk review and (2) an evaluation of SITE and comparison activities.

The enhanced desk review will be expected to include:

- An identification of similar in-service teacher training modules currently in use in Myanmar and the broader Southeast Asia region;
- An analysis of similarities and differences in these approaches;
- Documentation of any available evidence highlighting “good practices” in the delivery of in-service teacher training, including training programs targeting both trained and untrained (“daily wage”) teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools.
**Based on the “good practices” identified above, develop a list of key criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training modules.**

**Based on identification of similar in-service training programs in Myanmar and the identified criteria for effectiveness, develop a criterion-based, purposeful sample of sites to be visited during the evaluation.**

**At the conclusion of the review, the evaluation team will be expected to produce a 10-page enhanced Desk review Report addressing each of the points above.**

The **Evaluation of SITE and Others Comparison Activities** will be expected to:

- Supplement the evidence gathered during the desk review phase with primary data collected through rapid appraisal mixed-methods, including but not limited to key informant interviews, small and focus groups, direct observations, and if feasible the use of a mini-survey.
- Document evidence gathered from each interview through written summary interview notes which will be cleaned of any identifying information and submitted separately along with the final evaluation report.
- Conduct a careful analysis and triangulation of evidence gathered throughout the entire evaluation process.
- Deliver a 30-page evaluation report, along with associated annexes, providing complete, evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions provided.

**UNICEF reserves the right to request any data analysis files along with the summary interview notes.**

**Size of Team:** The evaluation is expected to be conducted by a team of 2-3 experts; one international team leader and 1-2 national consultants. On balance, the team is expected to collectively bring a strong understanding of evaluation methods, particularly in qualitative data collection and analysis, as well as in-depth experience in designing, implementing and/or evaluating teacher training programs in Myanmar and the broader SE Asia region.

**Norms and standards:** The guidance documents below will be part of the contract of the evaluation team:

- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, 2005
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, 2005 (including impartiality, independence, quality, transparency, consultative process)
- UNICEF Ethical Standards for Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis will guide the overall process
- Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF - 2013

The evaluation should incorporate the human rights, gender equality, and equity perspectives and be based on Results Based Management principles. UNICEF will provide background documents providing further detail on how this can be achieved.

**3. Geographic Area:** The evaluation team will be expected to propose their own criterion-based, purposeful sample of sites to be visited following their enhanced desk review. SITE has been implemented in 17 townships across 5 states and regions, including Mandalay (Thabeikkyin), Shan (Loilem, Namsang, Kutkhai), Sagaing (Pinlebu, Khamti), Magway (Pauk), and Mon (Mawlamyine, Chaung zone, Kyaik ma yaw, Mudon, Than Phyu Zayut, Ye, Thaton, Paung, Beelin, Kyaik Hto).

**4. Duration:** The evaluation team is expected to propose the expected duration of the work but UNICEF estimates around 12 weeks including planning, desk review, fieldwork, analysis and writing.

**5. Supervisor and Management Arrangements:** The evaluation team will be managed by the Education Section Evaluation Specialist (Evaluation Manager) that will provide day-to-day management and facilitation of the evaluation process, including day-to-day oversight of the evaluation team, under the guidance of the Evaluation Specialist (Cambodia, Malaysia and Myanmar) and the Education Chief.
The evaluation team will be answerable to the Evaluation Manager. The team will decide its own fieldwork programme in consultation with the Evaluation Manager. It will inform the Evaluation Manager of any problems arising. The team will also immediately inform the Evaluation Manager of any issues regarding the integrity or effectiveness of UNICEF’s response encountered during the evaluation research.

A Reference Group of immediate stakeholders as well as external experts will be established to ensure quality assurance. The Reference Group will be chaired by the Education Chief. A TOR outlining the roles and responsibilities of both the Reference Group will be developed separately.

UNICEF partners will be kept informed of the evaluation’s progress on a regular basis. They will be invited to the workshops and consulted on the evaluation outputs.

6. Type of Supervision/Support Required from UNICEF: The successful offeror will work closely with manager and larger UNICEF education team, MOE, and sub-national level counterparts. Periodic reporting as agreed upon will be submitted in digital form. A national expert who is familiar with township and state education processes will also be hired by UNICEF to support the data collection and analysis process.

7. Deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>End Product/deliverables</th>
<th>Duration/Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception report to detail expected methodologies (including detailed work plan) to complete tasks required. The Inception Report should outline the overall approach, data collection and analysis plan, evaluation design matrix, sampling plan, tentative fieldwork schedule, as well as present the draft data collection instruments and outline of the final report.</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>1 week from activity approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a detailed desk review of national and regional models of providing in-service teacher training. Draft 10 page enhanced desk review report documenting similarities and differences in approaches, examples of “good practice,” criteria for assessing “effectiveness,” and criteria for sampling sites for fieldwork.</td>
<td>Enhanced desk review report (10 pages)</td>
<td>As stated in Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the outset of fieldwork, the evaluation team will meet with the UNICEF Yangon team for an in-brief and discussion of the enhanced desk review report.</td>
<td>In-Brief with UNICEF Yangon team, revisions to enhanced desk review report, and Yangon-based interviews</td>
<td>As stated in Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out interviews and direct observation with teachers (who are in SITE and who are not), with head teachers, with TEO and SEO staff and with MOE staff.</td>
<td>Primary Data Collection</td>
<td>As stated in Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A validation workshop should be held with key SITE stakeholders to discuss preliminary findings and review for any factual inaccuracies. A debrief should include a presentation of initial impressions regarding tentative findings and conclusions.</td>
<td>Validation Workshop</td>
<td>Final 1-2 days of fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of a rough outline of major findings, conclusions, and recommendations and how they relate. A final outline will need to be approved before initiating the drafting of the evaluation report.</td>
<td>Submitting preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations matrix</td>
<td>Within two weeks following conclusion of fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out analysis and prepare draft evaluation report to be shared with MOE and development partners for comment.</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Within two weeks following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following receipt of comments on draft report, contractor should arrange for a report validation workshop with both internal and external stakeholders to discuss comments and suggestions for finalizing report. This may include discussion of where conclusions are not supported by findings or concerns with feasibility of recommendations. The contractor is encouraged, but not required, to consider feedback received during the workshop when finalizing the draft.</td>
<td>Report Validation Workshop</td>
<td>Within one week of receipt of comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare final report with recommendations and findings for future use of the SITE framework as an in-service teacher training model</td>
<td>Final report with recommendations</td>
<td>Within two weeks of above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Qualification and specialized knowledge/experience required for the assignment:

The evaluation is expected to be conducted by a team of two experts, one international and 1-2 national evaluation experts. Offerors are encouraged to submit a joint Expression of Interest highlighting any complementarities in skillsets between the two experts although individual Expressions of Interests will also be considered for both positions.

At a minimum, offerors are expected to meet the following qualifications. The **senior international expert** will be expected to meet the following minimum qualifications:

- At least seven (7) years of experience evaluating education-specific development programs in developing country settings;
- Advanced university degree in Education or other social sciences with focus on education and/or teacher training;
- Demonstrated ability to work in a multi-cultural environment and establish harmonious and effective working relationships, both within and outside the workplace; and
- Previous experience in evaluation of teacher training, especially in-service models is an asset.

The **mid/senior national expert** will be expected to meet the following minimum qualifications:

- At least three (3) years of experience managing and/or evaluating educational planning activities in developing country settings;
- Demonstrated experience providing written inputs into final evaluation reports;
- Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively in both English and Myanmar; and
- Demonstrated ability to work in a multi-cultural environment and establish harmonious and effective working relationships, both within and outside the workplace.

- Familiarity with Myanmar in-service teacher training models strongly preferred.
Evaluating QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

Annex 2: Revised QBEP results hierarchy

- Improved access to and quality of basic education for all children in Myanmar
  - An inclusive and informed NESP and supporting structures are developed and implemented
  - Systems supporting quality basic education strengthened
    - Stakeholder engagement increased
    - Legislative reform and inclusive policies strengthened
    - Motivation to access quality education increased
  - Evidence-based for advocating and delivering quality basic education improved
    - Learning from assessments, evaluations, and studies strengthened
    - No. of school-ready students increased
    - School environment improved
    - Teacher performance improved
    - School management improved

