

# **Rapid School Assessment**

## **Upper Secondary Education – Sector Development Project 2**

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH, & SPORT**

**Prepared by: KAMPUCHEAN ACTION TO PROMOTE EDUCATION**

**30 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	iii
<i>List of Tables</i>	iv
<i>Executive Summary</i>	v
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Background on the Project</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Purpose of the Rapid Assessment</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 General Considerations and Investigative Areas</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 Sample Construction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.3 Data Collection Methods</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.4 Data Management</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.5 Data Treatment</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1 Management &amp; Planning Issues</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1.1 Views about School Leadership	
3.1.2 Views about School Planning	
3.1.3 How Stakeholders Prioritize Issues in their Planning	
<b>3.2 School Perceptions and Concepts of Educational Quality/Services</b>	<b>11</b>
3.2.1 General Impressions about Quality among Stakeholders	
3.2.2 Issues Regarding Management of the Resource Centers	
3.2.3 Teacher Capacity Issues	
3.2.4 Life Skills and Career Counseling Services	
3.2.5 Issues Relating to Educational Inclusion	
<b>3.3 Enabling Environments</b>	<b>19</b>
3.3.1 Security Status and Utilities	
3.3.2 Science Lab Services	
3.3.3 Library Services	
3.3.4 ICT Lab Services	
3.3.5 Teacher Availability and Professional Learning	
<b>3.4 Stakeholder Outreach</b>	<b>26</b>
3.4.1 The Role of the School Support Committee in Education	
3.4.2 Perceptions of School-Community Relations	
3.4.3 Communication Channels with Stakeholders	
<b>4. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.1 General Impressions</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.2 Key Findings and Their Import for Programming</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
ANNEX 1: Identification of Investigative Areas and Factor List	
ANNEX 2: School Selection Sample	
ANNEX 3: Data Collection Tools	

## List of Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CAPI	Common Application Program Interface
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
DOE	District Office of Education
EEQP	Enhancing Educational Quality Project
ESDP III	Education Sector Development Project III
ESP	Education Strategic Plan
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GPI	Gender Parity Index
ICT	Information & Communication Technology
KAPE	Kampuchean Action to Promote Education
LSE	Lower Secondary Education
MoEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth, & Sport
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NGS	New Generation School
NIE	National Institute of Education
NS	Network School
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan
PIC	Project Implementing Consultants
PLC	Professional Learning Community
PMU	Project Management Unit
POE	Provincial Office of Education
SBM	School-based Management
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SRC	School Resource Center
SRCAP	School Resource Center Action Plan
SRS	Secondary Resource Schools
SSC	School Support Committee
USE	Upper Secondary Education
USE-SDP 2	Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2
VSO	Volunteers Serving Overseas

## List of Tables

<b>Table 2.1</b>	Summary of Data Collection Methodologies Employed by Key Informant
<b>Table 3.1:</b>	Training on Leadership Until Now
<b>Table 3.2;</b>	School Manager Views About Risk-Taking Behaviors
<b>Table 3.3:</b>	Teacher Perception of School Management Practices
<b>Table 3.4:</b>	Incidence of School Planning and Participation
<b>Table 3.5:</b>	Reported Frequency of Meetings
<b>Table 3.6:</b>	School Personnel Able to Correctly Define School-based Management
<b>Table 3.7:</b>	How School Stakeholders Prioritize Educational Issues
<b>Table 3.8:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of School Quality
<b>Table 3.9:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Attendance
<b>Table 3.10:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of Student Motivation
<b>Table 3.11:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of <i>Rien Kua</i> Practices
<b>Table 3.12:</b>	Key Challenges Identified by School Stakeholders in Managing the Resource Center
<b>Table 3.13:</b>	Reliance on Resource Centers by Network Schools
<b>Table 3.14:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Professionalism
<b>Table 3.14:</b>	Teacher Proficiency Level in ICT
<b>Table 3.16:</b>	Teacher Proficiency Level in English
<b>Table 3.17:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Training Needs
<b>Table 3.18:</b>	Stakeholder Perceptions of Teaching Methods Used
<b>Table 3.19:</b>	Perceptions of Life Skills Services at Schools
<b>Table 3.20:</b>	Availability of Career Counseling Services
<b>Table 3.21:</b>	Stakeholder Understanding & Perceptions of Educational Inclusion
<b>Table 3.22:</b>	Assessment of School Security
<b>Table 3.23:</b>	School Access to Electricity and Internet
<b>Table 3.24:</b>	Student Access to Science Labs
<b>Table 3.25:</b>	Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing Science Labs
<b>Table 3.26:</b>	Student Access to Libraries
<b>Table 3.27:</b>	Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing the School Library
<b>Table 3.28:</b>	Student Access to ICT Labs
<b>Table 3.29:</b>	Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing the ICT Lab
<b>Table 3.30:</b>	Description of Teacher Shortages
<b>Table 3.31:</b>	Teacher Perceptions of Professional Learning Communities
<b>Table 3.32:</b>	Teacher Receptiveness to Organizing Student Subject Clubs
<b>Table 3.33:</b>	Perceptions of the Role of School Support Committees at Schools
<b>Table 3.34:</b>	Perceptions of the Degree to Which SSC Supports the School
<b>Table 3.35:</b>	Perceived Frequency of SSC Meetings
<b>Table 3.36:</b>	Perceived Relationship between School and Community
<b>Table 3.37:</b>	Perceived Attribution of Cause for Poor School-Community Relations
<b>Table 3.38:</b>	Perceived Degree of Utilization of Social Media to Communicate with Stakeholders
<b>Table 3.39:</b>	Perceptions of Teacher & Student Access to Electronic Equipment
<b>Table 4.1:</b>	Divergence among Stakeholders in Prioritizing Important Educational Issues
<b>Table 4.2:</b>	Priority Ranking of Training Areas Identified by School Managers and Teachers

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### **PURPOSE AND GOALS:**

At the request of the Ministry of Education, Youth, & Sport, KAPE was asked to carry out a rapid assessment of the situational context in selected school sites that will host the Upper Secondary Education – Sector Development Project 2. There are two key goals underlying this rapid assessment including the following:

1. Improve the MoEYS' understanding of the problems and issues in target schools that will benefit from USE-SDP 2 investment.
2. Gather information that will assist KAPE and VSO to better support the project technically by improving understanding about the implementation context.

Given the short time frame for data collection, the assessment has been configured as a rapid assessment to simply provide some sense of the key issues in the implementing environment as well as the degree of convergence among stakeholders with regards to these views. The assessment sample was small and included 10 schools (about 7% of the project's schools) and 150 respondents, chosen purposively. The assessment focused primarily on stakeholders' perceptions of the educational context in the areas identified. These areas were discussed and agreed with USE-SDP's managing committee.

#### AGREED INVESTIGATIVE AREAS

1. *Planning & Management Issues*
2. *School Perceptions & Concepts of Educational Quality/Services*
3. *Enabling Environments*
4. *School Outreach*

### **KEY FINDINGS:**

***Needed Pre-requisites for Successful Investment:*** The current assessment sought to determine the degree to which situational pre-requisites are in place for successful investments. Indications in this regard were generally positive. For example, most resource center schools are conducting their planning regularly, including a plan for Resource Center utilization, known as the School Resource Center Action Plan (SRCAP). School managers and community members (but notably not teachers) tend to express their top planning priorities in terms of student learning. Stakeholders also reported that most schools (about two-thirds) do not suffer from major teacher shortages and security conditions are also generally good. Most school-level stakeholders report a high degree of openness to life skills programming and advising students on their careers. In addition, most school managers (about 80%) seem to express a strong predisposition to reasonable risk-taking in their management, which is a key attribute of a successful manager. These findings would all suggest that there are multiple pre-requisites in place for successful investment, notwithstanding some of the constraints discussed below.

***Resource Center Utilization:*** A key part of USE-SDP programming relates to investments in Resource Centers. Investigations in this area were, therefore, an important focus of data collection. Assessments with respect to Resource Center utilization rates found that stakeholders seem to feel that utilization rates of the centers were moderate to low. Only a few stakeholders indicated high utilization rates. Likewise, very few network schools indicated that they relied heavily on the centers either. This last finding

provides a good justification for current project planning to emplace libraries and science labs at network schools. But some of the other constraints in utilizing the Centers suggest the need for structural changes at the schools as well (besides more training). These structural changes include reducing class sizes, modifying the timetable to increase the amount of time available for a classroom period, and inhibiting private classes to the extent that this is possible (see below). Thus, project programmers should not limit their efforts to increase Resource Center utilization rates simply to more capacity-building activities only but rather to key structural features in the school environment as well.

**Other Key Constraints for Proposed Programming:** One of the key constraints found in this investigation relates to the high degree of divergence among stakeholders in certain areas, particularly in the way in which they prioritize key issues facing the school. School managers and community managers tended to be more convergent in their viewpoints while teachers frequently expressed somewhat different priorities relating to their salaries, private classes, and class sizes. Bridging these areas of divergence will be very important to efforts to achieve consensual planning.

Other important constraints were also identified that should be considered carefully by program planners. Most prominent on this list of constraints is the role of private classes (i.e., *rien kua*) that are a standard part of the routine of many teachers, especially those teaching Grade 12 students. Although private classes have been found to frequently undermine MoEYS investments in facilities because teachers put a higher priority on their private classes than they do on utilizing these new facilities, this assessment found that most teachers see the practice of organizing private classes as perfectly fine. This finding suggests that any efforts to root out private classes or even curtail them are likely to be met with fierce opposition.

Other important programmatic constraints to consider relate to the limited amount of time that comprises a subject period (see above) and the challenges this presents for effectively using the science and ICT labs. In addition, the labs are not designed for the large class sizes that often characterize many project schools, which also presents problems for high utilization of the Resource Center. Similarly, some of the schools where the Resource Centers have been placed have extremely large enrollments, exceeding 2,000, 3,000, and in some cases 4,000 students. Even though the centers have two science labs and two ICT labs, this is not nearly enough to ensure access to all students. The current strategy of converting normal classrooms into science labs, as is currently proposed is, therefore, highly advised.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background on the Project**

The ADB financed Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project (USESDP) is focused on improving the access, quality and relevance of upper secondary education (USE) and strengthening the institutional capacity for planning, management and service delivery of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MoEYS). It is an extension of the ADB financed Third Education Sector Project (ESDP III), which was designed and implemented to improve the equity, quality and efficiency of education services of the Lower Secondary Education (LSE) sector in Cambodia.

The USESDP is funded through ADB Loan 3427-CAM (COL) amounting to \$30 million, supplemented by Government's contribution in kind to the tune of \$3 million. The project aims to support the implementation of key priorities of MoEYS' Education Strategic Plan (ESP) 2014-2018, in compliance with the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2014-2018, with emphasis on improving access to and the quality and relevance of USE.

As one of the unique provisions of the design of USE-SDP 2, both MoEYS and ADB have agreed to include the involvement of civil society organizations with strong reputations for high quality programming in project implementation. In this respect, MoEYS has included the involvement two NGOs to assist the project with specialized technical implementation in diverse areas including School Planning, Life Skills Education, Career Counseling, Teacher Mentoring, Library Development, and several others. The NGOs tasked with this technical assistance include a national organization, Kampuchean Action to Promote Education (KAPE) and Volunteers Serving Overseas (VSO), which is international. KAPE was selected for its role in the project because it also implements the New Generation School Initiative (NGS) with direct funding from MoEYS. NGS is a program that the Ministry hopes USE-SDP can borrow some programmatic ideas in order to better realize goals relating to educational quality. Similarly, VSO has played key roles in assisting MoEYS to implement Continuous Professional Development (CPD) activities at many levels. Both agencies have been in negotiation with MoEYS since June 2019 to formalize agreements and contracts so that their support may start by the end of 2019 or the beginning of 2020.

### **1.2 Purpose of the Rapid Assessment**

During consultations with the Minister of Education, Youth, & Sport in August 2019, it was suggested that KAPE begin its involvement with USE-SDP 2 by carrying out a rapid assessment that can help to better inform the formulation of technical assistance to the project and also the give the Ministry a better understanding of the implementation context. Thus, there are two key goals underlying the present assessment. These include the following:

3. Improve the MoEYS' understanding of the problems and issues in target schools that will benefit from USE-SDP 2 investment.
4. Gather information that will assist KAPE and VSO to better support the project technically by improving understanding about the implementation context.

Given the short time frame for data collection, the assessment has been configured as a rapid (as opposed to a comprehensive) assessment to simply provide some sense of the key issues in the implementing environment as well as the degree of convergence

among stakeholders with regards to these views. The assessment focused primarily on stakeholders' perceptions of the educational context in the areas identified in Box 1. These areas and accompanying subtopics were discussed and agreed with the Project Management Unit (PMU).

It should be noted that the assessment survey was not really an 'evaluation' of the programming context in the common sense but rather sought to better understand how stakeholders perceived and understood each of the issues identified. These perceptions and understandings should provide a useful starting point for formulating training and technical inputs so that the project does not make any fatal assumptions and is relevant to stakeholder expectations of the project.

**BOX 1: Agreed Investigative Areas**

**1. Planning & Management Issues**

- Concepts of Leadership and Management
- Understanding of Planning Concepts
- Frequency of Planning

**2. School Perceptions & Concepts of Educational Quality/Services**

- School Stakeholder Perceptions of Quality
- Concepts of Educational Quality
- Concepts of Professionalism

**3. Enabling Environments**

- Physical Constraints (e.g., infrastructure, equipment, etc.)
- Teacher Availability
- ICT Issues
- School Security
- Availability of School Services (for students)

**4. School Outreach**

- Interaction with Community
- Methods of Communication in the School

## 2. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 General Considerations and Investigative Areas

As noted above, the present assessment focuses heavily on understanding the ‘perceptions’ of different stakeholders in the educational environment. Although ‘perceptions’ are not the same thing as ‘reality,’ it is understood that people’s behaviors are generally based on what they perceive to be reality, even though these perceptions may actually be wrong.<sup>1</sup> Differences in perception are a common source of conflict and misunderstanding. A good example of how differences in perception may play out relates to the way in which stakeholders prioritize the educational needs in a school. In this respect, communities may place a very high priority on investments in infrastructure and equipment whereas teachers may see their own salaries as a matter of the highest priority, a finding that was actually validated by this assessment. Better understanding how stakeholders perceive issues should be very useful to project implementers so that interventions can be structured in a way to ensure that everyone is on the same page. Thus, the approach used in this survey has been to *reconstruct* the perceptions of important groups of stakeholders to better understand how they perceive the ‘reality’ of the local educational context. This is why the same questions have frequently been administered to the same stakeholders.

The areas of inquiry for the assessment focused on four investigative areas including: (i) Planning & Management; (ii) Educational Quality and Services; (iii) Enabling Environments; and (iv) School Outreach. A total of 13 discrete variables were identified that fall under each of these investigative areas along with other operationalizing criteria. These are summarized in **Annex 1**.

