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Executive summary

This report forms the mid-term evaluation of Phase 2 (2017 – present) of the Strengthening pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar (STEM) project, which is implemented in partnership between the MoE and UNESCO with financing from three bilateral donors: Finland, Australia and the United Kingdom.

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress and approach of the STEM project so that, in the long-term, it can better contribute to realization of the teacher education reform agenda of the NESP 2016-21 and the global agenda of Sustainable Development Goal 4 for inclusive and equitable quality education for all. The evaluation is to assess to what extent the STEM project has made progress along the theory of change so that expected outcomes are achieved by project end, with a focus on the period between 2017 and 2018. The full Terms of Reference are included at Annex A.

Evaluation methodology and process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Evaluation activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception phase</td>
<td>Early March</td>
<td>Preliminary interviews with MoE, STEM project team, donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Intensive desk-based literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Preparation and submission of detailed Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Preparation of two on-line surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 April to 10 May</td>
<td>Intensive period of fieldwork including one-day field visits to three Education Colleges and interviews/focus group discussions with various key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>Presentation of early findings to STEM Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of findings</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Preparation and submission of draft final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June to August</td>
<td>Report finalisation; translation of the Executive Summary into Myanmar; communication of the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation has sought to answer a set of 16 Evaluation Questions, which were agreed with the Steering Committee during the inception phase, and which are organised around OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact, as well as M&E. To answer these questions, the Evaluation Team developed an evaluation design matrix (see Annex B) identifying the indicators, sources and tools to be used to answer these questions. The key tools and sources comprised:

Online surveys: developed as an efficient means of gathering data from two critical but geographically dispersed Education College populations: (i) CCT members (completion rate 75%) and (ii) EC principals (56%). The surveys were organised around ten question heads and comprised a mix of numerical responses (rating strength of opinion or degree of change) and free-form text answers. The surveys were drafted in English and translated into Myanmar.

Education College visits: Two-semi structured tools were developed for (i) interviews with EC principals and FGDs with other college senior management staff and (ii) for FGDs with teacher educators (both CCT members and non-CCT members).

Other KII's and FGDs: Another semi-structured tool was developed to guide key informant interviews and focus group discussions. This included a larger set of questions, the selection of which was adjusted from
interview to interview based on the category of respondent. This was used for interviews with MoE and related committees, commissions and boards; STEM's donors; other development partners; and CSOs. The full set of data collection tools are attached to this report at Annex D.

Evaluation questions, key findings and conclusions

The report is focused around analysis of findings against the agreed sixteen evaluation questions (EQs), which are organised using the OECD/DAC criteria (Effectiveness; Relevance; Efficiency; Efficiency & Effectiveness of M&E; Sustainability; and Impact to Date). A summary of the findings, is given below, together with the Evaluation Team’s overall assessments of STEM against these criteria:

Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 1: To what extent are the Ministry of Education and Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree programme to begin in December 2019, and how effective has the STEM project support to this preparation been?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The ECs are not well-prepared for the imminent start of the four-year course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is an urgent need for clear guidance and a structured process for each EC to adjust its pedagogic practice and teaching schedules to the new requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 2: Are the outputs achieved thus far likely to be effective in achieving the expected outcomes as described in the results matrix?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s positive relationship with MoE greatly enhances the likeliness of achieving outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A high volume of STEM’s planned outputs remain at an early stage or are yet to initiate at all, raising concern over the likely achievement of outcomes within the current project lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assumptions around MoE capacity &amp; resources to develop, approve and implement policy and reforms are critical to achievement of outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 3: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Some inclusive education concepts embedded into new policy documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased awareness of inclusive education vocabulary and concepts among CCT members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disability considered lowest inclusive education priority in ECs and highly prejudiced attitudes observed in ECs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 4: How has the STEM project adjusted its approach in response to challenges faced over the course of project implementation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ambitious &amp; changing timelines for the EC upgrade, limited human resources and protracted policy processes all pose major challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s reporting is open about and reflects on challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong response to challenge of low national curriculum development capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective response to the accelerated EC timeline and to overcoming hurdles around approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 5: Are the governance and modalities of STEM responsive to other work occurring within the education sector, which is likely to affect pre-service teacher education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s governance, through the project donors and Steering Committee, is a real asset and greatly increases responsiveness to other education reform work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM proactively pursues the participation of a wide range of actors involved in other reform areas, improving responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s implementation through an external contractor for curriculum development suffered from inconsistent communication, partially limiting responsiveness to primary curriculum reform work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a short-term perspective, and in light of the (highly challenging) accelerated timeline for implementation of the new EC degree course, STEM’s activities have not effectively prioritised support to aid MoE’s and ECs’ preparation ahead of December 2019. STEM’s work in policy (the TCSF and teacher policy) has effectively ensured extensive consultation and will result in policy that is better grounded in evidence and aligned to international standards. However, this has come at the cost of the pace of progress, and while key policy pieces remain unfinalized, the project has made almost no progress in supporting the MoE to address critical teacher educator capacity gaps. At more than halfway through the project’s lifespan, there remain a concerning number of activities yet to come online, which casts doubt on the likeliness that intended outcomes will be achieved within the project’s current funding window.

The project’s activities on inclusive education show partial progress insofar as the awareness of key agents working on reform has improved and key products (TCSF and EC year 1 curriculum) include ‘new’ concepts, and this in itself represents progress. However, the progress to-date is currently a long way from addressing critical skills gaps in classroom practice. STEM’s governance and modalities are generally effective in ensuring alignment with other reform activities, but unclear roles and communication with the curriculum development contractor have inhibited effectiveness. From a longer-term perspective, the project’s approach to government capacity development and ownership is likely to improve the prospects for achieving its outcomes.

Relevance

**EQ 6: To what extent have STEM results (mainly at output level) supported national priorities, including those of Education Colleges?**

- STEM’s design and its major outputs (TCSF and EC degree first year curriculum) are highly relevant to national priorities, as expressed in the NESP
- STEM’s ICT activities are relevant to the priorities of Education Colleges, who rate facilities as a top priority
- STEM hasn’t yet succeeded in ensuring the reform tackles some key stated priorities, including improving disability access and CPD for teacher educators

**EQ 7: To what extent has STEM supported activities that prepare ECs and ultimately teachers for supporting inclusive education policy and diversity in the classroom?**

- STEM has succeeded in raising awareness of inclusive education among a limited audience (the CCT)
- STEM has not yet addressed skill gaps in inclusive teaching
- Progress in addressing disability and ethnolinguistic inclusion has been particularly limited

STEM is clearly well-aligned to national priorities on pre-service teacher education, seen both in the delivery of key outputs stated in MoE policy, as well as other activities (such as on ICT) that are not as strongly emphasised in MoE policy but identified as essential by ECs. However, STEM ECs’ immediate priorities for the upgraded degree course have not yet been met, and the activities STEM has pursued on inclusive education to date are not sufficiently well aligned to increasing inclusive education and diversity in at classroom level, particularly in the dimensions of exclusion most acutely felt in Myanmar (such as disability and ethnolinguistic exclusion).

Efficiency

**EQ 8: Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results to date?**

- STEM’s VfM reporting is inadequate and information currently available on budget and inputs precludes full VfM analysis.
- STEM’s budget is underutilised; curriculum development has justifiably received the greatest share of activity spend
EQ 9: To what degree has the current approach by the STEM project to guidance and support of stakeholders contributed to co-ordination and harmonisation?

- STEM has ensured strong coordination with most stakeholders, including MoE and STEM's donors
- Coordination has not always been successful among actors involved in teacher education curriculum development
- STEM has not sufficiently supported the MoE to provide guidance and support to ECs

EQ 10: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied?