- No. of children reached and learning in QBEP targeted areas increased
### Annex 3: Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicative lines of inquiry</th>
<th>Decisions to inform</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Location of data collection</th>
<th>Means of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Are the current SITE activities relevant to the learning needs of the head teachers, teachers, staff they target?</td>
<td>Was SITE based on a planning process that enabled teacher needs in selected townships to be identified, prioritised, and then addressed?</td>
<td>In the absence of a SITE design document, will use education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders. UNICEF documents.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with TEO officers, head monks, school principals, head teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are SITE activities and outputs in line with the stated learning needs of target populations?</strong></td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders. School documents.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with TEO officers, head monks, school principals, head teachers, teachers, cluster heads, document review.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what degree is SITE coordinated as a whole school approach that is accepted, supported, and incorporated into the framework used by head teachers, teachers, and staff?</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF background documents. Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders.</td>
<td>TEO officers, head monks, school principals, head teachers, teachers, cluster heads, group interview with PTA members, parents, students.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How supportive is the local/national examination system of SITE learner-centric pedagogies?</strong></td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders. Review of examinations.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicative lines of inquiry</th>
<th>Decisions to inform</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Location of data collection</th>
<th>Means of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Do the current SITE activities provide an efficient model for implementing in-service teacher training?</td>
<td>Have the stated SITE objectives been completed in a timely manner?</td>
<td>In the absence of a SITE design document, will use education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have monitoring and reporting tools been used effectively to capture progress and results, and have they allowed for feedback loops on the model?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulation of data from targeted stakeholders with availability and quality of SITE M&amp;E frameworks</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Based on the EDR criteria identified, is SITE an effective model for delivering in-service training to trained and untrained teachers, as well as teachers from monastic schools and non-state schools?</td>
<td>What is the level of progress toward planned programme results?</td>
<td>In the absence of a SITE design document and explicitly stated expected programme results, will use education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulation of data from targeted stakeholders, with availability and quality of SITE planning documentation.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, cluster heads. SITE annual and mid-year reports, examination results.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the key factors that facilitated or hindered progress toward planned results?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulation of data from targeted stakeholders, with review of SITE documents.</td>
<td>TEO officers, head monks, school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads, students, SITE documents.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicative lines of inquiry</th>
<th>Decisions to inform</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Location of data collection</th>
<th>Means of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, have been the unintended consequences of SITE, particularly on teaching methods and school performance?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree have SITE activities been inclusive and equitable?</td>
<td>UNICEF criteria. Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulation of data from targeted stakeholders, with review of SITE documents.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads, focus group parents and students.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there ways in which activities can be improved for better performance at the strategic and project levels?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with TEO officers, school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there capacity and interest for SITE activities to be continued following the end of QBEP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key enabling or preventative factors in long term sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Indicative lines of inquiry</td>
<td>Decisions to inform</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Location of data collection</td>
<td>Means of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the current design are appropriate and viable for replication/scale-up and should they actually be replicated?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Triangulated data from targeted stakeholders</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with TEO officers, school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the school selection process and how might inherent selection bias impact on sustainability of SITE model in other schools?</td>
<td>Education and evaluation expertise of evaluation team.</td>
<td>Analysis of SITE selection criteria triangulated with data from targeted stakeholders.</td>
<td>One-on-one interviews with TEO officers, school principals, head teachers, head monks, teachers, cluster heads, SITE documentation.</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin, Kutkai, Thaton, Mawlamyine, Kyaukse, Thanbyuzayat, Thanlyin, Khamti townships</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location types</th>
<th>State and township</th>
<th>Rationale for selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention township</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, Thaton</td>
<td>2014 and 2015 cohort. High “2014 SITE Exam results.” Ethnic minorities. QBEP whole state approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, Than Byu Zayat</td>
<td>2014 and 2015 cohort participants; SITE State schools and Non-state school (Mon National Education Committee – MNEC). Ethnic minorities. QBEP whole state approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, Mawlamyine</td>
<td>Mawlamyine Education College, SITE trainers. QBEP whole state approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison township</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/division</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>School name</th>
<th>(Intervention/comparison)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sagaing</td>
<td>Khamti*</td>
<td>1. Thar Yar Kone Basic Education Post Primary School</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2015 cohort - State school - Rural - In the Tsp. with low “2014 SITE Exam results” (69%) - Ethnicity but most of the students can use Myanmar language well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Basic Education Middle School, Myoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Paw Mine Monastic Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>Thabeikkyin Kyin</td>
<td>4. Basic Education Middle School (Branch), 7 mile</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2012 cohort - State school - Rural - Majority Myanmar - MOE’s CCA - State school - MEDG’s CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan (North)</td>
<td>Kutkai</td>
<td>5. No. (3) Basic Education Middle School, Kutkai</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2012 cohort&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Urban&lt;br&gt;- Ethnicity (Plus Chinese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon State</td>
<td>Mawlamyine</td>
<td>6. No. (2) Thirimyine Basic Education Primary School, Thirimingala Mawlamyine</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2015 cohort&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Urban&lt;br&gt;- Within Mon State under QBEP’s whole state approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanbyuzaya</td>
<td>7. Basic Education Post Primary School, Welthonchaung</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2015 cohort&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Near urban&lt;br&gt;- Ethnicity (Mon)&lt;br&gt;- Within Mon State under QBEP’s whole state approach&lt;br&gt;- MNEC school&lt;br&gt;- Monastic school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thaton</td>
<td>8. Mon National Post Primary School Pa Nga No. (3)&lt;br&gt;9. Hantharwady Taikethit Monastic Post Primary School</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2015 cohort&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Rural&lt;br&gt;- Within Mon State under QBEP’s whole state approach&lt;br&gt;- In the Tsp. with considerably high “2014 SITE Exam results” (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Thaton</td>
<td>10. Basic Education Post Primary School, Thayettaw</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>- 2015 cohort&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Rural&lt;br&gt;- Within Mon State under QBEP’s whole state approach&lt;br&gt;- In the Tsp. with considerably high “2014 SITE Exam results” (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon Division</td>
<td>Than Lyin</td>
<td>11. Baho Basic Education Post Primary School&lt;br&gt;12. Damadipa Monastic Primary School</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>- MOE’s CCA&lt;br&gt;- State school&lt;br&gt;- Urban&lt;br&gt;- Monastic school&lt;br&gt;- MEDG’s CCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5: Evaluation team profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of role</th>
<th>Suitable attributes of the candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mike Thair</td>
<td>Technical Team Lead</td>
<td>Lead consultant responsible for writing the enhanced desk review and final evaluation report. Will lead on study design, development of qualitative interview guides, observation checklists, quantitative mini-survey, and sampling strategy. Responsible for data analysis and presentation of findings.</td>
<td>Strong regional education expertise including Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Singapore. Education expertise in teacher training, teaching and learning methodologies, and educational material development. Past education evaluation design and execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Nu Nu Wai</td>
<td>National Education Consultant (Mid)</td>
<td>Provide technical input to development of guidelines for qualitative methods and a structured questionnaire, conduct of fieldwork, analysis of qualitative data, reporting and presentation of findings.</td>
<td>Strong education technical background, particularly in quality basic education development, educational assessments and evaluations, and teacher training development. Knowledge of UNICEF systems and familiarity with QBEP programme. Brings gender balance to the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ye Myint</td>
<td>National Education Consultant (Mid)</td>
<td>Provide technical input to development of guidelines for qualitative methods and a structured questionnaire, conduct of fieldwork, analysis of qualitative data, reporting and presentation of findings.</td>
<td>Experience and formal qualification in education sector, knowledge on local education context and some experience of evaluation methodology. Known to Ministry of Education with good connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; community level</th>
<th>Township level</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Central level</th>
<th>Programmatic level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers (26)</td>
<td>Township Education Officers (5)</td>
<td>DFAT (1)</td>
<td>Senior decision makers at DTET (4)</td>
<td>Education Specialist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (68)</td>
<td>Deputy/Assistant Deputy Township Education Officers (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior decision maker at DBE and other officer (2)</td>
<td>Current SITE Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (12)</td>
<td>Assistant Township Education Officers (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former staff member of DEPT(1)</td>
<td>Field Education Officer (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastics schools (3)</td>
<td>Cluster heads (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous SITE consultants (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government schools (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous SITE Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic schools (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 7: Data collection tools

Annex 7.1: General School Observation (GSO)

Observer: [ ]
Date: [ ]
School: [ ]
Township: [ ]

A general walk-around should be made of the school and observation made, instead of relying completely on answers from school personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the following information clearly displayed in a public place to inform the school community?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School statistics (enrollment, pass rates, etc.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons of performance by year</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent teacher association (PTA) information</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of school activities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student awards, prizes, etc.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List below examples of other information on public display:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the schoolyard free of litter?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the grounds attractive and well-maintained?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the school have any gardens of flowers and shrubs that are maintained?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the school compound protected well for the safety and health of the children?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the school buildings and classrooms in a good state of repair safe for children?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Does the school have a safe and comfortable playground or playing space for children?

8. Are toilet facilities generally maintained in a good condition?

9. Is the number of toilets enough for total number of children (if possible, in terms of gender-balance)?

10. Drinking water is available and a system is in place that ensures that children have continuous and hygienic access to the water as they need it.

11. Are there enough facilities to wash hands for children?

12. Is water used to wash available enough and clean?

13. Is there any visible evidence suggesting parental involvement in helping or volunteering around the school, or providing resources and repairs/maintenance? If yes, provide examples below:

Additional comments/observations:

**Annex 7.2: Interview question guide for TEO officers, head teachers, cluster heads, head monks, etc.**

In your opinion, was SITE based on a planning process that enabled teacher needs in your township to be first clearly identified, prioritised, and then specifically addressed? Explain how was this achieved? (H1)

What are the prioritized learning needs of your teachers? What are the prioritised learning needs of your students? Does SITE address these needs? (H2)

To what extent is SITE coordinated as a whole school approach in your township? Can you give examples of this whole school approach? (H3)

In your opinion, how supportive are the SITE learner-centric pedagogies of the local/national examination system? (H4)

What, if any, have been the unintended consequences of SITE, particularly on teaching methods and school performance? (H5)

Is there capacity and interest for SITE activities in your township to be continued following the end of QBEP? (H6)

In your opinion, what is the overall concept and rationale for SITE? (H7)

Apart from teacher training, what other things can have an effect on the teaching effectiveness of teachers? (H8)

Please describe how the teacher peer assessment has worked in your township. Has the head teacher or a teacher from outside of school sat in on classes and completed the assessment checklist? How is this checklist used to improve teaching? (H9)

Are there ways in which SITE activities can be improved to help you become a more effective teacher? (H10)
DOCUMENTATION/RECORDS
The evaluation team will need to sight and check the following:

- Records of the completed teacher Assessment Checklists, teacher journals, details of School Group Study meetings, Cluster meetings (times/dates/attendance for each),
- Details of classroom observations and assessment of teaching. (H10)

The Evaluation Team to make a brief summary and assessment of these documents/records.