### 2.2 Sample Construction

In general, investigators primarily used non-probability-based sampling techniques when constructing the assessment sample for various sampling units and stakeholder participants. Investigations were carried out in ten schools that were varied in terms of their size, demographic setting (urban/rural), function (Resource School/Network School), and past performance on Resource Center assessment criteria administered in previous years by MoEYS. Because of the primacy of Secondary Resource Schools in USE-SDP 2, 60% of the visited schools were SRS’s while the remaining 40% were Network Schools. The ten schools visited and their respective characteristics are summarized in **Annex 2**.

The assessment team collected information from three stakeholder groupings including school managers (both directors and vice directors), teachers (technical subject leaders), and community members (SSC members, parents, etc.). It was not possible to include students in the survey because the assessment took place during the summer vacation months so all schools were still closed. A purposive sampling method was used to identify those individuals who would participate in the assessment following mainly the roles that they played at the school (e.g., director, technical leader, etc.). In all, a total of 150 individuals participated in the assessment across the ten target schools (see Table 2.1). The number of actual respondents in the survey slightly exceeded expected survey participants, which was originally estimated at 120 respondents.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-power-prime/201908/perception-is-not-reality>

## 2.3 Data Collection Methods

Three data collection methodologies were used to collect information including questionnaires (for school managers and teachers), short interviews to follow up on open-ended questions in the questionnaire (for school managers only), and focus group discussions (community members). Focus group discussions were only conducted in four schools. The methods of data collection for each stakeholder grouping are summarized in Table 2.1 below.

It should be noted too that when completing questionnaires, stakeholders were *not* asked to identify themselves so that investigators could assure them of their anonymity. This was done in order to prevent socially biased responding patterns.

The development of data collection tools was preceded by a process of generating discrete variables for study, as noted above, based on a review of the key investigative areas. Each question developed for use in investigatory tools was cross-referenced with these factors to ensure high levels of content validity during tool development. The investigators designed and administered 3 data collection tools, which were developed for the purpose. These tools were reviewed with MoEYS staff and VSO in order to modulate them to current data collection needs. The tools used for the assessment are summarized in **Annex 3**.

In order to expedite the data collection process, data collection forms were converted into an electronic format so that data could automatically be tabulated into a central file at the same time that the data was being collected. Investigators used a software program called *CS-Pro software* for this purpose. This software is among the most flexible data collection software on the market and can be adapted easily to multiple data collection formats.

**Table 2.1: Summary of Data Collection Methodologies Employed by Key Informant**

Stakeholder Grouping	Data Collection Method			Selection Formula	Proposed Number of Respondents	Actual Respondents
	Interview	Questionnaire	Focus Group Discussion			
School Managers	x	x		10 schools x 3 persons	30	32
Teachers (Technical Subject Leaders)		x		10 schools x 7 subjects	70	93
Community Members			x	4 schools x 5 persons	20	25
<b>Total</b>					<b>120</b>	<b>150</b>

One major constraint in the manner in which data was collected related to the inability of the survey teams to cross-validate responses with student views since the schools were not in session when the data collection occurred. In addition, observations of classroom practice and resource center usage were also not possible. Thus, the attitudes expressed by school managers and teachers may not necessarily represent an objective assessment of the investigative areas covered under this survey.

## 2.4 Data Management

Investigators used electronic data collection methods employing *Common Application Program Interface* or CAPI for data collection and quality control. This facility provided the assessment team with data collection of high quality, accuracy, and cost-

effectiveness. CAPI facilities helped to indicate the current location (GIS mapping) and actual time of an interview being conducted by an enumerator. This allowed KAPE to control the quality of the data collection and fieldwork over the internet.

All survey materials displayed in software with CAPI capability shows the observation form, back-check form, daily contact sheet (interviewee), and database spreadsheet. These forms can be accessed on any mobile device encoded with the required software and data. CAPI also allows for database retrieval and synchronization of data to the server each time a data collection form is completed. Tablet-based databases have logic codes to help easily detect skip patterns, robust error and inconsistencies in checking to ensure the quality and accuracy of data.



*Respondents complete an electronic questionnaire on mobile devices*

In order to provide high quality survey data, investigators developed a tablet-based database using *CSPro*, an open-source software from the US Census Bureau. This software is commonly used for large-scale research projects involving data entry with high quality controls (logic checks, cross tabulations, data verification and data checks) so that only complete and validated questionnaires are entered and only skipped questions are left blank. Data for the Assessment was entered using a method that automatically restricts out-of-range variables, checks for inconsistencies, does not allow missing fields where they are not appropriate, and ensures the accuracy of the entered data. After the fieldwork teams had completed their interviews, the data was automatically synchronized to a server. Then the indoor quality controller checked all of the data to ensure data quality and accuracy.

## **2.5 Data Treatment**

Standardized spreadsheets were prepared for each data collection tool involving interviews while composite responding forms were used in the case of focus group discussion forms. Data cleaning was greatly facilitated by electronic data collection. Quantitative data generated by interview schedules was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentage conversions, ranking, and mean scores where appropriate. No inferential statistical analysis techniques were employed for purposes of the present investigation. Disaggregation of the data by key variables such as stakeholder group membership was also undertaken where required.

Qualitative data collected from focus group discussions and interviews was analyzed using thematic analysis. Investigators read all transcripts from the data collection forms and used coding to identify key themes. Themes were described in the context of the project and the project indicators. The analysis and writing phase describing assessment findings has sought to triangulate the quantitative data collected with emerging qualitative data themes that were detected during focus group discussions.

### 3. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Management and Planning Issues

##### 3.1.1 Views about School Leadership

One of the first areas of inquiry under the assessment focused on how school managers thought about their own leadership ability. In this respect, a majority of managers (81%) indicated that they had already received a great deal of training on leadership issues. Only about 19% had said that they had only received ‘some’ or ‘no’ training on leadership issues. But in spite of the finding that most had received a great deal of training on this issue, almost 60% indicated that more was still desirable (see Table 3.1). This finding has significance for the receptivity of school managers for additional training in this area by USE-SDP 2.

**Table 3.1: Training on Leadership Until Now**

<b>Statement on Leadership Training</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Received a great deal of training on leadership but more is desirable	19	59.4
Received a great deal of training on leadership already	7	21.9
Have received some training on leadership	4	12.5
Have received no training on leadership	2	6.3
	32	

N=32

Investigators also explored manager views about risk-taking behavior since such behavior is clearly a key indicator of the kind of leadership style among school directors. Investigators make an assumption in this regard that those managers who are willing to take reasonable risks in improving their schools are more likely to demonstrate strong leadership whereas those that avoid risk are more likely to be weak leaders. School managers were given four statements and were asked to show their level agreement with one or more of these statements (i.e., they could choose more than one statement). The first two statements indicate viewpoints that are ‘pro-risk’ while the third and fourth statements indicated a more risk-averse orientation. Based on a review of the responding patterns among school managers, about two-thirds or more of school managers expressed support of statements that indicate a willingness to take risks in running their schools (i.e., Statements 1 and 2) (see Table 3.2). On the other hand, about one-fifth of respondents indicated their agreement with more risk-averse statements. (i.e., Statements 3 and 4) This should be very useful information when formulating school leadership training materials and particularly discussions relating to the role of risk in decision-making.

**Table 3.2: School Manager Views About Risk-Taking Behaviors (N=32)**

<b>Statement Describing ‘Risk’</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Kinds of Risk Statements</b>
1. Taking risks will lead to progress.	24	75.0	<b>Pro-risk Statements</b>
2. Taking risks is a necessary aspect of decision-making.	20	62.5	
3. Taking risks will get you into trouble.	6	18.8	<b>Risk-averse Statements</b>
4. Risk is a bad thing.	3	9.4	

The assessment also sought to better understand how teachers viewed the leadership styles of the managers at their respective schools. In this respect, only about a third of teachers viewed the management styles at their schools as ‘very democratic’ (see Table 3.3). A majority (56%) viewed management as only ‘somewhat democratic’ while about 12% of teachers viewed management as not very democratic at all. These perceptions seem surprising given the unanimity about the high frequency of meetings that occur at schools among both teachers and school managers. This would suggest that frequent meetings are not necessarily a guarantee of democratic management.

**Table 3.3: Teacher Perception of School Management Practices (N=93)**

<i>How would you describe the management practices at your school</i>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Very democratic	27	29.0
Somewhat democratic	52	55.9
Not very democratic	11	11.8
Hard to say	3	3.2

### **3.1.2 Views about School Planning**

Another key area of investigation related to school planning. Questions along these lines sought to discover information about the various kinds of planning documents that schools prepare including the annual School Improvement Plan (SIP) as well as the School Resource Center Action Plan (SRCAP), which resource schools are supposed to produce each year to ensure effective utilization of the resource center. Data collection activities indicated that over 90% of respondents indicated that schools have an SIP but that only 60% of respondents indicated that there is an SRCAP, which is about what one would expect given that Network Schools do not prepare SRCAPs. For both of these response patterns, there seemed to be high convergence between what school managers indicated and what teachers said (see

**Table 3.4: Incidence of School Planning and Participation**

<b>Statement on School Planning</b>	<b>Reported by School Managers</b>		<b>Reported by Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Schools with an Annual School Improvement Plan (Yes)	32	100.0	89	95.7
Schools reporting that all or most of the Annual Plan was implemented	27	84.4	54	58.1
Schools with an SRC Action Plan (Yes)	20	62.5	56	60.2
Schools reporting that all or most of the SRC Action Plan was implemented	18	56.3	42	45.2
<i>Schools reporting participation in planning by:</i>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
School Managers	31	96.9	-	-
Technical Subject Leaders	30	93.8	-	-
Community Representatives	29	90.6	-	-
Teachers	22	68.8	-	-
Commune Representatives	20	62.5	-	-
Students	12	37.5	-	-
Local Authorities	10	31.3	-	-
Monks	7	21.9	-	-
Other	1	3.1	-	-
<i>Teachers Reporting That They Had Participated in School Planning</i>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	--	--	80	86%
No/Don't Know	--	--	9	14%
N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)				

Table 3.4). In terms of the degree of implementation of the plan during the school year, school managers tended to take a more sanguine view of how much of the plan had been implemented. While 84% of school managers indicated that all or most of the SIP

had been implemented, only 58% of teachers concurred with this assessment. Similarly, 56% of school managers indicated that all or most of the SRCAP had been implemented whereas only 45% of teachers supported this view. These findings would suggest that while SIPs appear to be in place, not all SRS's are developing their Action Plans nor are they implementing them efficiently.

In terms of participation in school planning, school managers indicated high levels of participation from various stakeholders (see Table 3.4). Those stakeholders with the highest participation levels included school managers, technical subject leaders, and community representatives. Only about a third or less of school managers indicated participation in planning by students, local authorities, or monks.

The frequency of school level meetings reported by both school managers and teachers was highly encouraging. About 91% of managers indicated that monthly administration meetings occur regularly while almost 94% of teachers indicated that monthly technical meetings occur regularly (see Table 3.5). Responding patterns by school managers and teachers in this regard were highly convergent, helping to corroborate the veracity of what was reported.

**Table 3.5: Reported Frequency of Meetings**

Meeting Frequency	Reported by School Managers		Reported by Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
<b>Administration Meetings</b>				
Occur every month	29	90.6	85	91.4
Once every two months	1	3.1	6	6.5
Once a semester	1	3.1	2	2.2
Never	0	0	0	0
Other	1	3.1	0	0
<b>Technical Meetings</b>				
Occur every month	30	93.8	87	93.5
Once every two months	0	0	4	4.3
Once a semester	2	6.3	2	2.2
Never	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

The use of School-based Management (SBM) has been a central strategy of MoEYS to improve the quality of school planning and management in the secondary education sector. To assess how well the meaning of SBM is understood among stakeholders, school managers and teachers were presented with four different definitions of SBM and asked to identify the definition that best matched their understanding of SBM. The four definitions presented to stakeholders are displayed in Box 2. The 'correct' definition is the one presented in the second bullet point. When these definitions were presented to stakeholders, only about 53% of school managers were able to correctly define SBM while even fewer teachers were able to do

**BOX 2: Alternative Definitions of School-based Management**

- A management strategy in which authority for all operational aspects of a school is transferred from managers to community members.
- A management strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from central level offices to individual schools. (✓)
- A management strategy that enables schools to comply strictly with the rules and policies set at central level.
- A management strategy whereby the control of decision-making at a school is moved to local authorities such as the Commune Council Office.

so (43%). That is, about half or more of stakeholders could *not* correctly define this planning concept. These findings suggest that most training workshops to date have not yet been able to effectively convey to nearly half of stakeholders the core meaning of SBM principles (see Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6: School Personnel Able to Correctly Define School-based Management**

Stakeholder Ability to Define SBM	School Managers		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Able to Define SBM Correctly	17	53.1	40	43.0
Unable to Define SBM Correctly	15	46.9	53	57.0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

### **3.1.3 How Stakeholders Prioritize Issues in their Planning**

Another important area of investigation under the assessment of school management related to how stakeholders prioritized the key issues and problems affecting the school and how these perceptions differed among stakeholders. As part of the exercise to determine priority rankings, respondents were given 8 ‘stars’ and asked to allocate the stars to various issues presented in Table 3.7 below to indicate how important that issue was to them. The more stars that they allocated to an issue, the higher the priority attached to that issue. If they preferred not to allocate any stars to an issue, they were also allowed to do so. Based on an average of the number of stars allocated to each issue, investigators determined priority rankings for each of the issues shown in the table below (see Table 3.7). Priority rankings are indicated parenthetically (\*\*).

**Table 3.7: How School Stakeholders Prioritize Educational Issues**

Priority Educational Issues	Priority Ranking <i>(Based on the Number of Allocated Stars)</i>		
	School Managers	Teachers	Community Members
Infrastructure upgrading	2.1 (1)	2.0 (2)	2.0 (2)
Students are learning well	2.1 (1)	1.9 (3)	2.3 (1)
Teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism	1.8 (2)	1.9 (3)	2.3 (1)
Teachers have adequate salaries	1.4 (3)	2.6 (1)	1.3 (4)
Parents should be satisfied with the instruction at the school	1.3 (4)	1.5 (4)	1.5 (3)
School has a proper gate	1.3 (5)	1.3 (6)	0
Students dress properly	1.1 (6)	1.4 (5)	0
School has a flagpole	1.0 (7)	1.1 (7)	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers) (Top Issues are highlighted in grey scale).

A review of priority rankings indicated in the table suggests that there is some degree of divergence between school managers, teachers, and community members in how they prioritize issues. For example, student learning is the number one priority for school managers (along with infrastructure upgrading) and community members while for teachers this issue was given a priority ranking of ‘3’. For teachers, the top priority issue was their salaries, a surprising finding given that MoEYS has raised teacher salaries by a factor of three over the last 5 years. To be sure, several of the issues identified by managers, community members, and teachers as the highest priorities do fall within their top three picks as a common theme between teachers and school managers. A major exception in this regard was the finding that community members also place Parental Satisfaction with the school as one of the top three priorities. Nevertheless, some of the divergences are still surprising, especially when teachers tend to subordinate the learning

of their students to their own salaries. Happily, issues relating to flagpoles and school gates received the lowest priority ranking among all respondents, which has not always been the case in the past.