- STEM’s model of partnership with the MoE is highly appropriate, although:
  - Resource limitations at MoE and in STEM team limits the volume of work this modality can handle
  - Some opportunities have not yet been taken, such as to better utilise CCTs in ECs

STEM’s costs appear proportionate to its outputs to date, but its financial management structure precludes strong VfM analysis. Coordination has been proactive, covered many stakeholders and been positively received, but there have been challenges in integrating the work of the CREATE project. STEM’s modalities are generally appropriate but unclear roles and communication with the curriculum contractor have resulted in some inefficiencies. Development of the new curriculum and the TCSF have not been highly efficient processes.

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)

EQ 11: Are the results in the Results Matrix an accurate reflection of the theory of change, and does it allow for effective scrutiny of the theory of change?

- Results matrix largely captures the understood logic, although less so at outcome level, and it does not reflect assumptions
- STEM’s Results Matrix is lacking performance indicators that allow it to monitor progress against real intended outcomes

EQ 12: How may M&E both more effectively and efficiently provide timely information on progress towards outcomes, and other achievements and challenges?

- STEM lacks an operational M&E plan, indicators are not fully defined, and the timing of data collection is insufficiently frequent
- STEM does not systematically capture and review indicators of progress towards outcomes beyond hard output results

STEM’s Results Matrix captures activities and outputs comprehensively, but the outcome level of its Theory of Change is not well articulated, which is likely to limit effective strategic review of project performance. Progress towards outcomes is not adequately measured to enable well-evidenced strategic review of effectiveness. STEM lacks an operational MEL plan and does not articulate indicator definitions, the timing of measurements, or the communication of results.

Sustainability

EQ 13: Are the supposed benefits of the STEM project likely to last beyond completion of the current support?

- MoE’s strong engagement with and ownership of STEM strengthen the prospects of lasting benefits
- The policy and curriculum products that STEM is supporting the MoE to develop are likely to endure, although potential poor implementation of the new degree in 2019-20 poses a risk
• STEM’s participative capacity development approach strengthens sustainability
• Limited progress in addressing the status of primary school teaching represents the major threat to sustainability
• Weak EC management capacity will also limit the benefits of STEM without strengthened support

**EQ 14: Does the STEM project approach ensure that there is a capacity development dimension in all aspects of its design, implementation and monitoring?**

- STEM’s design and implementation prioritises capacity development through MoE participation and leadership in all activities
- Activities focused on the CCT represent a significant capacity development effort and achievement
- Capacity development in monitoring is not strongly built into STEM’s approach

MoE’s ownership of STEM, and the capacity development approach, particularly that taken with the CCT, provide strong prospects for the sustainability of much of STEM’s work. However, the long-term impact of STEM rests on some key assumptions both beyond and within STEM’s control, including MoE capacity and incentives for teacher educators and teachers to develop new competencies. Addressing the weak status of primary teachers through development and implementation of new teacher policy is critical to the enduring impact of the teacher education curriculum reform.

**Impact to date**

**EQ 15: What intended and unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?**

- Clear impact on capacity of CCT members
- All ECs have benefitted from strengthened ICT capacity for administration and teaching
- Policy development not sufficiently progressed to have effected institutional change at this point
- STEM has placed high demands on the time of CCT members

**EQ 16: How are results and good practice being communicated to stakeholders?**

- Communication of results to Steering Committee stakeholders is consistent
- Dissemination of results and good practices to teacher educators and students is very weak; an opportunity has been missed to utilise CCT members to communicate good practices in their own/nearby ECs

At the individual level, STEM has had a strong impact on the limited population engaged through the CCT, but evidence of impact across the broader TE population is weak. STEM has supported the MoE in progress towards critical institutional (policy) changes, but these have not yet been realised and so impact cannot yet be claimed for these.