Annex 7.3: Parent Group Discussion Checklist
(Group of 12-15)
Are parents involved in your school in any way? Please give examples. (P1)

Do you ever meet with the school principal and teachers? Please provide examples. (P2)

Do you think that parents should be involved in the school? Can you please give examples of how you think parents can be involved? (P3)

Is parent involvement encouraged by the school principal? (P4)

Is there a PTA at your school? What do you know about its activities? (P5)

Do you have any opinions on the teaching at your school? (P6)

Annex 7.4: Interview question guide for Parents Teacher Association (PTA)/School Committee / Board of Trustees (BOT)
Is there an active PTA/School Committee in your school? If yes, what are their activities and what has the PTA achieved? (PTA 1)

How often does the PTA/School Committee meet? (PTA 2)

Please describe who attends these meetings, and how the meetings are conducted. (PTA 3)

Apart from the PTA/School Committee, are parents active in the school in any other way? Please provide examples. (PTA 4)

In case of 2012 and 2013 cohort schools: Have there been any changes in how your school is managed since 2012/13 SITE implementation in your school? Please describe these changes and the benefits. (PTA 5)

What are the main challenges that the PTA/school committee faces in your school? Please give examples. (PTA 6)

Is there PTA/SC/BOT fund for your school? If yes, is it managed? (PTA 7)

Annex 7.5: Interview question guide for TEACHERS
Can you please describe how the SITE training cycle has operated in your school? (T1)

Please describe how the peer assessment works. Has the head teacher or a teacher from outside your school sat in on one of your classes and completed the assessment checklist? How was this checklist used to improve teaching? (T2)
Can you please show us your copy of the SITE Effective Teaching and Learning Module? Where is it usually kept? (T3)

In your opinion, have the SITE activities met your needs as a classroom teacher? Please give examples. (T4)

How supportive are the SITE learner-centric pedagogies of the local/national examination system? (T5)

Have the SITE monitoring and reporting tools provided you with useful feedback? If yes, please provide examples (T6)

Are there ways in which SITE activities can be improved to help you become a more effective teacher? (T7)

Apart from teacher training, what other things can have an effect on the teaching effectiveness of teachers? (T8)

What influence do examinations have on your teaching? (T9)

Is there an active PTA (SMC- School Management Committee in non-state school) in your school? If yes, what are their activities? Are any of these helpful in your role as a classroom teacher? (T10)

Are there any challenges you faced when engaging in SITE activities? If “Yes”, what are these? (T11)

What, if any, have been the indirect consequences of SITE, particularly on teaching methods and school performance? (T12)

Annex 7.6: CLASSROOM TEACHING OBSERVATION

Observer:                  Date:

School:                    Township:

Lesson start time:         Lesson end time:

Subject                   Grade:

No. of boys in class:      No. of girls in class:

No. of boys absent:        No. of girls absent:

Lesson topic:

Language(s) of instruction: 1. Myanmar 2. Local language only

3. Both

Comments:

Is the class taught multi-grade? 1. Yes 2. No

The following observations need to be made during the class, but not at the beginning.
At least 15-20 minutes of observation are required.

How are the students seated? (1-3 points, mark one only)
   1. Boys and girls sit together, no obvious separation by gender
   2. Boys and girls sit together but some grouping by gender.
   3. The classroom is very clearly separated by gender

How would you describe the learning intention? (1-5 points, mark one only)
   1. Teacher explains learning intention of lesson and monitors it throughout the lesson. Students understand learning intention. The learning intention is achieved.
   2. Teacher states learning intention of lesson and monitors it throughout the lesson. Students understand learning intention. Teacher monitors if learning intention is achieved.
   3. Teacher states the learning intention of lesson and monitors it throughout the lesson. Most students understand it. There is no monitoring and it is not clear if learning intention is achieved.
   4. The learning intention is not clear to the teacher or the students. Teacher does not monitor students learning. The learning intention is not achieved.
   5. The teacher has no learning intention for students.

How would you describe the lesson plan? (1-5 points, mark one only)
   1. Lesson plan is well structured and clear. Plan is followed throughout lesson.
   2. Teacher has clear lesson plan. Plan is followed throughout most of the lesson.
   3. Teacher has lesson plan. Teacher does not follow plan throughout lesson.
   4. Teacher has incomplete lesson plan. Teacher does not follow plan.
   5. Teacher has no lesson plan.

Use of teaching aids by teacher. (1-5 points, mark one only)
   1. Teacher uses teaching aids appropriately to support learning intentions.
   2. Teacher uses teaching aids, and they are related to learning intention.
   3. Teacher uses teaching aids, but they are not necessary. They do not effectively support the lesson.
   4. Teacher has chosen material that is inappropriate for the lesson. The material does not support the learning intention.
   5. Teacher does not use teaching aids when this would have been useful.

How would you classify the use of questions by the teacher? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
   1. Teacher questions individual students for various purposes - for example, checking students understanding and eliciting information from students.
   2. Teacher uses questions to check students understanding and follow up to student responses.
   3. Teacher asks questions to check students understanding but does not follow up the response.
   4. Teacher asks questions of the students, but the questions do not check understanding. Students are not given time to respond to questions completely.
   5. Teacher does not use questions.

How would you classify the use of learning materials by children? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
   1. All students use learning materials when necessary at their own initiative.
   2. All students have access to learning material to manipulate, but only use when
instructed to do so.
3. Most students have access to learning material sometimes.
4. Students rarely have access to learning material.
5. Students have no access to learning material they can manipulate.

What kinds of questions do children ask? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
1. Students ask questions for various purposes to teacher and other students. Students are supported in their questioning.
2. Students ask questions for help and clarification of other students or teacher.
3. Some students ask questions for help.
4. Students rarely ask questions to clarify instructions and task.
5. Students are not encouraged to ask questions.

How would you classify the involvement of the students in the lesson? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
1. Students are actively involved and enthusiastic.
2. Most students participate and are interested.
3. Some students are interested but do not participate actively in the lesson.
4. Some students participate some of the time, but most students are not motivated.
5. Students do not participate in the lesson. They are not motivated or interested.

How would you classify the feedback given to students during the lesson? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
1. Teacher gives students regular feedback on their progress in the lesson. The teacher monitors throughout the lesson for students understanding, adapting the delivery where appropriate.
2. Questions are used in class to find out what students have learned. Comments on students’ class work are made to give encouragement.
3. Teacher asks questions, but they do not always explain to students why their answers are good or not.
4. Teacher does not check for understanding during the lesson.
5. Students receive little or no feedback.

THE FOLLOWING ASSESSMENTS SHOULD BE MADE AFTER THE CLASS OBSERVATION

How would you classify the displays in the classroom? (1-5 Points, mark one only)
1. There are learning displays on the walls. Student work is displayed on walls in an organized and attractive way.
2. There are learning displays on the wall. Some student work is displayed on the walls.
3. There are some pictures and posters on the wall. There is no student work on the walls.
4. Few pictures on the walls.
5. There are no wall decorations.

General cleanliness and condition of classroom. (1-5 Points, mark one only)
1. Classroom is well maintained and very clean. Furniture in good condition.
2. Desks are classroom is clean, and in average condition. It appears that some maintenance is carried out.
3. The floor is clean and most desks are clean. Classroom is generally not well maintained.
4. There is some litter on the floor. Most desks are not clean and/or tidy.
5. Classroom generally appears dirty and poorly maintained.

General observations:
- Did the students react to the presence of an observer? How?
- What impression is there that the lesson observed was a ‘typical’ lesson? Reasons?
- Additional comments/observations.
Annex 8: Enhanced desk review

Annex 8.1 Enhanced desk review context and outcomes

The enhanced desk review is part of an evaluation of the School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) component of the Quality Basic Education Programme (QBEP). The evaluation will provide UNICEF and its partners with an objective assessment of SITE pilot activities to date. The enhanced desk review is intended to inform the evaluation planning and provide design inputs into the evaluation instruments. The specific objectives are as follows:

- Identify examples of similar teacher training modules currently in use in Myanmar and the region
- Analyse, compare, and contrast the similarities and differences in the identified approaches
- Document available evidence of “good practice” in the delivery of in-service teacher training
- Develop a list of criteria for assessing effectiveness of in-service training methodologies with input from national consultants
- Identify a criterion-based, purposive sample of sites to be visited during the evaluation with input from national consultants

The SITE model is based on the assumption that in-service training strengthens classroom teachers, promotes changes in classroom practices, and thus improves student learning. An important consideration is that teacher professional development does not occur in a vacuum, and there is a multitude of factors that may impact on training effectiveness, and ultimately what happens in classrooms.

The enhanced desk review will examine other in-service training approaches in Myanmar, Viet Nam, Indonesia, and Cambodia. The criteria used in selecting these countries included the availability of information, familiarity of the Technical Team with the countries selected, and a range of durations of engagement with modern in-service teacher training initiatives, with Indonesia having the longest engagement. Documents reviewed included published academic literature, donor reports, and project reports. From the original TOR, these were narrowed to allow a sharper focus within the confines of a 10-page report and to allow for the development of criteria to inform the evaluation methodology. From the documents reviewed a number of key themes were identified for closer critical review. The enhanced desk review will highlight similarities and differences, and from any ‘good practices’ identified, a list of key criteria will be produced for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training delivery.