In a variation of the above exercise, stakeholders were also allowed to identify what the biggest problems at their schools were without choosing from a list of pre-determined issues. That is, they could free-associate any problems that stood out to them. Some of the most frequently recurring responses to this open question are summarized in Box 3 below. Once again, responses indicated a large degree of divergence in how stakeholders prioritized the problems at their schools. Among school managers, *infrastructure*, *teacher shortages*, and *low teacher professional standards* stood out. Among teachers, *infrastructure* was also a major concern (as it was among school directors) along with *student absenteeism*, *weak school management* (not cited by managers), *lack of educational materials*, and *low community engagement*. Among community representatives, *teacher shortages*, *student absenteeism* (also cited by teachers), and exorbitant '*rien kua*' fees<sup>2</sup> are cited as the leading problems. Not surprisingly, this last problem relating to *rien kua* was not cited by either school managers or teachers but seems to be a burning issue among community members and parents.

The apparent divergence in the perception of local educational problems among stakeholders is a key finding of this investigation that suggests extreme caution when conducting planning sessions at target schools. Since building a consensus among all stakeholders is an important goal during school planning, it is apparent that reaching a consensus about planning priorities will likely be a key challenge.

### **BOX 3: Biggest Problems Cited by School Stakeholders at their Respective Schools**

#### **School Managers**

- Not enough facilities such as buildings, rooms, library etc. for a huge number of students as student numbers increase.
- Shortage of technical subject teachers as we used the normal teachers to teach different subjects.
- Science teachers are unfamiliar with how to use some science lab materials.
- Low professional standards among some teachers especially when they do not listen to school managers.
- Poor communication with communities to foster their involvement in education.
- Some teachers have limited capacity

#### **Teachers**

- Lack of classrooms, science labs, toilets and educational materials.
- High rates of student absenteeism.
- Lack of educational materials to facilitate teaching.
- School management is weak and does not provide strong leadership.
- Poor community engagement to support educational activities
- Limited access to computer and science labs at Resource Schools
- Teachers and students lack discipline.

#### **Community Members**

- Schools lack teachers, especially science teachers.
- PoEYS sends subject teachers they don't often need (e.g., Khmer, Sports, etc.)
- Student Absenteeism
- 'Rien kua' is unfair because many students cannot afford to pay for the extra classes. This causes student dropout.
- Teachers are always taking money from students during semester exams, which affects students' motivation and feelings.

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Rien Kua' is a Khmer Language term referring to private classes by public school teachers among their own students. Public school teachers often rely on such classes to supplement their income. Non-paying students are not allowed to participate in these classes.

## 3.2 School Perceptions and Concepts of Educational Quality/Services

### 3.2.1 General Impressions about Quality among Stakeholders

Following the survey of issues relating to Planning and Management Issues, investigators next turned to an examination of stakeholder views about Educational Quality and the nature of Educational Services provided by the school. A general line of inquiry asked stakeholders to compare their school with other schools in terms of school quality. Both school managers and teachers seemed to exhibit high convergence in their views. About three-fourths of respondents in both groups felt that their school was about the same as other schools (see Table 3.8). Between one-fourth and one-fifth of respondents felt that their school was actually better than other schools and hardly anyone said that their school was worse than other schools. Nevertheless, it seems surprising that the majority of respondents feel that their school is no different from other schools in spite of the significant amount of investment in Resource Center facilities and the SRS network.

**Table 3.8: Stakeholder Perceptions of School Quality**

Stakeholder Perceptions of School Quality	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
About the same as other schools	24	75.0	67	72.0
Better than most other schools	8	25.0	20	21.5
Worse than other schools	0	0	3	3.2
Difficult to say	0	0	3	3.2

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

Stakeholder views of teacher attendance are generally very positive. Nearly all respondents indicated that ‘nearly all’ or ‘most’ teachers come to work on time (see Table 3.9). School managers and teachers also appeared to be largely convergent in their assessments of this issue with teachers affirming attendance regularity at a slightly higher rate. Similarly, the problem of poor teacher attendance was not highlighted as a recurring theme among community members during focus group discussions.

**Table 3.9: Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Attendance**

Stakeholder Assessment of Teacher Attendance	School Managers		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Nearly all the teachers come to work on a regular basis.	7	21.9	34	36.6
Most teachers come to work on a regular basis but some are tardy.	24	75.0	58	62.4
About half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis but half are often tardy.	1	3.1	1	1.1
Less than half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis.	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

In the same way, there is also a generally very positive view about student motivation. About 90% of respondents or more felt that ‘all’ or ‘most’ students really want to attend school (see Table 3.10). Only about 10% of teachers felt that this was not the case and that only about half of the students exhibited adequate amounts of motivation. Community members also did not generally question students’ motivation to attend school during focus group discussions but they did note that student absenteeism is a major problem from their perspective.

**Table 3.10: Stakeholder Perceptions of Student Motivation**

Stakeholder Perceptions of Student Motivation	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Most children really want to attend school	12	37.5	27	29.0
Many children really want to attend school but a few feels that it is not so important	18	56.3	56	60.2
About half the children here really want to attend school but the other half feel that it is not so important	1	3.1	9	9.7
Few of the children here feel that attending school is very important	1	3.1	1	1.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

The issue of '*rien kua*' (i.e., private classes in public schools) in public schools is a very sensitive topic in the Cambodian public education system because in many cases, teachers can make more money from their private classes than they do from their state salaries. Thus, any effort to curtail these activities usually meets with fierce resistance from teachers. Nevertheless, many critics of the practice argue that it is immoral and unprofessional of teachers to charge such fees because they work in what is usually thought of as a 'helping profession'. In addition, charging fees creates a conflict of interest for teachers because the profit-motive argues that they should never 'fail' paying customers. From the perspective of projects such as USE-SDP 2, such classes also undermine investments in science and computer labs because teachers often prioritize their time to focus on their private classes rather than using facilities put in place by projects, at considerable expense to the National Treasury. In the present survey, community members also voiced serious concerns about the practice during focus group discussions because they felt that it is 'unfair' to poor students who cannot pay, which in turn demotivates them and encourages student dropout.

**Table 3.11: Stakeholder Perceptions of Rien Kua Practices**

Stakeholder Perceptions of Rien Kua	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Perceptions of Rien Kua</b>				
It's a practice that is both good and bad	24	75.0	61	65.6
It's a good practice	4	12.5	29	31.2
It's a bad practice	4	12.5	3	3.2
<b>What effect would stopping rien kua practices have at your school?</b>				
It would have no effect	18	56.3	19	20.4
Make things better	9	28.1	30	32.3
Make things worse	5	15.6	44	47.3

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

In spite of the controversy surrounding '*rien kua*' practices, investigators did still include some questions about this issue during survey activities (see Table 3.11). In this respect, it was found that about one-third of teachers felt that '*rien kua*' is absolutely a 'good' practice. The majority of teachers, however, indicated that it was a practice with both good and bad points, which represents a more balanced view. The majority of school managers (75%) were generally in agreement with teachers in their view that it

was a practice with both good and bad points though about 12% of school managers felt that it was absolutely a ‘bad’ practice, compared to only 3% of teachers who held this view. Surprisingly, more than half of teachers (about 53%) indicated that abolishing ‘ri-en kua’ would either have no effect on the school or would actually make things better. On the other hand, 47% of teachers indicated that abolishing the practice would make things ‘worse,’ suggesting that this is about the number of teachers who would resist any move to curtail the practice, if the project ever took any measures to suppress it.

### **3.2.2 Issues Regarding Management of the Resource Centers**

Through the Enhancing Educational Quality Project (EEQP), MoEYS has made significant investment in the establishment of resource centers in 50 schools.<sup>3</sup> The construction of even more centers is planned under USE-SDP 2. These resource centers, which are equipped with both science and ICT labs, are designed to enable teachers to move their teaching from theory to practice as well as enable students to acquire digital literacy. In order to better understand the challenges of operating the centers, stakeholders were asked to pick the three biggest problems that they have encountered since the centers were established (2009-14). These challenges are summarized in Table 3.12. The challenges identified varied somewhat between school managers and teachers. For managers, the number one problem was that teachers really did not know how to use the centers, followed by issues relating to maintenance (2), the disruptive effect of private classes (3), and lack of time for effective utilization (3). Teachers took a somewhat different view in describing the challenges of operating the centers. Their number one issue was that their class sizes are too big while the labs are too small to accommodate all of their students. Other issues identified by teachers included the lack of materials in the labs (2), and the lack of time in the school timetable (3). These are all very useful viewpoints that will be very helpful to USE-SDP 2 when building new centers and formulating training workshops to improve center utilization.

**Table 3.12: Key Challenges Identified by School Stakeholders in Managing the Resource Center**

Key Challenges Cited	School Managers		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Teachers don't know how to use them*	13	40.6 (1)	8	8.6
Maintaining the facilities*	10	31.3 (2)	4	4.3
Teachers know how to use them but put more emphasis on their private classes*	6	18.8 (3)	2	2.2
There is not enough time in the timetable to use the facilities*	6	18.8 (3)	21	22.6 (3)
Paying for the utilities	4	12.5		
Not enough time for administrators to effectively manage the facilities	-	-	-	-
The facilities are too small	-	-	8	8.6
The facilities have too few materials to be effective*	-	-	22	23.7 (2)
The facilities are often locked	-	-	1	1.1
Class sizes at the school are very big*	-	-	37	39.8 (1)
Other	1	3.1	5	5.4

N=20 (SRS Managers); N=56 (SRS Teachers); \*Top ranked issues or problems (highlighted in grey scale)

<sup>3</sup> Under EEQP, 18 resource centers were built; ESDP I built 14 and ESDP 2 built 18 more for a total of 50 centers.

The resource centers in SRS’s are not only intended for use by the host school. Rather, there was also an expectation when they were built that other surrounding schools, known as network schools, could also benefit from access to the centers both for teacher training purposes as well as teaching students. The four network schools participating in the survey were, therefore, asked to what degree they had been relying on the resource centers to improve their educational services. The responses cited by school managers and teachers tended to gravitate towards the middle ground (see Table 3.13). Hardly anyone said that the centers played ‘no’ role at all in education at their schools while only a very small minority (of teachers) indicated that they played a big role (16% of teachers and 0% of school managers). School managers gave the most generous assessment on this question indicating that the centers played ‘some’ role in education at their schools (83%) while only about 49% of teachers held this view. About a third of teachers indicated that the centers played only a very ‘small’ role in education at their schools while 17% of school directors shared this view. Clearly, USE-SDP 2 must find additional ways to increase the relevance of resource centers for educators in network schools.

**Table 3.13: Reliance on Resource Centers by Network Schools**

Reliance of Network Schools on Resource Centers	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
<i>To what degree does your school rely on the Resource Center School</i>				
Relies on them a great deal	0	0	6	16.2
Relies on them to some degree	10	83.3	18	48.6
Relies on them to a small degree	2	16.6	11	29.7
Does not rely on them at all	0	0	2	5.4

N=12 (Network School Managers); N=37 (Network School Teachers)

### 3.2.3 Teacher Capacity Issues

Given the primacy of investments to strengthen the capacity of teachers at both SRS’s and network schools, the survey also undertook to determine stakeholders’ perceptions of teacher capacity in a number of areas including general professional standards (defined as the degree of motivation to help students), English Language proficiency, ICT Literacy, and other areas. It is important to remember that these subjective assessments were made by school managers and the technical subject leaders in each school.

In terms of teacher professionalism, both school managers and technical subject leaders generally gave high marks to regular teachers with regards to their level of professionalism, defined as the degree to which teachers were motivated to help their students. In this respect, about two-thirds of managers indicated that ‘nearly all’ or ‘most’ of their teachers are ‘professional.’ Not surprisingly, technical subject leaders were even more generous in evaluating their colleagues with about three-fourths indicat-

**Table 3.14: Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Professionalism**

Stakeholder Assessment of Teacher Professionalism	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Nearly all are highly motivated and interested in helping students	18	56.3	44	47.3
Most are highly motivated and interested in helping students	3	9.4	25	26.9
Some are highly motivated but others less so	11	34.4	21	22.6
Difficult to say	0	0	3	3.2

N=32 (School Managers) N=93 (Teachers)

ing that all or most teachers exhibit high levels of professionalism. Still about a third of school managers and a fifth of subject leaders were less sanguine in their assessment saying that only ‘some’ teachers are motivated to help their students (see Table 3.14).

Investigators also sought to determine stakeholders’ attitudes about ICT and English language proficiency of both administrators and teachers. The vast majority of both school managers and teachers felt that only ‘some’ or ‘few’ teachers were proficient in using computers (see Table 3.15). Only about a third of school managers and one-fifth of teachers felt that most teachers have high levels of ICT proficiency. Similarly, very few school managers (3%) and teachers (9%) expressed the view that ‘most’ teachers were using ICT in their regular classroom instruction. The majority view seemed to be that only ‘some’ or ‘few’ teachers actually use ICT in their teaching. Given the increasing emphasis of the education system on digital education, the reluctance of most teachers to use ICT in their teaching is going to be a major challenge for the project.

English language proficiency among teachers and administrators paralleled the findings on ICT proficiency. In this regard, the majority of stakeholders expressed the view that half or less of both administrators and teachers had an intermediate level of English proficiency or higher (see Table 3.16).

**Table 3.15: Teacher Proficiency Level in ICT**

<b>Perceptions of Teachers Who are Proficient in Using Computers</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
All of them	0	0	0	0
Most of them	11	34.4	18	19.4
Some of them	19	59.4	69	74.2
Few of them	2	6.3	5	5.4
None of them	0	0	1	1.1
<b>Perceptions of Teachers Using ICT in Classroom Teaching</b>				
All of them	0	0	0	0
Most of them	1	3.1	8	8.6
Some of them	16	50.0	50	53.8
Few of them	13	40.6	23	24.7
None of them	2	6.3	12	12.9

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

**Table 3.16: Teacher Proficiency Level in English**

<b>Teacher Proficiency in English</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Perceptions of Teachers’ English Language Proficiency (Intermediate Level or Higher)</b>				
Most of them are intermediate or higher	0	0	7	7.5
About half of them are intermediate or higher	6	18.8	25	26.9
Some of them are intermediate or higher	26	81.3	61	65.6
None of them are intermediate or higher	0	0	0	0
<b>Perceptions of Administrators’ English Language Proficiency (Intermediate Level or Higher)</b>				
Most of them are intermediate or higher	2	6.3	-	-
About half of them are intermediate or higher	4	12.5	-	-
Some of them are intermediate or higher	22	68.8	-	-
None of them are intermediate or higher	4	12.5	-	-

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

One of the most important issues looked at by investigators related to the identification of specific areas of capacity building needed by teachers. This information will be very valuable in helping project advisers determine the content of capacity-building programming. Based on a list of 7 topical areas indicated in Table 3.17, stakeholders were asked to indicate the top ‘two’ areas where they felt that the most support was needed at their school. There was remarkable congruence between school managers and teachers in selecting the most needed areas of support, which included (i) ‘General Teaching Methods’ as the most commonly chosen area; (ii) ‘How to Do Experiments’ as the second most commonly chosen area; and (iii) ‘How to Use ICT’ as the third most commonly chosen area. All other topical areas only scored in the low double digits or single digits. These findings should not necessarily suggest that some of the other topical areas that had a lower priority among stakeholders will not receive any attention in project programming, only that the project should consider what the key training priorities seem to be for most stakeholders.