**Lessons learnt**

As in any comprehensive educational reform, there are important underlying principles which need adherence for the reform to flourish. In the Lessons Learnt final section of the report, two of these are elaborated:

(a) understanding of different stages in any reform process, particularly highlighting the importance of recognising the likely slowest step in the change (which we here equate with the challenges of encouraging a group of close to 2000 teacher educators in the colleges to change the ways in which they teach and how they prepare their students for primary and lower secondary school classrooms), and
again relating to the teacher educators, wise application of the key notion of transfer of training (where there are strong understandings regarding the weak transfer of skills embodied in the familiar workshop/training event culture, and recognising that effective skill transfer depends on a carefully structured cocktail of: early and repeated practice under supervision and regular feedback with coaching/mentoring).

**Recommendations**

There follows a relatively short list of Recommendations from the evaluation, fuller justifications for which appear at Section 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. STEM to support the MoE to generate and use a working version of the TCSF, as it pertains to the beginning teacher emerging from the new EC degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Urgently discuss with the DDG of DHE the possibility of providing additional units of resource in her office, based in NPT, to assist work planning and prepare for the EC degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Appoint a STEM/MoE Communications Officer to support EC preparations and roll out of the new degree course – a Myanmar language speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. STEM supports MoE to co-ordinate each EC’s creation and delivery of an action plan covering the next six months of preparation for the new program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strengthen STEM’s senior-level engagement, for example with the appointment of a senior education adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. STEM/MoE to recognise the important skill-set of the Core Curriculum Team (CCT) cadre in the new EC program, identifying developmental roles for them within each EC, and reflect the intended outcomes of STEM’s support to the CCT in the Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. STEM/MoE to ensure implementation of the comprehensive professional development plan for all teacher educators in ECs receives sufficient priority, so that teacher educators’ capacity to deliver the new course is not left neglected in favour of the more visible aspects of EC preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. STEM to ensure the Years 2-4 curriculum development process includes consultation with basic education subject authors and other actors in curriculum before developing first drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Further clarify roles and lines of communication between all actors in curriculum development, particularly for curriculum development contractor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Clarify role and required use of CREATE’s Teacher Education materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identify STEM’s intended changes (outcomes), reflect these in results matrix (with an appropriate measurement plan). Develop an operational MEL plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Define and agree Value for Money indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusive education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. STEM to support inclusion of explicit mention of disability inclusion in the TCSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop Special Education Needs/disability awareness training for EC management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provide pathways &amp; learning opportunities for educators wishing to specialise in SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. STEM to support greater emphasis on SEN in the curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Ethno-linguistic inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop practical strategies in the curriculum for teaching students whose mother tongue is not Myanmar language, such as introductions to speech/second language acquisition among children and on speech impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strengthen institutional capacity to support language diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations

3. **Gender:** Expand and coordinate gender mainstreaming  

4. Create a coordinated communication strategy between CCT and ECs to influence transfer of knowledge and attitudes
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## List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Core Curriculum Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESR</td>
<td>Comprehensive Education Sector Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>College Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Department of Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERPT</td>
<td>Department of Educational Research, Planning and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>The UK Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHE</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.TEd</td>
<td>Diploma of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Education College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Inclusive Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSWRR</td>
<td>Ministry of Social, Welfare, Relief and Resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAQAC</td>
<td>National Accreditation and Quality Assurance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEL</td>
<td>National Education Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPC</td>
<td>National Education Policy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESP</td>
<td>National Education Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>National League for Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOSC</td>
<td>Out of School Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Oxford Policy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>Primary Assistant Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCK</td>
<td>Pedagogic content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSF</td>
<td>Teacher Competencies Standards Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDE</td>
<td>University of Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDNR</td>
<td>University of Development of National Races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoE</td>
<td>University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIS</td>
<td>UNESCO Institute for Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-SWAP</td>
<td>United Nations System-wide Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDPA</td>
<td>Union Solidarity and Development Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUFL</td>
<td>Yangon University of Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUOE</td>
<td>Yangon University of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction/Context

1.1 Context

The National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-2021 sets out an ambitious programme of education reform. Teacher education and management is one of nine transformational shifts envisaged in the NESP. Without significant strengthening of all aspects of the teaching force at all levels of schooling, the improvements in student achievement envisaged in the NESP are unlikely to be achieved. This acknowledgement reflects the wider international perspective on the centrality of teacher performance to enhancing the quality of learning in schools.