Given the time constraints and length of the enhanced desk review report, it is not possible to provide individual detailed country overviews. The approach taken is to focus on distinctive characteristics of the teacher in-service training environment and particular initiatives in each country, and from these distil lessons that will guide the SITE evaluation planning process. Each country section highlights the particular teacher training initiatives that have been put in place and draws out the particular elements of effectiveness or weaknesses (as most relevant to the context) of these initiatives. By building on examples of good practice and challenges from Indonesia, Viet Nam, and Cambodia first, the review will then provide an overview of Myanmar last, in order that the lessons from other countries may be considered against the Myanmar context.
Annex 8.2: In-Service teacher training approaches in selected South East Asian Countries and Myanmar

Annex 8.2.1: Indonesia

Country education context and examples of teacher training initiatives

Key elements in reforms across the Indonesian education system are the KKG (Kelompok Kerja Guru) elementary school teacher clusters, and MGMP (Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran) secondary school subject teacher clusters. Within these clusters, teachers collaborate to prepare and deliver training and self-improvement activities within their schools. This concept dates back to the *Pemantapan Kerja Guru* (PKG) (Strengthening the Work of Teachers) system of in-service training in Indonesia. During the early 1990s, PKG was the largest teacher in-service/on-service initiative in the world. This tradition of collaboration where teachers meet in schools evolved from what was known as the *Sanggar Pemantapan Kerja Guru* (SPKG) system introduced on a trial system in 1982 with two SPKGs being set up in each province, and further centres being established in 1984. So as not to disrupt student timetables, school principals rescheduled timetables for participating teachers to allow one day free each week from teaching responsibilities.

Cluster activities focus on practical classroom lesson delivery rather than theoretical knowledge. Topics covered relate to the local context; provide grassroots support in the preparation of lessons and resources, and have the capacity to identify and provide on-going consultation and discussion for teachers requiring additional support. It also provides an opportunity to create and share teaching aids and other media for classroom teaching. Teachers also view clusters as an opportunity for training delivery, intensive capacity building, and formal guidance from government or donor-supported in-service training activities.

Drivers of the initiatives

These school-based activities stem from the concept that self-help is one of the best forms of support for the teacher professional development and it is key to note that these activities were driven by demand and not by supply. This demand came from the fact that these activities solved immediate classroom teaching challenges where, for example, teachers prepare collaboratively for lessons in the coming week. This demand-driven element also serves as a measure of the perceived usefulness of school-based activities amongst teachers.

Elements of effectiveness

There are two compelling outcomes of this approach. Firstly, we see an initiative translated into useful and sustainable teaching practices managed by teachers, and for administrators this transparency and sharing allows a clearer understanding of what is happening in classrooms. Secondly, the approach acknowledges and takes into account the worldview of teachers and responds to their particular context.

Diffusion and ability to scale up

Since the early 1990’s some donor-aided projects have picked up on strategies utilizing existing clusters, focussing not only on improving teaching methodologies but also school management and community support for schools. Since then this approach has become the main focus of government efforts to improve teaching quality in primary schools. Other donor-aided projects have focussed on working with district local governments with project components including district and school-based

---


55 Ibid (Monk & Dillon, 1995 and Pietersz, 1982).
management, community participation, and teacher training. District and school-based management components were designed to strengthen the capacity of local government and school principals to plan effectively, and manage and deliver quality basic education services.

Whole school approach
Teacher-training components trained teachers in active learning methodologies (known in Indonesia as PAKEM) and learning material development. These components are intended to be mutually reinforcing, and programs are delivered using a whole school approach.

Community participation
The community participation components strengthened the position and role of local stakeholders – parents, teachers, school committees, and community organizations – in planning and managing basic education.

Alignment with government policy
Over the past decade a number of development projects have replicated and further developed what is known as the Creating Learning Communities for Children (CLCC) approach, and have supported the government in its efforts to introduce PAKEM across the nation.56 57 These various project activities were well aligned with government policy and strategic plans, especially in the areas of improving the quality of teaching and learning, increasing the involvement of local communities in schools, improved governance and accountability through the strengthening of school committee capacity, and the increased availability of instructional materials.

Visible changes in the classroom
One of the most noticeable changes in many of the schools adopting these approaches, and a good indicator of improved teaching practices, are visible changes in classrooms.58 Although the schools and classrooms are not always in the best condition, they have been improved with minor repairs and painting. Classrooms also become a showcase for student work and teacher produced learning materials.

Weaknesses or gaps in the initiatives
Improving teaching practices system-wide in Indonesia is no easy task, however, especially in a system so vast and so diverse. In many cases, reforms have failed to be sustained and widely expanded beyond the life of projects.59 60 Notwithstanding all of the efforts to reform, the gap between policy and what happens in classrooms remains wide. The majority of classrooms and schools remain unchanged due to a number of factors that include:

i. Fragmented and rapidly changing education policy that at times is contradictory,
ii. Traditional Indonesian social and bureaucratic cultures that value traditional passive learning styles,
iii. An examination system that tends to reward the recall of facts and traditional chalk-and-talk learning approaches,
iv. A lack of technical capacity to adequately support teacher in-service resulting in the delivery of one-off training by poorly prepared trainers, and
v. Insufficient financial support for reforms.

---

Despite these challenges, and as a result of some of the activities described above, there can be found cases of very successful reform and good practice in schools and classrooms. However, the challenge remains in how to spread these reforms across such a large and diverse country.

Annex 8.2.2: Viet Nam

Country education context and examples of teacher training initiatives

While Viet Nam is one of the leading countries in South-East Asia in terms of the proportion of GDP allocated to education, (estimated to be one-fifth of the state budget)\(^{61}\), improvements in the quality of education have stagnated, and this is currently causing much public concern and debate. Contributing to this stagnation are inadequate governance systems, a slow-moving and very complicated bureaucracy, and inadequate accountability mechanisms. As a result, there is wide variation in educational practices throughout the country. Classroom teaching predominantly encourages students to adopt rote memorization and mastery of theory, and examinations rely almost entirely on the capacity of students to reproduce knowledge and skills. Some conditions reinforce this approach, including overloaded curricula and a cultural tradition of teachers being given unquestioned respect.

Over the past 20 years the chronological sequence of government education policy in Vietnam has been to: (i) increase and maintain enrolments, and free primary education; (ii) provide adequate numbers of teachers; (iii) the introduction of interventions to decrease the cost of schooling, (iv) provide school facilities and resources through minimum school standards; (v) upgrade teacher qualifications, provide in-service training, and develop teacher certification standards policies; and (vi) support full-day schooling and early childhood programs.\(^{62}\)

In 2012, national standards for secondary schools along with a national quality assessment process for school accreditation were introduced. However, in Viet Nam the implementation of national reform agendas can be very slow, especially at the provincial and district levels. Further compounding the problem is a lack of funding for reforms. For example, in major population centres where school enrolments are increasing rapidly, some schools have lost their previously awarded quality accreditation due to the lack of adequate classroom capacity to accommodate increasing student enrolments in line with the standards.

Drivers behind initiatives

In addition to teacher certification standards, a number of other demand-driven initiatives to professionalize the teaching force have been undertaken. These include awarding the title of “excellence” to teachers at the school, district, provincial, and national levels, and introducing regular demand-driven in-service teacher training. These demand-driven teacher training initiatives include: (i) asking teachers to choose a mix of compulsory and elective modules; (ii) providing training at a school or a cluster of schools with support from key teachers; (iii) providing extensive printed and IT-based materials to teachers for self-study; and (iv) offering a combination of face-to-face instruction, self-study, and classroom practice.\(^{63}\)

Weaknesses or gaps to initiatives

Lack of incentives: However, in Viet Nam the concept of pedagogical skills included in teacher standards still gives insufficient emphasis to and incentive for the application of improved teaching methodologies. The challenges in implementing effective mechanisms to implement national regulatory frameworks for reviews of teaching quality have not encouraged teacher compliance. Predominantly, academic qualifications are seen as the prime determinate of teaching quality, with


little attention be given to subject knowledge and classroom teaching skills. For example, in 2007, the government adopted a policy of linking teacher remuneration with qualifications, with teachers having higher qualifications being placed in higher salary scales. However, salaries were not linked to the competencies specified in the government standards. Also, the extent to which teacher training programs incorporate and reinforce the standards is unclear.\textsuperscript{64}

**Lack of whole school approach and weak community participation:** Viet Nam has made some progress towards improved governance in increasing the number of schools that prepare school development plans. However, the education system remains weak in leadership and accountability mechanisms. Traditionally there is a lack of interaction between principals and teachers, teachers and parents and parent-teacher associations lack capacity. Test scores have shown to be significantly higher in schools where principals are more actively engaged in observing teachers. There is also evidence that community involvement improves student performance.\textsuperscript{65} This involvement includes parent and wider community contributions and donations for minor repairs and helping in the school. The frequency that head teachers meet with parents has also been positively correlated with student achievement. In schools where these elements are in place, there can be noticeable improvements in classroom-learning environments with, for example, wall displays, and alternative student seating arrangements.\textsuperscript{66}

**Weak understanding of initiatives:** Widespread stakeholder understanding and engagement has been lacking in a lot of the government policy initiatives in improving classroom-teaching practices.\textsuperscript{67} Additionally, policy conceptual and theoretical frameworks can be contradictory and lacking in clarity. These issues may become critical as the government prepares for the implementation of new curricula and textbooks in selected schools after 2016. Compounding these challenges is a lack of clarity and understanding in reforms by stakeholders at various levels and within teacher professional development departments. Often the teacher development instructors are not familiar with school curriculum, and there is no long-term planning for in-service training delivery. The top-down approach does not take into account teacher needs in the areas of travel times required to attend courses, and lack attendance flexibility to fit in with teaching demands.\textsuperscript{68}

**Examination performance pressures and out of school tuition:** The competition to perform well in assessment is a distinctive feature of the Vietnamese education system and encourages students to become passive learners, with parents fearful of academic failure. Teachers are under constant pressure from parents and school principals to obtain high student pass rates. The overloaded curriculum and these examination performance pressures have encouraged a booming industry of “extra-study” classes that are very profitable for teachers. Even though they are technically illegal, these classes have become such a prominent feature of the education system that they are now considered by many, especially parents, to be almost as significant as the formal school system.\textsuperscript{69}

### Annex 8.2.3: Cambodia

**Country education context and examples of teacher training initiatives**

Cambodia has a history of policy fragmentation and lack of full implementation of programs that stems from that fact that between 1994 and 1999 over 50 per cent of the education budget came from

---
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outside sources and time limited project interventions. Over the past decade, this situation has improved.