**Table 3.17: Stakeholder Perceptions of Teacher Training Needs**

Areas Where Teachers Are Perceived to Have the Most Training Needs	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. General Teaching Methods*	19	59.4 (1)	49	52.7 (1)
2. How to do experiments*	17	53.1 (2)	48	51.6 (2)
3. How to use ICT*	15	46.9 (3)	45	48.4 (3)
4. How to better use the library for student learning	4	12.5	7	7.5
5. Classroom Management	3	9.4	15	16.1
6. Student Assessment	3	9.4	4	4.3
7. How to teach soft skills	3	9.4	12	12.9
8. Other.	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers); \*Top ranked topic (highlighted in grey scale)

Another equally important area of inquiry in this survey related to an assessment of teaching methods at stakeholders’ schools. In this regard, school managers and teachers were asked to characterize the most dominant teaching methodology used at their school. Stakeholders seemed very much split on the continuum of different practices that were presented to them, ranging from ‘strong focus on group work and student projects’ on one end to a simple ‘lecturing’ approach on the other. Because this survey occurred during the vacation months, it was not possible to independently verify stakeholder sentiment by actual classroom observations and this proviso should be kept in mind when considering stakeholder views on this topic. The largest group of stakeholders (40% of school managers and 34% of teachers) expressed the view that most teachers use a combination of lecturing and ‘some’ practical group exercises (see Table 3.18). Between a third and a quarter of stakeholders clustered

**Table 3.18: Stakeholder Perceptions of Teaching Methods Used**

How would you characterize the dominant teaching methodology employed at your school?	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
A strong focus on practical group work and student projects.	8	25.0	31	33.3
A good balance of lecturing and practical group exercises.	10	31.3	25	26.9
A combination of lecturing and some practical group exercises. ✓	13	40.6	32	34.4
Lecturing is the predominant method.	1	3.1	5	5.4
Hard to say	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

stakeholders clustered

at the other end of the spectrum expressing the view that most teaching at their school employed lots of group work and student projects with about the same proportion feeling that there was a good ‘balance’ between lecturing and practical work. Hardly anyone indicated that ‘lecturing’ is the predominant teaching method. Thus, stakeholders seemed to be very much split on how teachers generally teach, indicating that there is likely great diversity in the teaching methodologies used, an issue that certainly needs further exploration.

### **3.2.4 Life Skills and Career Counseling Services**

Under the USE-SDP Project design, life skills and student counseling services will be a major focus of investment. Thus, some number of questions was put to stakeholders about the incidence of life skills teaching and counseling and its role in their school’s educational programming. The vast majority of stakeholders indicated that their schools do teach life skills (90.6%) and that it played a major role in educational programming at the school (see Table 3.19). Among teachers, 73% indicated that life skills played a ‘big’ role in school programming, less than indicated by school directors but still a very large margin, nevertheless. Once again, the investigators were not able to independently verify these assertions since students were on vacation and the schools themselves were in recess so no activities could be observed.

**Table 3.19: Perceptions of Life Skills Services at Schools**

Stakeholder Perceptions of Life Skills Instruction	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Are there Life Skills Activities</i>				
Yes	29	90.6	-	-
No	3	9.4	-	-
<i>How big a role does Life Skills play at the school</i>				
Big role	28	87.5	66	71.0
Medium-sized role	4	12.5	22	23.7
Small Role	0	0	5	5.4
No Role	0	0	0	0
<i>Does the school need specialized facilities for life skills?</i>				
Yes	31	96.9	-	-
No	1	3.1	-	-

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

In terms of the availability of career counseling services, only about half of stakeholders indicated that ‘most’ students received support in the form of career counseling. A similar number of teachers indicated that they personally provided career counseling to their students on a frequent basis (see Table 3.20). The other half of stakeholders indicated that only ‘some,’ a ‘few’ or ‘none’ of their students received career counseling services. It is important to note in this regard that schools do not possess officially appointed counselors so that most of the counseling that does occur must be in the form of *ad hoc* advice to students. These findings suggest that there are serious gaps in student support with regards to how much guidance that they receive during their studies at their respective schools.

**Table 3.20: Availability of Career Counseling Services**

Stakeholder Perceptions of How Career Counseling	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
<i>How many students receive career counseling services at the school</i>				
Most of them	16	50.0	45	48.4
Some of them	9	28.1	26	28.0
A few of them	4	12.5	13	14.0
None of them	3	9.4	5	5.4
All of them	0	0	4	4.3
<i>Have you ever provided career counseling to any students?</i>				
Yes, frequently	-	-	50	53.8
From time to time	-	-	39	41.9
No, never	-	-	2	2.2
Not so often	-	-	2	2.2

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

### 3.2.5 Issues Relating to Educational Inclusion

The final area of inquiry under the investigation of *educational quality and school services* related to school-based inclusiveness. In this regard, stakeholders were asked to self-assess their own understanding of the concept of inclusiveness and indicate their perception of how inclusive their school was with regards to various vulnerable groups (e.g., girls, minorities, etc.). In terms of their own self-assessment of understanding the concept of inclusiveness, two-thirds of school managers and about 60% of teachers described their understanding as either ‘high’ or ‘medium’ while between 34% of managers and 39% of teachers acknowledged that they had a ‘low’ understanding of the concept

**Table 3.21: Stakeholder Understanding & Perceptions of Educational Inclusion**

Understanding & Perception of Educational Inclusion	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Self-Assessment of Understanding of Educational Inclusion</b>				
I have high understanding	8	25.0	27	29.0
I have satisfactory understanding	13	40.6	30	32.3
I have low understanding	11	34.4	36	38.7
<b>Assessment of the Inclusiveness of Your School by Risk Group</b>				
<i>Girls</i>				
High Inclusion	24	75.0	58	62.4
Medium Inclusion	5	15.6	17	18.3
Low Inclusion	2	6.3	2	2.2
<i>Minority Groups* Only for schools with minority groups</i>				
High Inclusion	6	18.8	30	32.3
Medium Inclusion	8	25.0	12	12.9
Low Inclusion	0	0	2	2.2
<i>Physically Challenged</i>				
High Inclusion	27	84.4	60	64.5
Medium Inclusion	2	6.3	9	9.7
Low Inclusion	0	0	4	4.3
<i>Poor Students</i>				
High Inclusion	26	81.3	61	65.6
Medium Inclusion	1	3.1	13	14.0
Low Inclusion	0	0	1	1.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

(see Table 3.21). Relatedly, most respondents also indicated medium to high levels of inclusiveness for all of the key vulnerable groups in Cambodian society, based on their own perceptions. Once again, it was difficult to independently verify these perceptions since students were on break. However, community members voiced strong views that

they felt that many teachers were highly discriminatory in the way that they treated poor students when teaching *rien kua* classes, as noted previously. In addition, a review of the gender parity index (GPI) of the ten participating schools found that the average index for enrollment is 1.11 suggesting higher representation of girls than boys. Thus, it may be useful to help stakeholders to introspect about their attitudes towards student inclusion and whether their schools are actually as inclusive as they think.

### 3.3 Enabling Environments

Investigations in this area sought to determine the degree to which facilities and local conditions support some of the key services that Secondary Resource Schools are supposed to provide. This includes such things as security conditions, the availability of utilities, teacher availability, and specific Resource Center services such as libraries and laboratories.

#### 3.3.1 Security Status and Utilities

Security conditions at all schools participating in the survey appear to be good to satisfactory suggesting low risk from external sources when making major investments in equipment and materials (see Table 3.22). About half of the schools indicated that all classroom buildings have access to electricity while the other half indicated that only the office and some buildings have access to electricity (see Table 3.23). Internet access was reported to be more patchy. No schools reported that ‘all’ buildings have internet access while nearly a fifth reported that there is no internet access at all in the school. Most schools reported that internet access is either limited only to the office or just a few classroom buildings. Access to internet services and electricity is clearly key to modernizing educational services in project schools and some of these prerequisites do not yet appear to be in place in one-fifth or more of schools.

**Table 3.22: Assessment of School Security**

Security Assessment	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Security is very good	29	90.6	67	72.0
Security is satisfactory	3	9.4	26	28.0
Security is not so good	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

**Table 3.23: School Access to Electricity and Internet**

Description of Access to Electricity	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
All rooms have electricity	17	53.1	-	-
Only some buildings have electricity	10	31.3	-	-
Only the office has electricity	4	12.5	-	-
There is no electricity	1	3.1	-	-
Description of Access to Internet				
All rooms have internet	0	0	-	-
Only some buildings have internet	11	34.4	-	-
Only the office has internet	15	46.9	-	-
There is no internet	6	18.8	-	-

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

### 3.3.2 Science Lab Services

Each Resource Center in the SRS's has two science labs designed to promote practical work in teaching students about chemistry, physics, and biology. Investigators tried to assess the degree of student access to the labs and some of the key challenges in optimizing such access as well as their effective use. When asked student access, only about a third of teachers rated the degree of access and utilization as high (see Table 3.24). School managers were more generous in their assessment with 47% indicating high access. Nevertheless, 51% of teachers indicated that only some students use the labs or none at all.



*A science lab at one of the Resource Centers visited by the survey team.*

**Table 3.24: Student Access to Science Labs**

<b>Description of Access to Science Labs</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Students use labs a great deal	15	46.9	31	33.3
Students use labs some of the time	12	37.5	29	31.2
Students do not use the labs much	1	3.1	19	20.4
School does not have a science lab (Network Schools)	4	12.5	14	15.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

**Table 3.25: Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing Science Labs**

<b>Challenges Identified by Stakeholders in Using Science Labs</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
1. The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students.*	15	46.9 (1)	24	25.8 (3)
2. The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students.*	10	31.3 (2)	29	31.2 (1)
3. Teachers prefer to teach theory more than practice.*	8	25.0 (3)	4	4.3
4. Teachers do not know how to use the labs.	7	21.9	11	11.8
5. The labs lack materials and equipment.	7	21.9	18	19.4
6. The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs.*	4	12.5	28	30.1 (2)
7. Students study the science subjects only one or two hours per week.	4	12.5	12	12.9
8. There is not enough time in the day to use the lab.	2	6.3	22	23.7
9. Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes	1	3.1	6	6.5
10. The labs are rarely open.	0	0	1	1.1
11. There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair.	0	0	4	4.3
12. Other	0	0	1	1.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers); \*Top ranked issues or problems (highlighted in grey scale)

Stakeholders were also asked to identify the two biggest challenges that they face in effectively utilizing the science labs at their schools. School managers cited three main challenges including that there are not enough labs for all the students, the labs are too small and class sizes are very big, and teachers prefer to focus on ‘theory’ rather than ‘practice.’ Teachers voiced similar concerns though they prioritized them in a slightly different way and rejected the challenge that teachers prefer theory. But another key challenge that teachers thought to be of very high importance was the structure of the timetable where time periods are very short (40 to 45 minutes). Teachers felt that it is very difficult to set up experiments and clean up afterwards within this very short time frame. These are important structural issues that the project should seek to address, particularly when some of the SRS’s have enrollments of over 3,000 students.



*Resource Center Libraries provide books but no digital resources for students*

### **3.3.3 Library Services**

Each Resource Center also contains a student library that is designed to promote research and the reinforcement of reading skills. Most network schools also possess libraries though not as well equipped as the SRS libraries. Once again, investigators both sought to assess the degree of student access to the library and the challenges in library utilization. Responses by stakeholders tended to parallel those about science labs. About half of school managers expressed the view that there was very high access to the libraries, a view echoed by about a third of the teachers interviewed (see Table 3.26). Still, it was of some concern that about two-thirds of teachers indicated that the library is only used some of the time or not at all. Thus, the project needs to consider how it can make the library more attractive to students as well as make structural changes to the timetable to facilitate student access.

**Table 3.26: Student Access to Libraries**

<b>Description of Access to Libraries</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Students use library a great deal	16	50.0	30	32.3
Students use library some of the time	13	40.6	39	41.9
Students do not use the library much	0	0	24	25.8
School does not have a library	3	9.4	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

The most daunting challenges in making the library function cited by stakeholders were highly convergent (see Table 3.27). The number one issue identified by school managers was the lack of digital resources in the library, meaning that there are not mobile devices or electronic workstations in the library. Teachers concurred with this assessment though they prioritized this as their third most important challenge. Other key challenges cited included the lack of time in the school day for students to use the li-

brary (this was teachers’ most important concern) and the lack of materials and books kept in the library. Lesser challenges that nevertheless had high rates of responding included the observation that libraries are frequently closed, teachers’ lack capacity to link the libraries with their teaching, and librarians lack leadership skills to effectively reach out to teachers and students. These observations will be very useful to programmers as they start to formulate technical inputs to improve library services.

**Table 3.27: Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing the School Library**

<b>Challenges Identified by Stakeholders in Using Libraries</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
1. There are no digital or internet facilities in the library.*	17	53.1 (1)	45	48.4 (3)
2. Students have little time to effectively utilize the library.*	15	46.9 (2)	53	57.0 (1)
3. Library lacks materials and research books.*	14	43.8 (3)	46	49.5 (2)
4. Teachers do not know how to link their teaching with library services.	12	37.5	19	20.4
5. Teachers have no time to link their teaching with library services.	11	34.4	28	30.1
6. The library is too small	11	34.4	3	3.2
7. Librarians have no leadership skills.	8	25.0	23	24.7
8. Library operating hours are too short.	0	0	13	14.0
9. Library is frequently closed.	0	0	39	41.9
10. Other	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers); \*Top ranked issues or problems (highlighted in grey scale)

### **3.3.4 ICT Lab Services**

The final educational pillar in the student services provided at each SRS is the ICT Lab of which there are two in each center. Each lab has about 25 workstations. The lab is a facility that is heavily dependent on the availability of electricity and internet service to be effective. Each SRS receives a fixed budget of 35 million CR each year (almost \$9,000) from MoEYS to ensure that the school can pay for both utility costs and maintenance to keep the labs running smoothly. About half of school managers (47%) felt that there is high access to the labs with about a third (32%) of teachers concurring with this view (see Table 2.28). On the other hand, about 56% of teachers indicated that only ‘some’ students can access the labs or none at all. Improving access to the ICT labs and expanding digital education services will be one of the most important objectives of USE-SDP programming.

**Table 3.28: Student Access to ICT Labs**

<b>Description of Access to ICT Labs</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Students use ICT labs a great deal	15	46.9	30	32.3
Students use ICT labs some of the time	11	34.4	33	35.5
Students do not use ICT labs much	0	0	19	20.4
School does not have an ICT Lab (Network Schools)	6	18.8	11	11.8

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

Some of the key challenges identified by school managers in running the ICT labs are summarized in Table 3.29. The number one issue identified by school managers (47%) was that there are too few labs available to provide access to all students, particularly in schools with thousands of enrolled students. The top issue identified by teachers (60%) was that many workstations are non-operational. Other top issues identified by respondents included a shortage of ICT teachers to properly run the labs, the utility budget comes too late from the government to keep the labs operating smoothly, and there is not enough time in the timetable to adequately give instruction to students. These are all very useful ideas to consider to ensure that future programmatic support is relevant.