A particular concern, and priority, for Myanmar is the educational needs of diverse communities across the country, celebrating their many distinctive cultural dimensions, while recognising that complexity of needs may link with disadvantage in provision. The following four points provide a window on contemporary practice:

First, despite significant recent increases in government funding for education, Myanmar still spends only around 2 per cent of GDP on education and under 1.5 per cent on basic education, which contrasts with neighbours Malaysia and Vietnam (Vietnam spends around 5-6 per cent of GDP on education, of which 3-3.5 per cent is specifically on primary and lower secondary education) (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018).

Second, enrolment is relatively strong in Myanmar at primary level, and enrolment in basic education increased by over 400,000 students between 2011 and 2014. At primary level, a 97% net enrolment rate was reported in 2017 (UNICEF/OPM, forthcoming). Myanmar has fewer out-of-school children at primary level than the regional average. However, drop-out rates are high and at secondary level (both lower and upper), the proportion of out-of-school children increases beyond regional trends. At secondary level Myanmar has by some way the second highest absolute number of out-of-school children in the region, second only to more populous Indonesia. Estimates made by the Asian Development Bank (2015) for the Comprehensive Education Sector Review suggest that only 10% of those enrolled in grade 1 in 2002/03 passed the matriculation exam, due to drop out and high rates of failure in the exam.

Third, there is limited available data on learning outcomes. However, the mode of teaching in classrooms is widely characterised by rote learning and outcomes are understood to be weak. A 2015 World Bank study concluded that Myanmar “does not have a way of reliably measuring and tracking students’ progress in reading, writing, and mathematics” (World Bank, 2015). The same study conducted an Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) in a sample of schools in Yangon. The EGRA found that over one-third of Grade 1 students and 10% of Grade 2 students could not read a single word. Although this study placed the performance of the Yangon sample higher than many comparable countries, it placed it lower than the Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam. Adult literacy in Myanmar stands at 76% overall, and 85% among 15-24-year-olds.

Fourth, while there have been important policy developments and ambitious reform plans set out in the National Education Law (2014) and NESP 2016-2021, practice in schools in relation to key dimensions such as gender equity, linguistic differences, and disability remains weak.

The specific focus of the STEM project is the perceived need to significantly enhance the quality of the output of teachers from the 25 Education Colleges. This is to be achieved through two key changes: (a) by requiring all 25 colleges to extend their training from the current two-year Diploma course to a new four-year degree course; (b) a root-and-branch modernisation of the curricula for the four-year program. These intentions faithfully mirror wider, international shifts in perspective on the pre-service preparation of teachers, which are summarised below:

- The first challenges the Education College and its teacher educators to offer a curriculum which integrates theory (both academic and methodological) with practice (what is appropriate and realistic in the particular school setting for which the students are being prepared). A particular focus is what has become known as pedagogic content knowledge (PCK) with its focus on the methodological skills to be employed by the classroom teacher.
- The second element is the attempt to make the school experience of the newly-trained teacher more valuable, through models which bring teachers’ colleges into partnership with the schools where their
students learn their craft, often bringing in the concept of mentorship delivered by expert school teachers. There is, in this latter, a significant assumption that partner schools can offer an appropriately supportive environment for the growth of the student teacher, and that they have teachers willing and able to take on the role of mentoring adults (itself a different skill-set from expertise as a classroom teacher).

The STEM project is attempting to respond to both of these dimensions in its on-going work with the Education Colleges.