A 2013 census conducted by the government found that of all teaching staff in Cambodia (primary and secondary) one in every eight had a degree, which was a dramatic improvement over the figures from previous years. However a third of teachers have not completed High School, and this poses significant challenges in lifting teaching quality. Understandably then, the recent history of education policy and aid to Cambodia has been directed to the retraining of unqualified teachers rather than providing resources for schools. In many cases, programmes have not been fully implemented due to the lack of infrastructure and the competing demands of basic education and technical and vocational skills.

**Drivers of initiatives**
Teacher in-service training programs are largely driven by imperatives such as the introduction of a new curriculum or textbooks, and generally programs do not have national coverage and are organised at the provincial level attended by the lead teacher who is expected to replicate the training via a cascade model. Nationally there is not in place any systematic or strategic implementation of in-service training. On the other hand, at the school level, regular teacher ‘technical meetings’ focusing on teaching methodology issues are commonplace and appreciated by primary and lower secondary teachers. In these meetings, teachers have an opportunity to interact with their other teachers to improve their mastery of the content and skills of the subjects they teach.

As with what occurs in Indonesia, often these ‘technical meetings’ are teacher driven without any external support, and in an environment where there are a supportive school principal and local community.

**Weaknesses or gaps in initiatives**
Cambodian classroom teaching remains didactic and focused on rote learning. In 2005, the government introduced the principles of “Child Friendly Schooling” that included a range of elements including “the child’s own ability to understand and know, academically effective, well organized and managed, involved with families and communities”, as the new guiding principle for classroom pedagogy. However, there is limited quantitative data available on the teaching and learning practices in Cambodian classrooms to verify any impact from these reforms. Further, the expectations in teacher classroom performance were not well supported by the modernization of the pre-service and in-service teacher training activities.

**Lack of whole school approach and weak understanding of initiatives:** The government has made efforts to improve parental participation and community monitoring of schools to improve educational quality based on approaches used in the World Bank funded Education Quality Improvement Project school grants program. A school financial planning and accountability system for school operating budgets was introduced by the government that involved parents and community management. Subsequent surveys have revealed that in the main, parents have had little involvement in school management. Similarly, parent-teacher contact is rare, and meetings with school principals are even less frequent, as are parent meetings with school committee members. Social accountability mechanisms established at schools to monitor school operational funds spending are

---

not considered to be very effective, particularly in small schools.\textsuperscript{75} Parental, community, school committee and teacher knowledge of reform programs are generally very limited.

**Lack of incentives for teachers:** Teachers are underpaid and operate with limited resources. Most schools work a split-shift system, with children attending either in the morning or the afternoon. Class sizes are large, and schools are poorly resourced. Many teachers earn extra income by providing supplementary classes; often with the same students and in the same classrooms after the official school day finishes. These activities will obviously compete with opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development outside of school hours. Similar conditions occur in the countries reviewed where teachers are forced to earn extra income, and the result is a lot of in-service training initiatives are 'blunted on the classroom door’ and nothing changes.

**Annex 8.2.4: Myanmar**

**Country education context and government education policies**

A Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) published in March 2013 reported that teacher education in Myanmar is generally characterised by a system where teaching competency is not recognised, with inadequate teaching practice before qualifying, a lack of comprehensive teacher education policy, and all underlined by weak implementation of official directives. The government plans to put in place an overarching education sector reform policy and strategy that focuses on expanding the quantity and quality of education and that recognises the complementary roles of the government, private sector and non-government sectors in service provision.

A result from the CESR was an initial draft of the “National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-21 for Teacher Education and Management” (Sub-sector Report No. 5) in July 2015, which identified the MOE stated transformational shift to achieve interactive teaching methodologies in classrooms with the aim of improving student learning by 2021. The NESP Teacher Education and Management Sub-sector Report also states that the National Education Law (2014, amended 2015) is intended to provide a clear national framework for progressive, integrated teacher and student-centred reforms.\textsuperscript{76} However the NESP and amended Education Law were highly contentious and lacked sufficient clarity, particularly in the areas of reforms required in teacher pedagogic knowledge, skills, and classroom teaching practices.\textsuperscript{77}

In the current Myanmar context, growth in the non-government sector of provision of basic education is seen to address the crosscutting issues of inclusion, equity, gender and quality in education, especially at primary level. Monastic schools provide basic education especially for underprivileged children in supplementing the country’s needs. The monastic school system currently operates over 1,700 schools catering for over 300,000 children.\textsuperscript{78} In these schools, the same government curriculum is used. Non-state schools run by semi-autonomous ethnic administrations in some of Myanmar’s ethnic states (e.g. the Mon National Education Committee – MNEC; and Karen Education Department – KED) are administered as alternative education systems that are closely linked to ethnic identity. Teachers in those non-state schools with ethnic administration receive most of their training from NGOs. Teachers from mixed schools in some ethnic regions that are co-managed with the government go through government training.

**Examples of teacher training initiatives**

In a time of rapid political change, in which the government is opening up to greater external exposure, there is an increasing opportunity for untrained teachers from state and non-state schools to receive

\textsuperscript{75} Changing Pedagogies: Vietnamese Case from International Perspectives. HCMC University of Education, 2013.
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training delivered under different training programmes and projects with support from the Ministry of Education, UNICEF, Myanmar Education Consortium (MEC), Monastic Education Development Group (MEDG), INGOs, NGOs and CBOs. Examples include (i) the Ministry of Education’s four-year nationwide child-centred approach (CCA) teacher training project (from 2012-2013 to 2015-2016)\(^{79}\); (ii) MEC’s complementary education project “Support to strengthening monastic education in Myanmar” (2013-2015) in which 1408 teachers have been trained in child centred teaching methods, as of February 2015\(^{80}\); and (iii) the Adventist Development Relief Association (ADRA) Myanmar’s “Support for education in post conflict south-eastern Myanmar” (2013), which was an initial one year pilot project in which teacher training sessions (training of trainers) of a comprehensive student-centred curriculum were conducted on 92 project sites for 2404 teachers within a time frame of three months (June to October 2013)\(^{81}\).

In this new context, in-service teacher training programmes implemented by both state and non-state sectors are seen to be more diverse and dynamic when compared to the original standardised practices of the Ministry of Education. The standardised mechanism includes offering theory-based in-service training certificate (teacher certificate or degree certificate) courses to state schoolteachers by educational institutes (education colleges and universities of education) and offering refresher courses. To improve this situation the UNESCO “Strengthening of Pre-service Teacher Education in Myanmar (STEM)”, which is in now in its early stages of implementation, has been designed to work with the Ministry of Education to address fundamentally important aspects of pre-service teacher education in the education colleges, including:

- A policy framework of pre-service teacher education and identification of standards for quality assurance;
- To improve a system of education colleges by restructuring and redesigning courses of teacher education and creating good networks to accumulate and share knowledge and experiences of all education colleges, and to develop institutional/management and human resource capacities of education colleges.

Other concerns, as the country expands the quantity and quality of education, are issues of enrolment, completion, drop-outs, over-age children and out-of-school children especially at the primary level, alongside the issue of many unqualified teachers in both state and non-state schools. Compounding these is the traditional didactic teaching approach encouraging students’ memorisation, recitation, and rote learning as well as student assessment overly dominated by tests and exams – which also needs to be addressed for future progress in quality of Myanmar basic education.

**Whole school approach**


---

79 Not available for the information on the size of the MOE’s nationwide CCA teacher training project.
The NESP Sub-sector Report No.5 points out the following three main sources of professional development identified in teacher development literature: “(i) External professional training provided by universities, education colleges, subject associations, inspectors and advisors, and private providers; (ii) School-based networks and clusters that support interaction between teachers to promote professional activity through face-to-face meetings and on-line dialogue; and (iii) School-based training where teachers work in self-study groups and receive feedback on their classroom teaching so that professional learning takes place through the sharing of dialogue with colleges within the school context.”

Based on this literature review, the key insight regarding training delivery approaches to date in Myanmar is that all programmes, except UNICEF’s School-based In-service Teacher Education (SITE) programme, are of the type where external professional training is provided by education colleges, the Department of Teacher Education and Training (DTET, previously the Department of Education Planning and Training), or private providers.

SITE adopts a school-based training approach (the blended learning approach combining head teacher organised school-based sessions, reading and reflection by teachers, and experiential learning). Teachers participating in the SITE training are from government schools, monastic schools, and non-state schools and include qualified government and daily wage teachers. The SITE approach intends to offer advantages in reducing delivery cost as well as the loss of teacher time normally associated with more traditional training events through “building on traditional workshop delivery modalities in providing extensive coaching and mentoring”. However, it is not clear from SITE documentation how the programme will reduce loss of teacher time and reduce delivery costs.

The Ministry of Education DTET has been implementing a four-year nationwide CCA teacher training project from 2012-2013 to 2015-2016. Nation-wide teacher training (in-service) for CCA is provided in all basic education schools at the primary level including monastic schools and private schools. The original base of this CCA training extension is from the JICA’s “Strengthening Child-Centred Approach Project” (2004 - 2011). There is no evidence to suggest that the CCA and SITE programmes are linked.