*Computer Lab with 25 Workstations in a Resource Center*

**Table 3.29: Identification of Key Challenges in Utilizing the ICT Lab**

<b>Challenges Identified by Stakeholders in Using ICT Labs</b>	<b>School Managers</b>		<b>Teachers</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
1. The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students.*	15	46.9 (1)	25	26.9 (3)
2. There is a shortage of ICT teachers to run the labs.*	13	40.6 (2)	8	8.6
3. Many workstations are non-operational.*	6	18.8 (3)	56	60.2 (1)
4. The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students.	6	18.8	13	14.0
5. The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs.	5	15.6	5	5.4
6. The labs lack computers and materials.	4	12.5	20	21.5
7. There is not enough time in the day to use the lab.	3	9.4	17	18.3
8. There are no available hours in the timetable to use ICT labs.	3	9.4	6	6.5
9. Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes.	2	6.3	3	3.2
10. Utility Budget from MoEYS comes too late to keep the labs running regularly.*	1	3.1	35	37.6 (2)
11. Teachers do not know how to use the labs.	1	3.1	14	15.1
12. The utility costs of maintaining the ICT labs means that it is not possible to keep them running regularly.	0	0	7	7.5
13. The labs are rarely open.	0	0	11	11.8
14. There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair.	0	0	1	1.1
15. Other	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers); \*Top ranked issues or problems (highlighted in grey scale)

### 3.3.5 Teacher Availability and Professional Learning

The final element in the assessment of the enabling environment at target schools and the extent to which this environment supports high quality educational services, relates to the availability of teachers. Teacher shortages in rural areas have been reported as a major problem in many Cambodian schools that often undermines the ability of schools to provide effective educational services. Often this requires over-utilizing teachers, asking teachers to teach subjects in which they have not expertise, and increasing class sizes. Although community members in focus group discussions highlighted the lack of teachers as a serious problem, and particularly science teachers, at local schools, most stakeholders in the surveyed schools themselves (school managers and teachers) did not see teacher shortages as a major issue. About 59% of school managers indicated that there is ‘no’ teacher shortage at their school or if there is, it is only very slight (see Table 3.30). Almost 80% of teachers echoed this view. Nevertheless, almost 40% of school managers said that there is a ‘growing’ shortage of teachers, indicating that this could be a problem for them in the future.

**Table 3.30: Description of Teacher Shortages**

Stakeholder Assessment of Teacher Shortages	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
There is no teacher shortage	9	28.1	39	41.9
There is a slight teacher shortage	10	31.3	35	37.6
There is a growing shortage of teachers	12	37.5	17	18.3
There is a major shortage of teachers	1	3.1	2	2.2

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are one means through which USE-SDP 2 hopes to improve teacher practice at target schools. Such communities enable teachers to learn from one another and also share materials. Creating PLCs has often been problematic at Cambodian secondary schools because of the practice of *rien kua*, where teachers do not look upon one another as colleagues but as competitors trying to get as many student ‘customers’ as possible. As a result, there is often little sharing of materials or mutual assistance. Thus, the conventional logic is that PLCs are not thriving in Cambodian schools. The present survey tended to validate these presuppositions. In Table 3.31 below, it is rather revealing to know that 45% of the Technical Subject Leaders surveyed did not even know what a PLC is. Among those that did know what a PLC is, only 5% said that the PLC at their school was ‘alive and vibrant.’ The remaining 49% of teachers felt that PLCs at their school either do not exist at all or are not very active. These findings are very important in that they demonstrate a key area of needed intervention. Nevertheless, the project will be greatly challenged in strengthening a PLC culture as long as *rien kua* practices push hard against inter-teacher cooperation.

**Table 3.31: Teacher Perceptions of Professional Learning Communities**

How would you describe the professional learning community at your school?	No	%
The PLC is alive and vibrant	5	5.4
The PLC exists but it is not very active	2	2.2
There is no PLC of any substance at the school	44	47.3
I don’t understand what a PLC is to adequately answer this question	42	45.2

N=93 (Teachers)

One of the planned interventions in USE-SDP 2 schools will be to set up extra-curricular student clubs that have teacher advisers to facilitate them. Such activities can have a dramatic impact on heightening student motivation and bringing book-learning to life. The present survey, therefore, sought to determine the receptivity of teachers to volunteering for such extra work. Responses among teachers indicate that this activity should be feasible, as about a fifth of teachers indicated that there would be ‘many’ teachers (perhaps including themselves) who would be receptive to working with such clubs (see Table 3.32). For these clubs to work, it is not necessary for all teachers to be involved but one-fifth should provide the needed critical mass necessary.

**Table 3.32: Teacher Receptiveness to Organizing Student Subject Clubs**

<i>If teachers at your school received special training about organizing student subject clubs, how many of them do you think would be interested in volunteering to provide this service?</i>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Many of them	21	22.6
Some of them	50	53.8
Few of them	12	12.9
None of them	2	2.2
Don't know	8	8.6

N=93 (Teachers)

### 3.4 Stakeholder Outreach

The assessment of issues in this area relate mainly to the role of the School Support Committee (SSC) in developing the school and the quality of school-community relations. Once again these assessments are based on attitudinal perceptions rather than objective metrics. One of the important goals in this assessment is to determine the degree of convergence or divergence between the viewpoints of different stakeholders as a starting point for the design and modulation of different project interventions.

#### 3.4.1 The Role of the School Support Committee in Education

All school directors (though surprisingly not all teachers) attested to the existence of a School Support Committee at their school. The main kinds of support provided by the committee seems to be furniture, general financial support, and teaching materials with high agreement by both school managers and teachers (see Table 3.33).

**Table 3.33: Perceptions of the Role of School Support Committees at Schools**

Presence of an SSC	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	32	100.0	84	90.3
No	0	0	2	2.2
Don't know	-	-	7	7.5
<b>Kinds of Support from SSC, if one exists</b>				
Furniture	17	53.1	49	52.7
Financial Support	16	50.0	55	59.1
Teaching aids/materials	13	40.6	50	53.8
Buildings	10	31.3	16	17.2
No support	3	9.4	2	2.2
Other	0	0	0	0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

Descriptions about the level of support from the SSC tended to gravitate towards the middle of the response spectrum with about half of school managers and teachers stating that the SSC supports the school to a 'medium degree.' About a third of respondents indicated strong support while only 10% indicated 'little' or 'no' support (see Table 3.34). In terms of the frequency of SSC meetings with the school, the vast majority of school managers (68%) indicated that meetings about occur once a semester (see Table 3.35). Among teachers, the most frequent response to this question was 'don't know,' which along with the highly divergent response patterns in comparison to school directors would indicate that teachers have little contact with SSCs and really have little idea about the extent of their involvement in the school's affairs.

**Table 3.34: Perceptions of the Degree to Which SSC Supports the School**

Degree of SSC Support to the School	S School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Supports the school a great deal	12	37.5	26	28.0
Supports the school to a medium degree	16	50.0	43	46.2
Only provides a little support to the school	4	12.5	9	9.7
Does not provide any support	0	0	1	1.1
Don't know	-	-	14	15.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

**Table 3.35: Perceived Frequency of SSC Meetings**

SSC Meeting Frequency	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Once a month	2	6.3	24	25.8
Once every two months	3	9.4	2	2.2
Once a semester	22	68.8	21	22.6
Once a year	5	15.6	16	17.2
Never	0	0	1	1.1
Don't know	-	-	28	30.1
Other	0	0	1	1.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

### 3.4.2 Perceptions of School-Community Relations

The survey's assessment of stakeholder perceptions of school-community relations was generally positive. Over a third of both school managers and teachers indicated that relations with the community were either 'very strong and active' or moderately strong (see Table 3.36). Hard anyone said that relations were not strong. Similarly, most school managers and teachers indicated that if there is a break down in communication between school and community, it is likely the fault of both parties and not just the community. Only about 10%+ of school-based stakeholders tended to put more blame on the community (see Table 3.37).

**Table 3.36: Perceived Relationship between School and Community**

How Stakeholders Describe the Relationship between their School & Community	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
Very strong and active	13	40.6	36	38.7
Moderately strong and active	19	59.4	52	55.9
Not very strong and active	0	0	1	1.1
Hard to say	0	0	4	4.3

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

**Table 3.37: Perceived Attribution of Cause for Poor School-Community Relations**

When communities and parents are not involved in education, it is usually:	School Managers		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
The fault of both the school and the community.	23	71.9	74	79.6
The fault of the community	4	12.5	11	11.8
The fault of the school	4	12.5	7	7.5
Other	1	3.1	1	1.1

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

In spite of the hopeful findings suggested above, there is often a tendency among many Cambodian educators to attribute to parents attitudes that suggest that they do not value education or fail to make time to be involved in school affairs. Open-ended responses by those participating in the survey by school managers and teachers tended to confirm that these biases do still exist among some of the individuals in surveyed schools (see selected responses in Box 4). These responses suggest a failure to look critically at one's own behaviors where many teachers prioritize their private classes over the regular public teaching, extort money from students, and discriminate against poor students. Many school managers similarly turn a blind eye to these practices. Is it any wonder then that parents might put a low priority on working with schools and their operators?

Focus group discussions with community members on the other hand took a much more cheerful view of things and stated that they saw ‘few’ obstacles to good school-community relations (see Box 4). These patterns of responding once again show a high degree of divergence in attitudes among key school stakeholders on the same topic and suggest the need for considerable bridge building activities during the design and implementation of project interventions.

**BOX 4: Perceived Greatest Obstacle to Good School-Community Relations**

**School Directors**

- The communication between school and communities is not good.
- Communities rarely participate in education because they have little time
- Parents do not recognize the importance of education for their children.
- Communities do not trust school management.

**Teachers**

- Lack of communication with communities and parents.
- Parents and communities don’t have time to join meetings and so rarely collaborate with schools.
- Parents are busy and do not value education.
- Difficult to contact parents and invite them to join the school activities.

**Community Members**

- There are few obstacles to maintaining good relations between schools and communities.
- The communities will come to support the school when any invitation.

**3.4.3 Communication Channels between School and Stakeholders**

There are several areas where USESDP 2 intends to try to leverage new technologies to improve the delivery of educational services in target schools. This includes adding digital resources to libraries, introducing teacher-mentoring software to improve the support of classroom practices, and initiating e-counseling services, among others. It is, therefore, important to have a better understanding about the availability of electronic communication channels and the ubiquity of technology in target areas.



*Teachers use mobile devices to complete survey forms during the assessment*

The survey presented below is once again a review of stakeholders’ perceptions of social media and the availability of technology in the local area; these perceptions could not be objectively verified. Nevertheless, they provide some basis for making conclusions about the nature of the local context and how this should affect programming in the project’s efforts to promote digital education. In terms of social media use, school-based stakeholders indicated that social media is currently widely used. Between 39% to 41% of school managers and teachers

indicated that social media is used a ‘great deal’ while a similar number of respondents indicated that they used social media to ‘some degree’ (see Table 3.38).

**Table 3.38: Perceived Degree of Utilization of Social Media to Communicate with Stakeholders**

<b>Degree to Which Social Media is Used to Communicate with Different Stakeholders</b>	<b>Approximate Percentage (%)</b>	
	<i>Resource Schools</i>	<i>Network Schools</i>
Social media is used a great deal at my school	40.8	38.8
Social media is used to some degree at my school	43.4	40.8
Social media is used very little at my school	14.5	18.4
Social media is not used at my school	1.3	2.0

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

Stakeholders also indicated that smartphones are also widely used by both teachers and students. Over 80% of teachers are thought to be in possession of a smartphone and about two-thirds of students. These figures are very similar in both Resource Schools and Network Schools. On the other hand, laptops appear to be much less present with only one-quarter of teachers or less in possession of such a device. Nevertheless, this information suggests that there is a strong foundation for introducing interventions that will require the use of mobile technology and social media.

**Table 3.39: Perceptions of Teacher & Student Access to Electronic Equipment**

<b>Kinds of Equipment to Which Teachers &amp; Students Have Access</b>	<b>Approximate Percentage (%)</b>	
<i>Estimated Percentage of Teachers with:</i>	<i>Resource Schools</i>	<i>Network Schools</i>
Laptops	26.8	17.7
Smartphones	83.3	80.2
<i>Estimated Percentage of Students with:</i>		
Smartphones	67.8	61.8

N=32 (School Managers); N=93 (Teachers)

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

### 4.1 General Impressions

The present assessment has focused primarily on efforts to gauge the perceptions and attitudes of stakeholders on various issues of key import to the implementation of the Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2. What the assessment has found that is that stakeholders, including school managers (school directors and vice directors), teachers, and community members, have attitudes about education that are frequently divergent on many issues. For example, teachers do not seem to be well-informed about school-community relations; stakeholders often seem to prioritize problems and issues very differently, and they have very different views of the issue of private classes, linked to the delivery of the state curriculum (among others). This is not to say that there has been no convergence on viewpoints (there has been), only that more divergence was reported than was originally expected, particularly in the perception of problems. In general, school managers and community members tend to be more convergent in their views than are teachers whose attitudes frequently diverge from other stakeholder groups. Understanding these points of divergence (as well as convergence) will be very useful to those providing training support to stakeholders and will help programmers to avoid some fatal assumptions about what stakeholders think or do not think.

The overall impression of the context in target schools is a positive one. Most schools are conducting their planning, including a plan for Resource Center utilization. School managers and community members tend to express their priorities in terms of student learning. Stakeholders also reported that most schools (about two-thirds) do not suffer from major teacher shortages and security conditions are also generally good. Most school-level stakeholders report a high degree of openness to life skills programming and advising students on their careers. In addition, most school managers (about 80%) seem to express a strong predisposition to reasonable risk-taking in their management, which is a key attribute of a successful manager. These findings would all suggest that there are multiple pre-requisites in place for successful investment, even though there are also some key constraints that the project must consider. These are more fully elaborated below.



*The exterior of a school Resource Center in a surveyed school*

### 4.2 Key Findings and Their Import for Future Programming

**School Planning:** Stakeholders reported that key planning documents that need to be completed each year (e.g., SIPs, SRCAPs) were indeed in place and that these documents had been developed with broad participation from various stakeholder groupings (e.g., teachers, community members, etc.). However, there seemed to be serious disagreement about how much of this planning had actually been implemented, particularly with respect to the SRCAP. In this regard, only about half of surveyed schools reported that most of the plan had been implemented with teachers reporting even lower levels

of implementation. Low rates of planning implementation may be related to significant amounts of divergence among stakeholders in terms of how they prioritize issues. Table 4.1 below indicates the top issues among stakeholders with rankings provided parenthetically. In terms of the number one issue identified, school managers and community members converge on only one issue (students are learning well) while teachers are largely divergent with respect to their number one priority issue from both school managers and community members. It surely must be difficult to develop unified planning when stakeholders lack a consensus on what the key priority issues even are. Thus, this finding should figure prominently in efforts to design training materials on school planning and implementation.