There is one additional necessary condition for this reform process to succeed. Beginning teachers may have been provided with the technical tools to change classroom practice and therefore enhance children’s learning, but they need to feel that they are working in a professionalised environment, where their skill-sets are recognised by, among others, their employers (salaries; professional development opportunities) and parents (professional esteem and respect). The key challenge (as is expressed in the NESP) is to strengthen the understanding of the centrality of the teacher in the overall reform.

1.2 Scope

The evaluation considers the design and implementation of the STEM project from the commencement of Phase 2 (January 2017) to present (April 2019).

1.3 Governance

The evaluation has been governed by a Reference Group, who established the evaluation Terms of Reference, and who have provided feedback on each key deliverable. The Reference Group is comprised of STEM’s existing Steering Committee, which is made up of the Union Minister for Education, the DG and DDG for Teacher Education of DHE, representatives of other MoE departments, members of the NEPC, NCC, and NAQAC, the project’s donors (Australia, Finland and the UK), and UNESCO. The Evaluation Team have reported directly to the Evaluation Manager, UNESCO’s Associate Programme Specialist.
2 Program description (ToC)

This section aims to describe STEM’s activities and objectives, both as explicitly documented and implied in the project logic. Further analysis of the project’s Results Matrix is included under the findings for Evaluation Question 11, at Section 5.4.

2.1 Background

Phase 1 of the STEM project was implemented between July 2014 and February 2018, with total funding of USD 2.5 million provided by the Government of Australia. Phase 2 – which forms the focus of this evaluation – began in January 2017, with funding from the Government of Finland (EUR 3.25m), and more recently the Governments of Australia (USD 2.25m, from April 2018) and the United Kingdom (USD 1m, from September 2018). Phase 2 is due to run until August 2020, with total committed funding of approximately USD 6.92 million.\(^1\)

2.2 Objectives

The STEM project’s stated objective is that Myanmar’s primary and middle school teachers provide inclusive quality education according to the Myanmar Teacher Competency Standards Framework (TCSF), enabling students to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.\(^2\) If realised, this would make a major contribution to Myanmar’s achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 4.\(^3\) The project is designed also to support the National Education Strategic Plan’s Transformational Shift in teacher education; namely that Teachers support, develop and apply interactive classroom teaching and learning benefitting all students.

2.3 Change logic

STEM is to a large extent driven by the MoE and forms an integral part of the government’s pre-service teacher education reform. To enable effective evaluation of STEM’s performance (and the Value for Money it offers its donors), its contribution to the reform must be delineated from what would happen if the project did not exist or did not perform well.

---

\(^1\) Approx. Finland contribution of $3.67m, converting €3.25m at June 2019 rate of 1:1.129193
\(^2\) STEM documentation refers to problem-solving skills; the basic education curriculum framework refers to 21st century skills
\(^3\) Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all by 2030, increasing the number of qualified teachers
Figure 1: STEM logic model

STEM inputs

- advocacy
- strategic advice
- generation of evidence
- capacity development
- work planning
- drafting, editing, translation of policy documents and products
- monitoring & evaluation
- Steering Committee progress review - accountability

which enhance

- increased buy-in to reform
- logical sequencing of reform
- greater ability to process required volume of reform work
- greater alignment of reform to good practices
- strengthened coherence between components and with other MoE reforms
- improved MoE skills to develop & implement policy

resulting in

- evidenced-based identification of needs
- quality policies & curriculum that meet international standards
- ownership by key users; sustainable reforms
- timely & consistent implementation of reform
- comprehensive implementation of reform (key activities not missed/delayed), including inclusion of minorities

Through a range of technical inputs, STEM addresses capacity gaps in the Ministry, and enhances the probability that reforms planned are evidence-based, high quality, timely, and are sustainable.