Under MEDG, untrained or undertrained primary teachers in monastic schools are currently trained through the Yaung Zin competency-based teacher training programme, which consists of eight modules. The programme is not directly linked to SITE but does share similarities in its approach to teacher training. The programme considers trainees in applying to be assessed for the Yaung Zin Certificate of Competence after some months of teaching in their school and working with their mentor. The content of training modules employed in the programme is quite similar to UNICEF SITE’s module content and how similar is seen in table below.

Table: Similarities and dissimilarities between SITE’s training module83 (effective teaching and learning) and MEDG’s Yaung Zin training module84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Yaung Zin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional practice</strong></td>
<td>Reflective practice</td>
<td>Professional development and the reflective practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ basic skills</strong></td>
<td>Development of students’ basic skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and learning objectives</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum and learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and learning strategy</strong></td>
<td>Child friendly schools; Child friendly teaching and learning practices (Active</td>
<td>Teaching and learning strategies; Learning needs and learning styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82 NESP, Teacher Education and Management Sub-sector Report No. 5, 2015, p. 18.
83 Source: Study Guide for Effective Teaching and Learning (SITE module).
### Lesson plan
- Learning through interaction and collaboration

### Learning assessment
- Assessing learning

### Teaching and learning materials
- Learning materials
- Teaching and learning aids

### Classroom management
- Classroom management

### Parents and community
- Working with parents and the community

### Module learning assessment to trainees
- Module learning evaluation

### The term represented the training programme
- “competency-based”
- “Competency-oriented”

---

Based on the findings from the reports “Midterm Review of the Quality Basic Education Programme in Myanmar” (July, 2015) and “MDG Report Myanmar” (2013), CESR Phase 2 Technical Annex on Secondary Teacher Education, and Continuing Professional Development” (2014) as well as from the overview of the content of the other three countries considered in this enhanced desk review (Indonesia, Viet Nam and Cambodia), it has been found that areas to focus on to evaluate effectiveness of teacher training initiatives are: (i) working environments that are encouraging and supporting for teachers to apply properly what they learned in trainings to the classroom practice in sustainable action; (ii) nation-wide clear concepts of expected student learning achievement and outcomes, and teachers’ pedagogic knowledge and skill competency that match the expectations from students; and (iii) a whole school approach needed to support improvements in classroom practices.

Helping teacher educators and teachers transform classroom talk from the familiar rote, recitation and exposition to include a wider repertoire of dialogue and discussion in whole class, group-based and one-to-one interactions will require providing INSET (in-service teacher education and training) in alternative classroom interaction and discourse strategies that are more child-focused and dialogic in nature.\(^8^5\)

To summarise, Myanmar exhibits a number of characteristics found in the other countries reviewed, included changing and fragmented education policy, lack of technical capacity to support effective in-service training, insufficient financial resources to support reform, and a complicated bureaucracy coupled with inadequate accountability mechanisms. The following section will examine more closely the similarities and differences across the countries reviewed, and identify key criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service teacher training that will inform planning of the SITE evaluation.

---

**Annex 8.2.5: Similarities and differences**

Across the countries reviewed, teacher in-service implementation strategies are generally prescriptive and top-down, assuming compliance and commitment from teachers to changing working practices and educational goals. There is insufficient attention given to understanding the motivation, capabilities and beliefs of teachers. Consequently, teachers invariably find themselves teaching in the same way that they have done prior to engaging in professional development activities.

However, in all of the countries reviewed it is possible to find small pockets and even individual schools where the reform of teaching practices has been successful. Common across these examples are strong elements and encouragement of local ownership by classroom teachers and the wider

---
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Community. These have avoided the mistakes of top-down approaches where the innovations were imposed on teachers with little, if any, opportunity for individual input.

The pressures of testing exist across all the countries discussed, however, it is probably most prominent in Viet Nam. There can be significant influence from examinations and the curriculum on the activities and beliefs of teachers. While teachers may understand and agree with improved teaching methods, in practice they will adopt more didactic methods. This places teachers in the very unenviable situation of realising the cognitive benefits of alternative teaching practices, but at the same time they are under pressure to have students perform well in examinations that require factual recall and routine calculations. Coupled with these constraints are the opportunities for teachers to derive income from "extra-classes" that further detracts from the motivation to engage in professional development activities, especially as improvements in teaching effectiveness generally do not provide additional income.

Common across the countries examined are challenges in implementing national reform agendas. Indonesia has some advantage over the others with its longer history of reform, and Myanmar with its very short history of reform is probably the most vulnerable. A critical lesson in reform is that while initially the imperative is on improving infrastructure and resources towards providing more classrooms and student access, this is often at the expense of improving what is actually happening in classrooms and the broader school environment. Often success is measured for example on how many student textbooks and teacher guides were distributed and new classrooms constructed. However more sustainable results, albeit at a slower rate of reform, are characterised by whole school approaches where teachers are actively supported by the school principal, other teachers, and the wider community.

Most prominent in Cambodia, but occurring in other countries as well and possibly a risk for Myanmar as it embarks on reform, is the phenomena where gains can be made in time limited project funded activities that subsequently collapse, or at least plateau, once funding ceases. In Indonesia, a number of development projects over the past decade have further developed the CLCC methodology and supported the government in its efforts to introduce PAKEM nationally. Significant in this success, and an important lesson, are the origins of CLCC, in that in 1999 it started as a small pilot project that was gradually scaled up. This ensured that the inputs into individual schools were sufficient to facilitate whole school development, and involved enough personnel to provide critical mass for sustainable changes.

Annex 8.3: Key criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training

By not taking into account factors such as the complexity of school environments and teacher resistance to new initiatives, teacher professional development is unlikely to be successful. Modern approaches to teacher development view teachers as learners who have an active role in professional development and acknowledge the importance of teachers’ beliefs and feelings, their economic and social situation, and the impacts of educational and administrative contexts. This is in contrast to earlier approaches where the premise adopted was that clearly identifiable teaching skills were able to produce specific student learning outcomes, ignoring the complexity of school and classroom environments, and the wider contextual setting.

The adoption of this conceptualization of teacher professional development can be seen in what can be broadly categorized as whole school approaches. This approach is evident in some of the initiatives in the countries reviewed here including CLCC and PAKEM in Indonesia, "Child Friendly Schooling" in Cambodia, and the Myanmar Quality Basic Education Program (QBEP).

---

Central to the evaluation of improved teaching methods is that these must be observable in classrooms, and entail changes in teacher thinking and attitudes. In adopting a whole school approach in support of these changes in classrooms, the broader supportive school and community environment must also display clearly observable elements linked to improved teaching practices.

The following criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training are distilled from the lessons learnt from the above discussion, in addition to the Technical Team’s insights and reviews of initiatives in the four countries reviewed.

**Activities need to be well aligned with government policy that implicitly supports improvements in classroom teaching methods**

This is especially important in the areas of improving classroom-teaching practices. Coupled with this should be supportive policy covering involvement of local communities in schools, improved governance and accountability through the strengthening of school committee capacity, and the increased availability of instructional materials and other resources in classrooms.

This alignment with government policy is most pronounced in Indonesia, which has a longer history of modern teacher development reform than the other countries reviewed. Successes in donor-aided projects since the 1990’s have informed government policy making in Indonesia, and as more activities are implemented this alignment has increased. This is due to the fact a number of the teacher in-service initiatives undertaken were of a manageable size, not entirely focussed on large components of infrastructure that tend to distract from teaching-learning activities, and were able to very clearly demonstrate quite dramatic changes in classroom practices. Similar examples can be found in Cambodia with, for example, the World Bank funded Education Quality Improvement Project and other initiatives with similar objectives. However, in both countries, challenges remain in implementing national policy and implementation.

**Visible changes in schools and classrooms**

Without exception, sustainable improved classroom teaching practices are accompanied by visible changes in the physical appearance schools and what happens in classrooms. This does not necessarily imply significant investment in infrastructure, but more in the areas of minor improvements, often supported by the local community and parents. For example, classrooms being painted in bright, light colours, gardens, and other improvements enhancing the school environment. Most importantly classrooms will display learning materials, and student work, and there may be alternative student seating arrangements encouraging less teacher centred learning approaches.

These sorts of improvements are well documented in evaluations of activities such as the Managing Basic Education Project (MBE) in Indonesia between 2003 and 2007, Decentralised Basic Education (DBE1 and DBE2) projects from 2005 to 2011, and the subsequent Prioritizing Reform, Innovation, and Opportunities for Reaching Indonesia’s Teachers, Administrators, and Students (PRIORITAS) project. Limited evidence of these types of improvements can be found in evaluations of externally funded projects in Cambodia and Viet Nam, where the focus is often on training and resources to increase student enrolments with little focus on what actually occurs in classrooms when teachers return from in-service training. In documenting project “success”, the focus has often been on the number of teachers trained and teaching/learning packages delivered to schools.
Well sequenced and coordinated whole school approach

Improved classroom practices do not occur in isolation, and must be supported by appropriate school environments. Whole school approaches have been implemented in Indonesia, Myanmar and Cambodia, but are less common in Viet Nam. In Myanmar, the whole school approach called the Child Friendly School concept was introduced with the support of UNICEF in selected schools in 2001 as an approach to whole school transformation for improving school effectiveness. This approach has since been adopted as a part of a government strategy for improving education quality, however, it has not been introduced nationally despite some promising results.

In considering whole school initiatives, reviews of initiatives across Indonesia, Cambodia, and Myanmar showing improved classroom teaching practices have demonstrated improvements in some specific areas as follows. In evaluating specific initiatives, schools showing progress in all of these areas are more likely to demonstrate improved teaching practices.