**Table 4.1: Divergence among Stakeholders in Prioritizing Important Educational Issues**

Key Planning Issues	School Managers	Teachers	Community Members
Infrastructure upgrading	(1)	(2)	(2)
Students are learning well	(1)	(3)	(1)
Teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism	(2)	(3)	(1)
Teachers have adequate salaries	(3)	(1)	(4)
Parents should be satisfied with the instruction at the school	(4)	(4)	(3)

**Capacity-building Needs:** The stakeholders that contributed to this assessment generally seemed very receptive to planned investments in capacity-building, even though many said that they had already received a great deal of training already on various topics such as leadership and management. In terms of teacher capacity-building areas, there was high congruence in the topical areas where teachers should receive more support (see Table 4.2). The top priority topical area in this regard was ‘General Teaching Methods.’ In spite of all

**Table 4.2: Priority Ranking of Training Areas Identified by School Managers and Teachers**

Areas Where Teachers Are Perceived to Have the Most Training Needs	School Managers	Teachers
General Teaching Methods	(1)	(1)
How to do experiments	(2)	(2)
How to use ICT	(3)	(3)

the previous training received by teachers, however, many stakeholders still seemed to be very misinformed about some very basic concepts. For example, barely half of school managers could correctly define what *School-based Management* is even though this is supposed to be one of the key thrusts of the project. Similarly, about half of teachers indicated that they had never heard of the concept of *Professional Learning Community*, let alone whether one existed at their school. Given these and similar gaps in knowledge and understanding among school-based stakeholders, any efforts to map out capacity-building needs should take into consideration that stakeholders are themselves unsure of what technical areas they most need to develop in themselves.

Nevertheless, there do seem to be in place some of the needed pre-requisites for planned capacity-building activities, particularly those that rely on increased use of technology to improve educational services. For example, most teachers possess smartphones and there is internet access in at least one or more buildings in most target schools. The same is true for electricity service. In addition, about one-third of teachers reportedly have high proficiency in using ICT, which should also prove to be

enough of a solid foundation to start introducing digital resources into the library, mentoring software, and e-counseling services.

**Resource Center Utilization:** Given that additional investments are planned in Resource Centers as well as expanded investments in libraries and science labs in network schools, the findings relating to Resource Center Utilization rates could prove to be very useful. Overall, stakeholders seem to feel that utilization rates of the centers were moderate to low. Only a few stakeholders indicated high utilization rates. Similarly, very few network schools indicated that they relied heavily on the centers either. This last finding provides a good justification for current project planning to emplace libraries and science labs at network schools. But some of the other constraints in utilizing the Centers (see Box 5) suggest the need for structural changes at the schools as well (besides more training). These structural changes include reducing class sizes, modifying the timetable, and inhibiting private classes to the extent that this is possible (see below). Thus, project programmers should not limit their efforts to increase Resource Center utilization rates simply to more capacity-building activities only but rather to key structural features in the school environment as well.

**Box 5: Summary of the Top Challenges in Utilizing Resource Centers Cited by School Managers & Teachers**

- Teachers don't know how to use the Centers
- Maintaining the facilities
- Teachers know how to use the Center but put more emphasis on their private classes
- There is not enough time in the timetable to use the facilities
- The facilities have too few materials to be effective
- Class sizes at the school are very big and the Center cannot accommodate them.

**Key Constraints for Proposed Programming:** Stakeholder divergence in attitudes about various education issues has already been cited as one key constraint that project programmers will have to deal with as the project moves forward, particularly with respect to achieving consensual planning. But there are also other factors to consider. Most prominent on this list of constraints is the role of private classes (i.e., *rien kua*) that are a standard part of the routine of many teachers, especially those teaching Grade 12 students. Aside from the fact that teaching private classes to one's own students is generally seen as unethical and a clear conflict of interest, there are other practical reasons why this practice may undermine USE-SDP 2 programming. Mainly this refers to the observation that teachers often prioritize their private classes to the detriment of educational investments made by the Ministry such as the Resource Center. Indeed, many stakeholders (especially school managers and community members) identified this as a major factor that accounts for underutilization of the Resource Center because teachers place a higher priority on their own private classes (see Box 5). In addition, this assessment found that most teachers see the practice of organizing private classes as perfectly fine, indicating that any efforts to root it out or even curtailing it are likely to be met with fierce opposition.

Other important constraints to consider relate to the limited amount of time that comprise a subject period (usually 40 to 45 minutes) and the challenges this presents for using the science and ICT labs. Some of these challenges have also been laid out in Box 5, as well. In addition, the labs are not designed for the large class sizes that often characterize many project schools, which also presents problems for high utilization of the Resource Center. Similarly, some of the schools where the Resource Centers have been placed have extremely large enrollments, exceeding 2,000, 3,000, and in some cases 4,000 students. Even though the centers have two science labs and two ICT labs, this is

not nearly enough to ensure access to all students. The current strategy of converting normal classrooms into science labs as is currently proposed is, therefore, highly advised and may help to address some of these constraints.

## ANNEX 1: Identification of Investigative Areas

### Ministry of Education, Youth, & Sport Investigative Areas for USE-SDP Quick Assessment Survey

Investigative Area	Stakeholder Grouping			Remarks
	School Managers	Teachers	Community Members	
<b>A. Concepts of Leadership and Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk taking behavior</li> <li>• Decision-making (Auto-cratic-Democratic)</li> <li>• Level of awareness of School Based Management guidance</li> <li>• Accountability (i.e. holding teachers to account for quality of teaching)</li> <li>• What formal leadership and management training have directors had?</li> </ul>	x	x	--	
<b>B. Understanding of Planning Concepts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting priorities</li> <li>• Problem Identification</li> <li>• Participation</li> </ul>	x	x	x	
<b>C. Frequency of Planning</b>	x	x	x	
<b>D. School Stakeholder Perceptions of School Quality</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparisons with other schools</li> <li>• Working Conditions</li> </ul>	x	x	x	
<b>E. Concepts of Educational Quality</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion (i.e. that learning is for everyone): What is directors' and teachers' level of awareness?</li> <li>• School Environment (Access to facilities, utilization of facilities/ Use of Science Labs and the Available)</li> <li>• Content of Education (Curriculum)</li> <li>• Extracurricular activities</li> <li>• Educational Outcomes (How does the assess outcomes – tests, projects, school efficiency measures, etc.)</li> <li>• Processes of Learn-</li> </ul>	x	x	x	

Investigative Area	Stakeholder Grouping			Remarks
	School Managers	Teachers	Community Members	
ing/How Teachers teach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which qualifications do teachers currently have?</li> </ul>				
<b>F. Concepts of Professionalism</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role modeling</li> <li>Acceptability of private classes</li> <li>Utilization of facilities among teachers</li> <li>ICT Literacy among teachers</li> <li>Incidence of Mentoring Support</li> <li>Attitudes towards students</li> <li>What are the current and desired mechanisms for Teacher Professional Development?</li> </ul>	x	x		
<b>G. Physical Constraints</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to electricity</li> <li>Access to internet</li> <li>Infrastructure Conditions</li> </ul>	x	x		
<b>H. Teacher Availability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortage or Surplus</li> </ul>	x	x	x	
<b>I. ICT Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Literacy among Teachers</li> <li>ICT infrastructure esp. the availability of internet in school/classroom and (if possible) the school catchment area</li> </ul>	x	x		
<b>J. School Security</b>	x		x	
<b>K. Availability of School Services (for students)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life Skills Classes</li> <li>Counseling services</li> <li>Library availability</li> <li>Science Labs</li> <li>ICT Labs</li> </ul>	x	x	x	
<b>L. Interaction with Community</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequency of Interaction</li> <li>How the school interacts with community (Big Meetings, individualized Meetings, etc.)</li> <li>Kinds of Community Support (financial, in-kind, etc.)</li> </ul>	x	x	x	

Investigative Area	Stakeholder Grouping			
	School Managers	Teachers	Community Members	Remarks
<b>M. Methods of Communication in the School</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social Media Groups</li> <li>• Meetings</li> <li>• SMS Messaging</li> <li>• Announcements</li> <li>• Use of Smartphones (how many teacher have access to a smartphone)</li> <li>• Student and Parent Access to Smartphones</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	x	x		

## ANNEX 2: School Selection Sample

Name of Nominated School	Province	District	Selection Criteria			
			Demo-graphic Setting	Size	Performance on SRS Previous Assessments	School Type
			Urban/ Rural	Big: 25 classes+	Good: A/B	Resource School
				Medium: 15 to 24 classes	Medium: C	Network School
Small: 14 or less	Poor: D					
1. Preah Sihanouk	Kampong Cham	Kampong Cham	Urban	Big	Good	SRS
2. Hun Sen Chumpouvoan	Phnom Penh	Pursen Chey	Rural	Medium	Good	SRS
3. Chbar Ampov	Phnom Penh	Chbar Ampov	Urban	Big	Fair	SRS
4. Tep Pranam	Kandal	Ponnhea Leu	Rural	Medium	Fair	SRS
5. Hunsen Kampong Popil	Prey Veng	Peareang	Urban	Small	Medium	SRS
6. Samdach Decho Hun Sen Soung	Tbaung Khmum	Soung	Rural	Big	Medium	SRS
7. Samdach Chounnat	Kampong Cham	Kampong Cham	Urban	Big	-	NS
8. Hun Sen Chantnal	Kampong Spue	Oudong	Rural	Big	-	NS
9. Hun Sen Takmao	Kandal	Krong Takhmao	Urban	Small	-	NS
10. Heng Samrin Chak Damril	Tbaung Khmum	Oraing Ov	Rural	Small	-	NS

Please Circle:

Kind of School: SRS Network School

### ANNEX 3: Data Collection Tools

## Upper Secondary Education – Sector Development Program Survey Form – Teachers

<b>Interviewee Name:</b> XXXXXXXXXXXX	<b>Sex &amp; Age:</b>	<b>M F / ____ Years</b>
<b>School Name:</b> _____	<b>Interviewer Name:</b>	_____
<b>Province:</b> _____	<b>Position:</b>	_____
<b>District:</b> _____	<b>Date:</b>	_____
<b>Working duration:</b> _____ Years	<b>How old are you?</b>	_____

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<b>Section 1: Management and Planning Issues</b>	A, B
1.	How would you describe the management practices at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> Very democratic <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat democratic <input type="checkbox"/> Not very democratic <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say	A
2.	Does your school have an annual plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>	B
3.	If you have a plan, did you participate in the planning. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	B
4.	If you have a plan, how much of the annual plan was implemented? <input type="checkbox"/> All of it <input type="checkbox"/> Most of it <input type="checkbox"/> Some of it <input type="checkbox"/> None of it <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	B
5.	Does the school have an SRC Action Plan? <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>	
6.	If you have an SRC Action Plan, how much of the plan was implemented? <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> All of it <input type="checkbox"/> Most of it <input type="checkbox"/> Some of it <input type="checkbox"/> None of it <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	B
7.	How often do you join school administration meetings? Every month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> _____	B
8.	How often do you join school technical meetings? Every month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> _____	B
9.	Which of the following definitions of School-based Management best matches your own understanding of SBM? <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy in which authority for all operational aspects of a school is transferred from managers to community members. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from central level offices to individual schools. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy that enables schools to comply strictly with the rules and policies set at central level. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy whereby the control of decision-making at a school	A

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<input type="checkbox"/> is moved to local authorities such as the Commune Council Office. <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know the meaning of SBM.	
10.	<p>To answer the following question, you will have to use 8 stars (★). Draw one or more stars in front of each the areas below to show how much priority you put on it. The more stars you draw in front of something, the higher the priority you think it has. If you feel that something has hardly any priority, just leave it blank. Be sure you do NOT use more than 8 stars.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. _____ Infrastructure upgrading</li> <li>2. _____ School has a flagpole</li> <li>3. _____ Students are learning well</li> <li>4. _____ Teachers have adequate salaries</li> <li>5. _____ Teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism</li> <li>6. _____ Students dress properly</li> <li>7. _____ Parents are satisfied with the instruction at the school</li> <li>8. _____ School has a proper gate</li> </ol>	B
<b>Section 2: School Perceptions and Concepts of Educational Quality/Services</b>		C, D, E, H, J
11.	Complete the following statement:  <i>The biggest problem in my school is: _____</i>	C
12.	Complete the following statement:  <i>The one thing that I am most proud of during my time as a teacher of this school is: _____</i>	D
13.	Complete the following statement in any way that you would like:  <i>If I were a very rich person and wanted to improve the education system, I would: _____</i>	C
14.	What are some of the key challenges you face in utilizing the Resource Center? ( <i>Pick the top 2 issues for you only</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The facilities are not well maintained.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The facilities are too small.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The facilities have too few materials to be effective.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The facilities are often locked.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> I don't know how to use them.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> I know how to use them but am too busy with my private classes to use them.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the timetable to use the facilities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Class sizes at this school are very big</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify: _____</li> </ul>	D
15.	How would you describe the attendance of teachers in general at your school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Nearly all the teachers come to work on a regular basis</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Most teachers come to work on a regular basis but some are tardy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> About half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis but half are often tardy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Less than half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis</li> </ul>	D, E

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	If teachers don't come on a regular basis, what is usually the reason? _____	
16.	How would you describe the other teachers in your school? <input type="checkbox"/> Nearly all are highly motivated and interested in helping students <input type="checkbox"/> Most are highly motivated and interested in helping students <input type="checkbox"/> Some are highly motivated but others less so <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to say	D, E
17.	How would you describe the Professional Learning Community (PLC) at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> The PLC is alive and vibrant <input type="checkbox"/> The PLC exists but it is not very active <input type="checkbox"/> There is no PLC of any substance at the school <input type="checkbox"/> I don't understand what a PLC is to adequately answer this question	D,E
18.	How would you describe the quality of education at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> Better than most <input type="checkbox"/> About the same as most <input type="checkbox"/> Worse than most <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to say	C, D
19.	How would you describe the attitudes of children at your school towards education? Please pick the statement that best describes the situation at your school. <input type="checkbox"/> Most children really want to attend school <input type="checkbox"/> Many children really want to attend school but a few feel that it is not so important <input type="checkbox"/> About half the children here really want to attend school but the other half feel that it is not so important <input type="checkbox"/> Few of the children here feel that attending school is very important	C
20.	How many of the teachers in this school are proficient in using computers? <input type="checkbox"/> All of them <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	E, H
21.	How many of the teachers at this school actually use ICT in their classroom teaching? <input type="checkbox"/> All of them <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	E, H
22.	What are the most important areas where teachers at your school need more training? Please choose the top TWO areas in your opinion. <input type="checkbox"/> General Teaching Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management <input type="checkbox"/> Student Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> How to do experiments <input type="checkbox"/> How to use ICT <input type="checkbox"/> How to better use the library for student learning <input type="checkbox"/> How to teach soft skills <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please Specify: _____	E
23.	Which statement below best describes how the majority of teachers at your school teach? (Choose only ONE statement) <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturing is the predominant methodology. <input type="checkbox"/> A combination of lecturing and some practical group exercises. <input type="checkbox"/> A good balance of lecturing and practical group exercises.	E