- **Improved school management:** This support is demonstrated by district officials and school principals being able to clearly articulate good management practices including, for example, school strategic plans and identification of the short- to long-term needs and priorities of the school. School principals can demonstrate a good grounding in classroom teaching practices, evaluation processes, and incentives. Principals are comfortable with community involvement in the school.

- **Active parental participation:** Levels of involvement may vary, but are evidenced by involvement in activities such as volunteer teacher-aids, minor school repairs, the supply of teaching aids, or very basic activities such as cleaning classrooms periodically.

- **Engaged school committees:** School committees play a useful role in school management, which is a good measure of community support and enthusiasm for schools. Good indicators of the effectiveness of these committees include transparency and communication with the broader school community, gender balance across a representative cross section of the community, and the inclusion of teachers.

- **Clear and focused conceptual framework:** To support improvements in classroom teaching practices, there must exist a clear and focused conceptual framework that links all elements of the whole school approach. Most important is that this framework is well understood and able to be clearly articulated by all stakeholders at all levels, including teachers. For example, stakeholders can clearly articulate the purpose, coordination sequencing of the initiative, and map out what was expected currently and in the future.

Wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms

In a broader context, teacher employment conditions will have a critical impact on teacher effectiveness in classrooms, and across all four countries reviewed there is a need for governments to consider alternative approaches to accreditation, and mechanisms for providing rewards and incentives linked to improved qualifications, participation in professional development and improved classroom teaching practices. What is generally lacking across these countries are clear and comprehensive “roadmaps” in policy development and facilitation of the necessary organizational mandates required for institutionalisation of these processes, or if they are in place, effective implementation is lacking. This challenge is complex in that teacher salaries and conditions are usually a component of a broader public service salary scale and thus cannot usually be treated in isolation.

In the absence of adequate policy frameworks covering teacher working conditions and salaries there is the long-term risk that teacher development activities and the allocation of staff incentives will become increasingly wasteful of resources due to poor targeting and ineffective strategic planning. Another important consideration for policy in the education sector is attention to assessments of student learning and the provision of targeted relevant and high-quality professional development.
Lack of policy in these areas is manifested across all the countries reviewed in activities such as “extras-classes” to supplement teacher incomes, absenteeism, and low teacher commitment to professional development due to the lack of appropriate incentives.

**Annex 8.4: Conclusion**

The above discussion highlights the role of whole school approaches as an integral component of sustainable school based in-service teacher training. Four broad categories of criteria are identified for assessing the effectiveness of in-service teacher training. Central to any evaluation of improved teaching methods are observable changes in classrooms that entail changes in teacher thinking and attitudes, and these changes are supported by clearly observable elements in the broader school and community environment. It is this rationale and approach that will inform the SITE evaluation strategy and methods.

**Annex 8.5: Enhanced desk review references**


Annex 9: Detailed sampling strategy

Annex 9.1: Sampling strategy
The enhanced desk review identifies four broad categories of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of in-service training as follows:

1. Activities that are well aligned with government policy that implicitly support improvements in classroom teaching methods;
2. Visible changes in schools and classrooms;
3. Well sequenced and coordinated whole school approaches that encompass elements of:
   a. Improved school management
   b. Active parental participation
   c. Engaged school committees
   d. A clear and focused conceptual framework; and
4. Wider influences on teacher effectiveness in classrooms.

How the team has arrived at these categories, as well as more detail on the categories themselves, is given in the enhanced desk review. Further details on specific evaluation categories, and how these will be measured in practice, is given in the draft field tools, which were developed alongside the Inception Report.

The tight timeframe in which to conduct the field-work, combined with issues of logistics and accessibility has meant that the sample of schools will need to be relatively small. Given this small sample number, the complex and multi-faceted environment in which school-based teacher development occurs (see the enhanced desk review for a more detailed explanation) and the lack of
independently verified quantitative data available against which SITE activities and results can be judged, the evaluation methodology will be qualitative. The evaluation will be based on evidence from document reviews, interviews, observations and discussions, and the collective experience of the team members.

The prime advantage in using this approach is the richness of data provided. However, observation and interview techniques can be time-consuming. Once processed, opportunities will be investigated to triangulate this data with qualitative and quantitative data from other sources. Although it was made clear during the Reference Group meeting that an additional seven townships from Kayah (using the whole state approach) have since been included, the sample frame used here includes only the 17 townships in the five States and Divisions (Mandalay, Shan, Magway, Sagaing, and Mon) stated in the TOR. It proposed to sample eight townships across Sagaing, Mandalay, Shan North, Mon, and Yangon. The township selection includes State and monastic schools, schools with high and low SITE examinations results, areas of ethnic and religious diversity, a mix of socio-economic circumstances, areas with vulnerable populations such as internally displaced people (IDPs), and conflict areas. Two non-SITE townships are included. In the absence of a SITE design document with further detail on rationale for selection of SITE townships, the evaluation selection was initially developed to incorporate as many different types of township as logistically possible within the time available, and in line with the November-December 2015 SITE training schedule, which will also allow direct observation in trainings alongside further interviews and discussions. However, recent discussion with a UNICEF member of the SITE programme revealed that there would be no trainings taking place in November, during the field work period, and that all trainings had been shifted to December, although at the time of contact no exact dates had yet been set. Therefore, training observations will no longer form part of the fieldwork schedule.

The original intention was to include a ninth sample site, Namsang South in Shan State (South). However, having been informed by the Township Education Officer of heavy gun fighting in this area, it was decided to remove this site from the sample. The evaluation team considered replacing this site with another township that shared the characteristics of Namsang South, namely that it contained cohorts from 2012 and 2013, ethnic minorities, and conflict schools. However, as Kut Kai Township in Shan North shares the same characteristics, it was felt that the removal of Namsang South would not result in a loss of relevant data. Furthermore, by removing Namsang South from the sample selection, the team will be able to spend more time in each of the other sites thereby improving the quality and depth of overall data collection. This rationale was shared with UNICEF and tentative approval was given to pursue this revised strategy.

The detailed sampling strategy per location to be visited is provided in the table below, including detail on the rationale for selection, stakeholders targeted, evaluation criteria applied, and evaluation activities. Further detail on numbers of respondents and interviews to be targeted is provided in the Inception Report and detailed Field Work Schedule. After meeting with the Reference Group in Nay Pyi Taw on 30 October 2015, it was made clear that they were keen to include both students and parents beyond members of parent teacher associations as relevant stakeholders.

Annex 9.2: Evaluation strategy constraints

It is recognised that there are a number of limitations and risks in the methodology adopted. Given the scale and geographic spread of the SITE activities, the evaluation timeframe and budget does not provide sufficient time and human resources to undertake a broader coverage or more in-depth analysis. Consequently, the sample of townships and schools selected is small, and cannot be considered random. Coupled with this, although a variety of townships and schools are selected, some types within the SITE project may be underrepresented. However, in order to mitigate these factors, the criteria for selecting the sample sites were developed so that as broad a representation of
townships as feasible were able to be chosen, and this strategy is consistent with the stated aim in the TOR of identifying a "criterion-based purposeful sample of sites".

It is also the case that in the absence of a detailed SITE design document and independently verified quantitative data that SITE can be quantitatively evaluated against, the quantitative element of the evaluation is likely to be very small, and focused solely on desk evaluation of any available quantitative data.

While these limitations do exist and are not easily mitigated, the qualitative data from the selected sites will identify indicative findings and trends. The key here will be in the data analysis and identification of findings across similar and/or different school and township settings and possible causal factors. If strong trends exist across the sample sites, then it would be safe to extrapolate these to other sites, or at the very least use these findings as a focus for further investigation.

Stakeholders will also be expecting the evaluation team, and they can be expected to be very prepared for the visit. In areas such as classroom observations, this may have some impact on what is observed. This factor can be addressed by the experience of the evaluation team members, and here the observation checklist asks specifically, in the opinion of the evaluation team member conducting the evaluation, “what impression is there that the lesson observed was a ‘typical’ lesson?”.
## Annex 9.3: Detailed SITE sampling strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location types</th>
<th>State and township</th>
<th>Rationale for selection</th>
<th>Targeted stakeholders</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent teacher association (PTA) member/s, non-PTA member parents</td>
<td>• Active parental participation and engaged PTA.</td>
<td>Focus group discussions. Number of discussions TBD at detailed field schedule stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head monk, school principal, teachers, students</td>
<td>• Visible changes in schools and classrooms. • Articulate &amp; demonstrate good school management practices. • Explore wider influences on teacher effectiveness.</td>
<td>(i) Classroom and general school observation, (ii) key informant interviews with (a) school principal/head monk and (b) teacher of classroom observed. Number of interviews TBD at detailed field schedule stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of QBEP's School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location types</th>
<th>State and township</th>
<th>Rationale for selection</th>
<th>Targeted stakeholders</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Comparison Township** | Mandalay, Kyaukse | MOE’s CCA teaching training Project (2012-2016) schools. Monastic Education Development Group (MEDG)’s competency-based teacher training programme. | TEO officers, cluster heads, head teachers | • Articulate and demonstrate good school management practices.  
• Explore wider influences on teacher effectiveness. | Key informant interviews with (i) TEO officer, (ii) head teachers, and (iii) cluster heads. Number of interviews TBD at detailed field schedule stage. |
| | Yangon, Than Lyin | MOE’s CCA teaching training Project (2012-2016) schools. Monastic Education Development Group (MEDG)’s competency-based teacher training programme. | Parent teacher association (PTA) member/s, non-PTA member parents | • Active parental participation and engaged PTA. | Focus group discussions. Number of discussions TBD at detailed field schedule stage. |
| | | | School principal, teachers, students head monk, teachers, students | • Visible changes in schools & classrooms.  
• Articulate and demonstrate good school management practices.  
• Explore wider influences on teacher effectiveness. | (i) Classroom and general school observation, (ii) key informant interviews with (a) school principal/head monk and (b) teacher of classroom observed. Number of interviews TBD at detailed field schedule stage. |
### Annex 10: QBEP log frame

#### PROGRAMME TITLE
**Quality Basic Education Programme (QBEP), 2012-2015**

#### GOAL/IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased number and proportion of children in Myanmar accessing and completing quality basic education</td>
<td>Net primary enrolment rate nationally (by sex)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Ministry of Education EMIS data, MICS, IHLCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate to grade 5 nationally (by sex)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Ministry of Education EMIS data, Programme M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OUTCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased number and proportion of children accessing and completing quality basic education in targeted townships</td>
<td>Net primary enrolment rate in targeted townships (by sex)</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>3%-points above baseline</td>
<td>6%-points above baseline</td>
<td>• The economic situation does not deteriorate drastically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate (by sex) to grade 3 in targeted townships</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate to grade 5 (by sex) in targeted townships</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>5%-points above baseline</td>
<td>5%-points above baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Data on survival rate at national level may be delayed each year depending on the MOE calculation process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

87 Data on survival rate at national level may be delayed each year depending on the MOE calculation process.

88 If reliable population estimates are not available, the number of enrolled students will be used to assess progress in enrolment in targeted townships and the milestone 2 will be an increase of 1 per cent and the target in 2015/16 an increase of 2 per cent compared to the baseline in 2011/12. National data is 84 per cent for NER.

89 Survival rate to grade 3 and 5 will be calculated using the reconstructed cohort method with the underlying data taken from the routine EMIS. National data is 74 per cent for grade 5.

90 Data will be taken from the routine EMIS.
### Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

#### Ministry of Education EMIS data; programme surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of grades 3 and 5 students (by sex) achieving the minimum (50%) competency(^\text{91}) in standardized maths and Myanmar language tests</td>
<td>To be determined(^\text{92})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% Mathematics 50% Myanmar Language(^\text{93})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Standardized tests administered at baseline and end of programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of new entrants in grade 1 with prior ECD experience in targeted QBEP townships (^\text{94})</td>
<td>To be determined(^\text{95})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%-points above baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>UNICEF monitoring and survey data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS (US$)</th>
<th>TOTAL(^\text{96}) (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF Share (%)</th>
<th>MDEF (US$)</th>
<th>MDEF Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,957,411/-</td>
<td>14,156,100/-</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>51,801,041/-</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{91}\) Minimum competency level expected is at least 50 per cent score (out of possible 100 per cent) in a standardized learning achievement test.

\(^{92}\) Baseline survey will be conducted in February 2012. No national data exist.

\(^{93}\) MDEF 1 learning achievement result for language was 59 per cent for mathematics 21 per cent.

\(^{94}\) This will be taken from the school survey conducted together with learning achievement tests.

\(^{95}\) This will be determined through the learning achievement baseline survey in February 2012. MICS data (2009/10) is 39.8 per cent.

\(^{96}\) Total programmable amount excludes 7 per cent recovery cost.
## Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

### OUTPUT 1

|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Expansion of coverage of quality ECD services | Number of 0-5 year old children in targeted townships\(^\text{97}\) accessing facility-based ECD services\(^\text{98}\) | To be determined | 20,000 | 40,000 | 70,000 | 85,000 | • Policy climate favourable for proposed changes  
• Government approves policy development process  
• If multi-sector plan agreed, System for targeting mapping and provision of integrated ECD services by concerned ministries to be developed by 2015.  
• Improved school readiness and retention. |

**Source**  
Partners’ data & UNICEF monitoring reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of schools in targeted townships with ECD facilities for 3-5 year olds  (^\text{99})</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of school-based ECD facilities that meet minimum quality standards in targeted townships</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**  
TEMIS; UNICEF and partner monitoring reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sector ECD national action plan/ policy in place</td>
<td>Policy framework designed</td>
<td>Policy drafted</td>
<td>Action plan drafted</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral five year ECD National policy in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**  
Government plans; UNICEF reports

### IMPACT WEIGHTING

---

\(^{97}\) Only selected villages in the targeted townships will be selected. Since population sizes at village levels are not available, the number of children reached will be monitored.

\(^{98}\) It includes school- and community-based ECD facilities, which includes mother circles; however parenting education is not included due to measurement difficulties. MICS data for 3-5 attendance is 22.9 per cent.

\(^{99}\) National data is 6.6 per cent of schools with preschool classroom.
**Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS (US$)</th>
<th>TOTAL (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF Share (%)</th>
<th>MDEF (US$)</th>
<th>MDEF Share (%)</th>
<th>RISK RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,659,700/-</td>
<td>2,624,370/-</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8,035,330/-</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTPUT 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved quality of teaching and learning practices in basic education in targeted Townships in Government and Monastic schools and in both mono-grade and multi-grade schools.</strong></td>
<td>% of primary teachers applying improved teaching methods as defined by classroom observation criteria</td>
<td>To be determined&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and human resource capacity of implementing partners meet the scope of the programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

Baseline and end of programme surveys; UNICEF monitoring; both using classroom observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-service teacher education framework developed and operationalised in targeted education colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive assessment report of 2 ECs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of primary teachers receiving face-to-face and distance learning in-service training (INSET)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Face-to-face: 8250 teachers</td>
<td>Face-to-face: 8250 teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>100</sup> Baseline was conducted in October 2011. Reports will be ready in early 2012.
### Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in targeted township provided with essential supplies and textbooks, (including humanitarian support to border areas).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>620,000 students receive supplies</td>
<td>632,000 students receive supplies</td>
<td>645,000 students receive supplies</td>
<td>658,000 students receive supplies 1.1 Mio (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>UNICEF M&amp;E and monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers trained to implement secondary life skills curriculum</td>
<td>3,900 teachers</td>
<td>10,800 teachers</td>
<td>To be determined (Baseline)</td>
<td>11,200 teachers</td>
<td>2,903 teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children (10-15 years) in school demonstrating correct information and skills to reduce risk including prevention of HIV/AIDS in targeted townships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000 teachers (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Baseline, and end of programme surveys; UNICEF monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT WEIGHTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INPUTS (US$)</td>
<td>TOTAL (US$)</td>
<td>UNICEF (US$)</td>
<td>UNICEF Share (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (US$)</td>
<td>30,759,052/-</td>
<td>7,916,450/-</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced planning, management, monitoring &amp; evaluation and mentoring capacity of key education actors at all levels</td>
<td>Proportion of schools with operationalized SSAs/SIPs in targeted townships</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>• MOE agreeing on ESR and committing to implementing the identified milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>UNICEF field monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of master trainers, head teachers and TEOs/Assistant TEOs trained on instructional leadership and management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 master trainers trained</td>
<td>32 TEOs/ Assistant TEOs trained</td>
<td>32 TEOs/ Assistant TEOs trained</td>
<td>96 TEOs/ Assistant TEOs trained (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 head teachers trained</td>
<td>1700 head teachers trained</td>
<td>1700 head teachers trained</td>
<td>3900 head teachers trained (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>TEMIS review, regular monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of townships with TEMIS fully operational</td>
<td>TEMIS partially operational in 3 townships</td>
<td>TEMIS partially operational in 5 townships</td>
<td>TEMIS partially operational in 8 townships</td>
<td>TEMIS fully operational in 8 townships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>TEMIS review, regular monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of townships with Township Education Plans according to agreed standards</td>
<td>0 townships</td>
<td>Strategy for development of township planning developed</td>
<td>10 townships</td>
<td>15 townships</td>
<td>25 townships (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

101 Townhip Education Plans should at least include simple diagnosis of problems, planned activities with cost estimates and strategies for mobilizing these resources.
# Evaluation of QBEP’s School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

## Township planning manual developed

**Source**

UNICEF field monitoring; commissioned studies

## IMPACT WEIGHTING

## RISK RATING

Low

## INPUTS (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF Share (%)</th>
<th>MDEF (US$)</th>
<th>MDEF Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,962,068/-</td>
<td>1,243,260/-</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1,718,808/-</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OUTPUT 4

### Enhanced coverage, quality and relevance of second chance, alternative education

- **Indicator:** Number of out-of-school aged 10-14 year-old children (by sex) enrolled in NFPE programme in targeted townships
- **Baseline:** 2011/12
- **Milestone 1:** 2012/13
- **Milestone 2:** 2013/14
- **Milestone 3:** 2014/15
- **Target:** 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>32,000 (Cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

Ministry of Education Reports, NFPE data, UNICEF M&E Reports

### Number of out-of-school adolescents aged 10-17 reached by EXCEL in targeted townships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>49,000 (Cumulative) (by sex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

Ministry of Education Reports, NFPE data, UNICEF M&E Reports

### Proportion of reached out-of-school adolescents completing EXCEL in targeted townships

- 85% of total reached learners complete full course

**Source**

Ministry of Education Reports, NFPE data, UNICEF M&E Reports

## Assumptions

- Policy on reintegration and equivalence is clarified
- Government allow more NGO partners implement NFPE
- Human resource capacity of MOE increased
## Evaluation of QBEP's School-based In-service Teacher Education Pilot Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National framework for Non Formal Education (NFE) equivalency and certification developed</td>
<td>Task force established &amp; functional</td>
<td>Agreed framework</td>
<td>Action plan</td>
<td>Evidence of framework with implementation plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK RATING</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS (US$)</th>
<th>TOTAL (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF (US$)</th>
<th>UNICEF Share (%)</th>
<th>MDEF (US$)</th>
<th>MDEF Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,373,318/-</td>
<td>1,023,020/-</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9,350,298/-</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>