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<input type="checkbox"/> A strong focus on practical group work and student projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say	
24.	How big a role does life skills instruction play in your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A very big role <input type="checkbox"/> A medium sized role <input type="checkbox"/> A small role <input type="checkbox"/> No role	D, J
25.	How many of the students at your school receive career counseling? <input type="checkbox"/> All of them <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	D, J
26.	Have you personally ever provided career counseling to your students? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, frequently <input type="checkbox"/> From time to time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so often <input type="checkbox"/> No, never	D, J
27.	How would you describe the practice of ‘rien kua’? <input type="checkbox"/> A good practice <input type="checkbox"/> A bad practice <input type="checkbox"/> A practice that is both good and bad	D
28.	What effect would stopping ‘rien kua’ at your school have on your school? <input type="checkbox"/> It would make things worse <input type="checkbox"/> It would make things better <input type="checkbox"/> It would have no effect	D
29.	How many of the teachers at your school have an intermediate level of English proficiency or higher? <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> About half of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	E
30.	If teachers at your school received special training about organizing student subject clubs, how many of them do you think would be interested in volunteering to provide this service? <input type="checkbox"/> Many of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them <input type="checkbox"/> Don’t know	D
31.	How would you describe your understanding about concepts of ‘educational inclusion’? <input type="checkbox"/> High understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory Understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Low Understanding	D
32.	How would you describe the inclusiveness of your school for each of the following kinds of student groupings? <i>(If you do not have this group, please leave blank)</i>	D
	Girls <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion	D
	Minorities: <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion	
	Physically Challenged <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion	
Poor Students <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion		
33.	To what extent does your school rely on the Resource Center? <i>(For Network Schools Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Relies a great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Relies to some extent <input type="checkbox"/> Does not rely much <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say	D
34.	Of all the different kinds of assistance that a project could provide to your school to improve educational quality, what single input do you think is the most important? _____ _____	D, J

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
<b>Section 3: Enabling Environments</b>		F, G, H, I
35.	How would you describe security in your school? <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Not so good	I
36.	To what extent do your students utilize the science labs at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no science labs	F
37.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the science lab at your school? Pick the 3 most important issues at your school. <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers prefer to teach theory more than practice. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students. <input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the day to use the lab. <input type="checkbox"/> The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Students study the science subjects only one or two hours per week. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs lack materials and equipment. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are rarely open. <input type="checkbox"/> There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	F
38.	To what extent do your students utilize the library? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no library	F
39.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the library at your school? Pick the 3 most important issues at your school. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to link their teaching with library services. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to link their teaching with library services. <input type="checkbox"/> Students have little time to effectively utilize the library. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no digital or internet facilities in the library. <input type="checkbox"/> Librarians have no leadership skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Library operating hours are too short. <input type="checkbox"/> Library is frequently closed. <input type="checkbox"/> Library lacks materials and research books. <input type="checkbox"/> The library is too small. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	F
40.	To what extent do your students utilize the ICT labs at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no ICT labs	F, H
41.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the ICT labs at your school? Pick the 3 most important issues at your school. <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Do not have enough ICT Teachers to operate the lab. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes. <input type="checkbox"/> The utility costs of maintaining the ICT labs means that it is not possible to keep them running regularly.	F, H

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Budget from MoEYS comes too late to keep the labs running regularly. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students. <input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the day to use the lab. <input type="checkbox"/> The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no available hours in the timetable to use ICT labs. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs lack materials and equipment. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are rarely open. <input type="checkbox"/> There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the workstations are non-operational <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
42.	How would you describe the teacher shortage at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> There is no shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a slight shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a growing shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a major shortage	G
43.	In general, how often do you utilize the Resource Center? <input type="checkbox"/> Very Frequently <input type="checkbox"/> Frequently <input type="checkbox"/> Once in a while <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much	F
<b>Section 4: Stakeholder Outreach</b>		K, L
44.	Is there a School Support Committee (or PTA) at the school? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, in what ways does the school support committee help the school? (Check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching aids/materials <input type="checkbox"/> Buildings <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Support <input type="checkbox"/> No support <input type="checkbox"/> Others _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	K
45.	To what degree does the SSC support the school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Support a medium amount <input type="checkbox"/> Only provides a little support <input type="checkbox"/> Does not provide any support <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	K
46.	How often does the School Support Committee meet to discuss school issues? <input type="checkbox"/> Once a month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	K, I
47.	Complete the following statement based on your personal experience. Choose only ONE response.  <i>When communities and parents are not involved in education, it is usually:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of the community <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of the school <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of both the school and the community. <input type="checkbox"/> None of these answers matches my view. My view is that _____	K, I

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
48.	<p>How would you describe the relationship between the school and community?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very strong and active   <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat strong and active  <input type="checkbox"/> Not very strong and active   <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say</p> <p>What do you see as the single greatest obstacle to maintaining good relations with the local community? _____</p>	K
49.	<p>To what degree does your school use social media to communicate with stakeholders such as teachers, parents, students, community members, etc.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A great deal   <input type="checkbox"/> Use it to some degree   <input type="checkbox"/> Very little   <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all  <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know</p>	I
50.	Approximately what percentage of teachers have laptops? _____%	I
51.	Approximately what percentage of teachers have smartphones? _____%	I
52.	Approximately what percentage of students have smartphones? _____%	I

Please Circle:  
**Kind of School:** SRS Network School

**Upper Secondary Education – Sector Development Program  
 Survey Form – School Directors**

<b>Interviewee Name:</b> XXXXXXXXXXXX	<b>Sex &amp; Age</b>	<b>M F / ____ Years</b>
<b>School Name:</b> _____	<b>Interviewer Name:</b> _____	
<b>Province:</b> _____	<b>Position:</b> _____	
<b>District:</b> _____	<b>Date:</b> _____	

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<b>Section 1: Management and Planning Issues</b>	A, B
1.	Which of the following best describes your view about taking risks to improve your school? Check as many as might apply.  <input type="checkbox"/> Risk is usually a bad thing to be avoided whenever possible. <input type="checkbox"/> Taking risks is a necessary aspect of decision-making. <input type="checkbox"/> Taking risks will get you into trouble with higher authorities and so should generally be avoided. <input type="checkbox"/> The only way to gain progress is by taking risks, as long as the risks seem acceptable.	A
2.	3. How would you feel about sharing more of your authority with a committee who would help oversee any grant funds provided?  <input type="checkbox"/> I would support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> I am not sure if I would fully support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> I would be against this idea <input type="checkbox"/> I cannot really say how I would feel	A
4.	How much training on Leadership Issues have you received from MoEYS? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Quite a bit but more training is desirable <input type="checkbox"/> Some Training <input type="checkbox"/> None at all	A
5.	Does your school have an annual plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	B
6.	If you have a plan, indicate who was involved in the planning. If you do NOT have a plan, leave this question blank. Check all that apply.  <input type="checkbox"/> School managers <input type="checkbox"/> Grade leaders <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers <input type="checkbox"/> Community representatives <input type="checkbox"/> Commune representatives <input type="checkbox"/> Monks <input type="checkbox"/> Students <input type="checkbox"/> Local authorities (police, soldiers, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Others: _____	B
7.	If you have a plan, how much of the annual plan was implemented? <input type="checkbox"/> All of it <input type="checkbox"/> Most of it <input type="checkbox"/> Some of it <input type="checkbox"/> None of it	B

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
8.	Does the school have an SRC Action Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
9.	If you have an SRC Action Plan, how much of the plan was implemented? <input type="checkbox"/> All of it <input type="checkbox"/> Most of it <input type="checkbox"/> Some of it <input type="checkbox"/> None of it	B
10.	How often do you have school administration meetings? Every month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> _____	B
11.	How often do you have school technical meetings? Every month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> _____	B
12.	Which of the following definitions of School-based Management best matches your own understanding of SBM?	
13.	<input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy in which authority for all operational aspects of a school is transferred from <b>school</b> managers to community members. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from central level offices to individual schools. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy that enables schools to comply strictly with the rules and policies set at central level. <input type="checkbox"/> A management strategy whereby the control of decision-making at a school is moved to local authorities such as the Commune Council Office. <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know the meaning of SBM.	A
14.	To answer the following question, you will have to use 8 stars (★). Draw one or more stars in front of each the areas below to show how much priority you put on it. The more stars you draw in front of something, the higher the priority you think it has. If you feel that something has hardly any priority, just leave it blank. Be sure you do NOT use more than 8 stars.  9. _____ Infrastructure upgrading 10. _____ School has a flagpole 11. _____ Students are learning well 12. _____ Teachers have adequate salaries 13. _____ Teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism 14. _____ Students dress properly 15. _____ Parents are satisfied with the instruction at the school 16. _____ School has a proper gate	B
<b>Section 2: School Perceptions and Concepts of Educational Quality/Services</b>		C, D, E, H, J
15.	Complete the following statement:  <i>The biggest problem in my school is:</i> _____	C
16.	Complete the following statement:  <i>The one thing that I am most proud of during my time as director/vice director of this school is:</i> _____	D
17.	Complete the following statement in any way that you would like:	C

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<i>If I were a very rich person and wanted to improve the education system, I would:</i>	
18.	<p>What are some of the key challenges you face in managing the Resource Center? (Pick the top 2 issues for you only)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Maintaining the facilities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Paying for the utilities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teachers don't know how to use them</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teachers know how to use them but put more emphasis on their private classes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the timetable to use the facilities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not enough time for administrators to effectively manage the facilities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify: _____</p>	D
19.	<p>How would you describe the attendance of teachers at your school?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nearly all the teachers come to work on a regular basis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Most teachers come to work on a regular basis but some are tardy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> About half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis but half are often tardy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less than half of the teachers come to work on a regular basis</p> <p>If teachers don't come on a regular basis, what is usually the reason? _____</p>	D, E
20.	<p>How would you describe the teachers in your school?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nearly all are highly motivated and interested in helping students</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Most are highly motivated and interested in helping students</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some are highly motivated but others less so</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to say</p>	D, E
21.	<p>How would you describe the quality of education at your school?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Better than most</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> About the same as most</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Worse than others</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Difficult to say</p>	C, D
22.	<p>How would you describe the attitudes of children at your school towards education? Please pick the statement that best describes the situation at your school.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Most children really want to attend school</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Many children really want to attend school but a few feel that it is not so important</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> About half the children here really want to attend school but the other half feel that it is not so important</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Few of the children here feel that attending school is very important</p>	C
23.	<p>How many of your teachers are proficient in using computers?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None of them</p>	E, H
24.	<p>How many of your teachers actually use ICT in their classroom teaching.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them    <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None of them</p>	E, H
25.	<p>What are the most important areas where teachers need more training? Please choose the top two areas in your opinion.</p>	E

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<input type="checkbox"/> General Teaching Methods <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management <input type="checkbox"/> Student Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> How to do experiments <input type="checkbox"/> How to use ICT <input type="checkbox"/> How to better use the library for student learning <input type="checkbox"/> How to teach soft skills <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please Specify: _____	
26.	Which statement below best describes how the majority of teachers at your school teach? (Choose only ONE statement)  <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturing is the predominant methodology. <input type="checkbox"/> A combination of lecturing and some practical group exercises. <input type="checkbox"/> A good balance of lecturing and practical group exercises. <input type="checkbox"/> A strong focus on practical group work and student projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say	E
27.	Do you have any life skills program in your school?    Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>  If Yes, Name of life skills _____, _____, _____ (Eg. Rice, Frog/fish raising, Sewing, Vegetable growing, HIV/AIDS, Safe migration, ...)	D, J
28.	How big a role does life skills instruction play in your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A very big role <input type="checkbox"/> A medium sized role <input type="checkbox"/> A small role <input type="checkbox"/> No role	D, J
29.	Do you need specialized facilities to teach life skills? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	D, J
30.	How many of your students receive career counseling at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> All of them <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> Few of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	D, J
31.	How would you describe the practice of ‘rien kua’? <input type="checkbox"/> A good practice <input type="checkbox"/> A bad practice <input type="checkbox"/> A practice that is both good and bad	D
32.	What effect would stopping ‘rien kua’ at your school have on your school? <input type="checkbox"/> It would make things worse <input type="checkbox"/> It would make things better <input type="checkbox"/> It would have no effect	D
33.	How many of your teachers have an intermediate level of English proficiency or higher? <input type="checkbox"/> Most of them <input type="checkbox"/> About half of them <input type="checkbox"/> Some of them <input type="checkbox"/> None of them	E
34.	How many administrators at your school have an intermediate level of English proficiency or higher? <input type="checkbox"/> Most of us <input type="checkbox"/> About half of us <input type="checkbox"/> Some of us <input type="checkbox"/> None of us	E
35.	How would you describe your understanding about concepts of ‘educational inclusion’? <input type="checkbox"/> High understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory Understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Low Understanding	D
36.	How would you describe the inclusiveness of your school for each of the following	D

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
37.	kinds of student groupings? <i>(If you do not have this group, please leave blank)</i> Girls <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion Minorities: <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion Physically Challenged <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion Poor Students <input type="checkbox"/> High Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Medium Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Low Inclusion	D
38.	To what degree does your school rely on the Resource Center School? (For Network Schools only) <input type="checkbox"/> Relies a great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Relies to some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Does not rely at all	
39.	Of all the different kinds of assistance that a project could provide to your school to improve educational quality, what single input do you think is the most important? _____	D, J
<b>Section 3: Enabling Environments</b>		F, G, H, I
40.	How would you describe security in your school? <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Not so good	I
41.	How would you describe access to electricity at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> All buildings have it <input type="checkbox"/> Only some buildings have it <input type="checkbox"/> Only the office has it <input type="checkbox"/> No access to electricity at all	F
42.	How would you describe access to internet at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> All buildings have it <input type="checkbox"/> Only some buildings have it <input type="checkbox"/> Only the office has it <input type="checkbox"/> No access to internet at all	F
43.	To what extent do your students utilize the science labs at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no science labs	F
44.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the science lab at your school? Pick the 3 most important issues at your school. <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers prefer to teach theory more than practice. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students. <input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the day to use the lab. <input type="checkbox"/> The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Students study the science subjects only one or two hours per week. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs lack materials and equipment. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are rarely open. <input type="checkbox"/> There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	F
45.	To what extent do your students utilize the library? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no library	F
46.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the library at your school? Pick the 3	F

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	most important issues at your school. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to link their teaching with library services. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to link their teaching with library services. <input type="checkbox"/> Students have little time to effectively utilize the library. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no digital or internet facilities in the library. <input type="checkbox"/> Librarians have no leadership skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Library operating hours are too short. <input type="checkbox"/> Library is frequently closed. <input type="checkbox"/> Library lacks materials and research books. <input type="checkbox"/> The library is too small <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
47.	To what extent do your students utilize the ICT labs at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the time <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much <input type="checkbox"/> School has no ICT labs	F, H
48.	What are the challenges in effectively utilizing the ICT labs at your school? Pick the 3 most important issues at your school. <i>(For Resource Center School Only)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers do not know how to use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> There is a shortage of ICT teachers to run the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers have no time to use the labs because they are too busy with their private classes. <input type="checkbox"/> The utility costs of maintaining the ICT labs means that it is not possible to keep them running regularly. <input type="checkbox"/> Utility Budget from MoEYS comes too late to keep the labs running regularly. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too few in number to be accessible to all students. <input type="checkbox"/> There is not enough time in the day to use the lab. <input type="checkbox"/> The classroom periods are too short to effectively use the labs. <input type="checkbox"/> There are no available hours in the timetable to use ICT labs. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs lack computers and materials. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are too small to accommodate a full class of students. <input type="checkbox"/> The labs are rarely open. <input type="checkbox"/> There is no one to regularly maintain the labs and so they fall into disrepair. <input type="checkbox"/> Many workstations are non-operational. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	F, H
49.	How would you describe the teacher shortage at your school? <input type="checkbox"/> There is no shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a slight shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a growing shortage <input type="checkbox"/> There is a major shortage	G
50.	In general, how would you describe the rate of utilization of the Resource Center? <input type="checkbox"/> Very Frequent <input type="checkbox"/> Frequent <input type="checkbox"/> Once in a while <input type="checkbox"/> Not so much	F
<b>Section 4: Stakeholder Outreach</b>		K, L
51.	Is there a School Support Committee (or PTA) at the school? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, in what ways does the school support committee help the school? (Check all that applies) <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching aids/materials <input type="checkbox"/> Buildings <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Support	K

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<input type="checkbox"/> No support <input type="checkbox"/> Others _____	
52.	To what degree does the SSC support the school? <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Support a medium amount <input type="checkbox"/> Only provides a little support <input type="checkbox"/> Does not provide any support	K
53.	How often does the School Support Committee meet to discuss school issues? <input type="checkbox"/> Once a month <input type="checkbox"/> Once every two months <input type="checkbox"/> Once a semester <input type="checkbox"/> Once a year <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	K, I
54.	Complete the following statement based on your personal experience. Choose only ONE response.  <i>When communities and parents are not involved in education, it is usually:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of the community <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of the school <input type="checkbox"/> the fault of both the school and the community. <input type="checkbox"/> None of these answers matches my view. My view is that _____	K, I
55.	How would you describe the relationship between the school and community? <input type="checkbox"/> Very strong and active <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat strong and active <input type="checkbox"/> Not very strong and active <input type="checkbox"/> Hard to say  What do you see as the single greatest obstacle to maintaining good relations with the local community? _____	K
56.	To what degree does your school use social media to communicate with stakeholders such as teachers, parents, students, community members, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> A great deal <input type="checkbox"/> Use it to some degree <input type="checkbox"/> Very little <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	I
57.	Approximately what percentage of teachers have laptops? _____%	I
58.	Approximately what percentage of teachers have smartphones? _____%	I
59.	Approximately what percentage of students have smartphones? _____%	I

**Upper Secondary Education – School Development Program  
Focus Group Discussion – Community Members**

<b>Persons Interviewed:</b>	<b>Total: 25 F: 6</b>
<b>Circle all that apply:</b>	<b>Mothers, Fathers, Members of SSC, Village Heads, CC</b>

No.	Question	Variable Reference
<b>Section 1: Management and Planning Issues</b>		A, B
53.	<p>How often do you have a meeting with schools in your community? What did you discuss with them about school issues? Can you give some concrete examples?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally, talk about the rules or regulations of school. Want to discuss with parent and provide the comments related to student behavior. Meeting every month but sometime two months – talk about the teacher teach the student regularly, hygiene and environment, student attendant, building repaired, and brought those issues to talk with parent. Asked the communities to advice to parent to follow up with their children study. Talking about the budget usage e.g. income and expense in the school and asked the community to sign on the expense to improve school.</li> <li>• Meeting with school to help providing the scholarship to the poverty student twice per year. We also joined with the organization to spread out the information related to safe migration to the dropped-out student and spread out the traffic law. However, we were not clear related to the school budget as we never joined.</li> <li>• The main thing was discussing about the relationship between parent and school in term of the student absent a lot twice per year. In addition, we also discussed related to the lack of study materials and equipment such table, chair and repaired the school building.</li> <li>• Not so often – one per semester based on the school invitation. Sometime discussing about how to use the school budget and student discipline and environment management.</li> </ul>	B
54.	<p>[Participants should be broken up into groups of 3 to 4 persons to do the following exercise] To answer the following question, each group will have to use 8 stars to indicate how they prioritize various issues in the school (★). Each group should discuss the issues indicated on a piece of poster paper and allocate the stars according to how they prioritize each one. Some issues may receive no stars and others may receive 1, 2, 3 or more stars if it is a very high priority. Remember to remind participants that they may not use more than 8 stars for the exercise. When they have finished, take a picture of each prioritization poster that has been done and record it for analysis. <i>Use Poster 1 for this Exercise.</i></p> <p>17. ★★ (2) Infrastructure upgrading 18. 0 School has a flagpole</p>	B

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<p>19. ★ ★ (2.3) Students are learning well                      20. ★ (1.3) Teachers have adequate salaries                      21. ★ ★ (2.3) Teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism                      22. 0 Students dress properly                      23. ★ (1.5) Parents are satisfied with the instruction at the school                      24. 0 School has a proper gate</p> <p>Why did you choose it as priority?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reason to priority upgraded infrastructure because it's important to have a good environments and good building attract the students to study.</li> <li>• When the student outstanding make other parent want to send their kids to school.</li> <li>• If the teacher has enough salary, they will pay more attention to the student. And the teacher didn't involve the community or school activities that make the parent and community lazy to involved as well.</li> <li>• If teachers are professional and have more knowledge, they will teach the student well.</li> <li>• Make the teacher to punctuation with school, come to teach regularly. the parent satisfied with the quality of teachers, and report to the parent through SSC related to the student absenteeism.</li> <li>• When the teacher has high level of professionalism, they will treat all the student equally without discrimination even they didn't 'rien kua'.</li> <li>• When the teacher not discriminate the student and teach them equally, the parent will happy as their children have knowledge from school.</li> <li>• As we think that students are learning well is a priority because it also encourages the other students to study hard.</li> <li>• The community in Ta Kmao high school mentioned that teachers demonstrate high levels of professionalism as it's important to improve the education quality – as we can see that the teacher in private school which have similar salary but they show the high professionalism. So, that would be good to make the teacher change their behavior and willing to improve the quality of education by themselves rather than increase their salary. However, make the parents are satisfied with the instruction at the school. In addition, if the school have no gate, the proper gate is the most priority to think about - As the school need to have proper gate, if no gate the student can go out every time which not respect to the school regulation.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Section 2: School Perceptions and Concepts of Educational Quality/Services</b>	C, D, E, H, J
55.	<p>In your opinion, what is the biggest problem(s) at this school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the school weak on the management or not clear to the student will have an issue. To solve this problem, we meeting with director and teachers to make this school better. Another concern related to bully student; we report to the local authority.</li> </ul>	c

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school shortage with teacher e.g. no chemistry teacher, but after the school request to ministry and they sent Khmer or Sport teacher that was not fit the requirement.</li> <li>• Absenteeism students but they always absent event we advise them.</li> <li>• The biggest issue in this school is ‘rein kua’, that would be better to reduce or stop the practice of ‘rein kua’ as not all student can afford to pay for ‘rein kua’ that can cause the dropout. In addition, stop taking the money from student during the semester exam as it will affect to the student feeling.</li> <li>• As we also knew that the teacher in Preak Sihaknuk is surplus but would shortage of subject teachers. In addition, the environment was not preparing and management well as the school is big with a huge number of students.</li> <li>• Teachers respect the school regulation or discipline and come to teach regularly and on time. However, surplus teachers and they teach different subject from their skills.</li> </ul>	
56.	<p>What is the greatest improvement at this school that you’ve seen and why you are most proud about it? Alternatively, tell me if you think that there has been little improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure such as garden, building etc.</li> <li>• The quality of education seems better than before as more students passed the exam.</li> <li>• The community more involve in the school activities – the school request to SSC to spread out information about the needed of the school to the parents for supporting. The parent more involved and provide support to build infrastructures.</li> <li>• The school have like skills related to art, create something for sell, farming vegetable and cooking.</li> <li>• We think that would be good if we have new building as the student were increased, however we would request to have modern materials for teaching and learning the same as Phnom Penh and upgrading computers as the old labs more computers not work well.</li> <li>• We noticed that the study result seems to be better and the environment also be better than before. However, related to teacher we suggest to reduce the practice of ‘rien kua’.</li> <li>• Mostly we can see the improvement of infrastructure such as building, school gate, garden, pole of flags, football yard and environment was better. However, the toilet should be improved and have enough water usage.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the greatest improvement of the school were infrastructure or school facilities, however in term of the quality of education might need to be improved.</p>	D
57.	If you were a very rich person and wanted to improve the education system, what you would like to change?	C

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly, build new building and tables and modern study materials</li> <li>• Secondly, find the good teachers and strengthen quality of teachers and students. However, we also involved in the maintaining the school or materials and follow with teaching and mobilized the community to involve the school activities.</li> <li>• Will support the teacher to teach follow the education curriculum and policy, and stop 'rein kau' at the school. That could be increase the teacher salary, so that they will pay more attention to teach student.</li> <li>• We will increase the teacher salary, if they have enough salary the practice of 'rein kau' will be reduced. In addition, will improve the classroom to have modern teaching and learning materials.</li> </ul>	
58.	<p>Based on your knowledge of the school, what are some of the key challenges you see in improving educational quality?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problems are teachers not really changed their habit and think about their benefit as priority.</li> <li>• Teacher has no discipline and they complain about their salary is low. The school complain about the shortage of teacher; however, some teachers get the study our to teach 'rien kau'. We will happy if the school can teach the student full-time (morning and afternoon).</li> <li>• Few community members said that the student used a lot of phone that not pay attention to the study, so that would be good if school has the role not allow the student to bring their phone to the classes.</li> <li>• What we can see nowadays when the student finished the school couldn't find the job as the curriculum is not help them, so if the school can provide the life-skills. School should provide English language and ICT skills to students which can help them to get the job when they finished the school.</li> </ul>	D
59.	<p>Tell me how do you feel about the quality of education at your local school? Do you think school will help your children earn a living as they get older? <i>Use Poster 2.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quality of education in our area seems better than before 80% - as we can see that the more students passed the exam.</li> <li>• Not good enough yet – as some students were dropout of school because they thought that it's not important and can't find the job for their future.</li> <li>• The student hasn't learned computer from grade 7, so they need to go out to study if they can afford. It would be good if the student can have computer knowledge. This school have 2 computer labs but not enough for all student to study and very little study. Another thing, the science and computer labs were sometime used by the network schools even it was not enough for the resource center.</li> <li>• If the student can complete the school, they could find the job to do such as being a teacher etc.</li> <li>• To be able to have a good quality of education, the student should learn more on the science connect the theory with real practice e.g. they can use laboratory lab and visit other school or workplace. Nowadays, only</li> </ul>	C, D

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	theories were taught at school but didn't have any practice. when the student study life-skills E.g. agriculture – allow the student to practice.	
60.	<p>How would you describe the attitudes of children at your local school towards education?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some students want to study but some don't want to study – the student live far away from school and maybe because of they are lazy to study.</li> <li>• Some of them said that they are poor – and there are a lot of factories around that attract them to go to work.</li> <li>• However, most of the student really want to study and know the important of education.</li> <li>• Not sure related to teacher attendant because of the school director never report to us.</li> <li>• As we can see that most of the students want to study, but around 20% of students were used or engage their labour by family.</li> <li>• Most of the student really want to study, but only small amount of student doesn't want to study as they were engaged from friend. Moreover, some student doesn't have money to pay for 'rein kua' that why they don't want to come to school.</li> </ul>	c
61.	<p>How do you feel about the practice of 'rien kua?' Use Poster 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rien kou is good to support student for better study performance. The student can have ability to research. If no Rien Kou, the student will be bad performance.</li> <li>• The important of Rien Kou because the student learn less in the class – what we can see that most of the student Rien Kou are outstanding students and not fail the exam.</li> <li>• The government school need to follow the curriculum and don't have enough time to teach in the details less – Rien Kou will teach the details and important lesson</li> <li>• If the school increase more study time would be good and might not need Rien Kou practice. And have enough teachers to study on the subject.</li> <li>• We think that 'rien kau' is not bad if it is a complementary and not impact on the study time, but we heard from the students saying that if we not 'rien kua' with teacher, we could not pass the exam or even we passed but not get the good grade. In addition, most of the good lesson from curriculum was taught in 'rien kua' class.</li> <li>• The practice of 'rien kua' have more advantage and disadvantage – the student can learn more and have enough knowledge to pass exam, however it also has disadvantage such they pay more attention to the student who 'rien kua' and also they might take the study time for 'rien kua'.</li> </ul>	D
62.	Of all the different kinds of assistance that a project could provide to your school to im-	D, J

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	<p>prove educational quality, what single input do you think is the most important?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen teachers – provide them enough salary, if they have enough salary, they will pay more attention to the students. Also improve the teacher capacity and should not have another job to support their life.</li> <li>• Student materials or scholarship – e.g. support the poor students.</li> <li>• Train teacher and provide teaching materials support to make teacher be able to teach student with quality.</li> <li>• Provide scholarship for the poverty student as most of them dropout as can't afford with study.</li> <li>• The main priority is providing more training to the teachers and provide more teaching and learning materials to school as every parent want their children be able to find the job when they finished from school.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 3: Enabling Environments</b>		F, G, H, I
63.	<p>How would you describe security in your local school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The security is better than before, if the student doesn't have uniform not allow to enter school.</li> <li>• It can be seen that nowadays, the security in our local school seems to be better and no any problems.</li> <li>• The was any security problem as the school have the guard.</li> </ul>	I
64.	<p>How would you describe the teacher shortage at your local school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the other local schools' shortage of teachers – because sometime they borrow teachers from this school. And this school also shortage of subject teachers.</li> <li>• As the teachers told us that the school has enough teachers, however there some shortage subject teachers such computer, chemistry teachers etc.</li> <li>• Overall, shortage of subject teachers but surplus Khmer teacher or normal teachers.</li> </ul>	G
<b>Section 4: Stakeholder Outreach</b>		K, L
65.	<p>How did the school engage parents/community people/local authorities in school events? Can you give some concrete examples?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School informed to SSC and student to inform the people in the community to involved in the school activities.</li> <li>• When the meeting the local authority came to join the school activities and the community members mobilized the funds to support the school development.</li> <li>• More parents involved in the school activities if any invitation from school.</li> <li>• School invited the parent through local authorities and community people.</li> <li>• Mostly, the parent joins the meeting with school during the beginning of</li> </ul>	K, I

*Rapid Assessment Survey – Upper Secondary Education Sector Development Project 2*

No.	Question	Variable Reference
	academic school year.	
66.	<p>How do you feel about the relationship between the community and the school? Is it a close relationship? Can you give some concrete examples? <i>Use Poster 4.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good communication between community and school, and community continue inform to parent if any issue related to their children at school.</li> <li>• When the student absent from school – school asked the community members to support to spread information to their parent.</li> <li>• The relationship between the school and community is good, when the school have any event or need any support always ask community members to join the meeting.</li> </ul>	κ