2.4 Work streams, outcomes and outputs

The project’s activities are organised around four activity work streams:

1. Adoption of comprehensive teacher policies informed by international standards, which will enable implementation of the updated competency based 4-year EC degree course
2. Education College (EC) two-year diploma upgraded to specialized programs with competency-based teacher education curriculum
3. Strengthened management and administration of Education Colleges
4. An inclusive education approach mainstreamed through teacher policies, teacher education curriculum, and Education College Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs

The project works to achieve its objective through four strands of work:

Work stream 1 – teacher policy: STEM’s work on teacher policy aims to support the NESP’s Teacher Education Strategy 1, to strengthen teacher quality assurance and management.

Outcomes: STEM aims to strengthen the capacity of MoE to review, develop, and implement comprehensive teacher policies informed by international human rights, gender equality, and teachers’ rights in order ultimately to improve the status of teachers in pre- and in-service teacher education and to improve the quality of teaching by improving student-teacher ratios, and by creating incentives for teachers to adopt TCSF competencies.

Outputs: To achieve this, STEM is working towards:

1. Establishment of the Teacher Education Council, which will enable teacher representative to advise and support implementation of teacher education and management reforms; currently STEM’s activities focus on the prior step of establishing a Teacher Task Force (TTF).

---

4 See also STEM’s Results Matrix Q1 2019, at Annex J.
5 The project refers to these as outcomes, but in the main they are – strictly speaking – outputs.
2. Development of a teacher quality assurance system, through the development of the TCSF.\textsuperscript{6} Currently STEM’s activities focus on finalisation (including validation) of the framework.

3. Design and implementation of an equitable teacher recruitment, promotion, and deployment system. To date, activities have focused on facilitating development of a draft options paper and establishing the TTF/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MoE has available resources to develop policy at the pace planned (STEM is not directly addressing human resource issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education reform is sufficiently high on decision makers’ agenda; decision making rests sufficiently within the authority and influence of those actors STEM supports. The extent of STEM’s influence on decision making beyond the Teacher Education section of DHE and in particular beyond MoE is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE has incentives to adopt reforms in the time and manner proposed that STEM recommends based on evidence of good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE policy makers do not face political or capacity restraints in regard to policy that reflects the standards of UNESCO and STEM’s donors, including on inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE has the resources and capacity to implement new policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators have incentives (e.g., through assessment) and opportunities to develop their competencies as required to deliver new curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work stream 2 – upgraded teacher education degree course:** This works towards the NESP’s Strategy 2, to improve the quality of pre-service teacher education.

**Outcomes:** STEM’s support in developing the curriculum and materials and in building EC and teacher educator capacity is intended to enable effective implementation of the new competency-based EC degree course. Simultaneously, STEM aims to develop the capacity of a new cadre of curriculum development experts in Myanmar to shape the new curriculum (to ensure its suitability), to develop ownership and to develop capacity for future curriculum reform; and to support its implementation in ECs. The ultimate outcomes (implicitly) intended of this work stream are that teacher educators deliver the competency-based curriculum effectively, leading to effective preparation of student teachers who then deliver the new basic education curriculum effectively in schools.

**Outputs:**

1. Establishment of a Curriculum Core Team (CCT) of EC personnel to support international authors in developing a competency-based curriculum (including syllabi, manuals, teacher educator guides and student teacher textbooks).

2. Strengthening of teacher educators’ knowledge, capacity (underpinned by a framework for CPD) and resources (particularly ICT) to successfully implement the new curriculum. STEM’s work in this area to date has focused predominantly on installation of ICT and training in its use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and capacity development of ECs and TEs can take place in time for roll-out of the new degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher educator training and CPD conducted and planned is sufficient to prepare them to teach new degree course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators and student teachers have incentives to adopt new competency-based approaches contained in the new degree curriculum (because e.g., CPD framework and TCSF make sufficient progress, assessment of teacher educator and student teacher performance is updated, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum receives authorisation from Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT members have sufficient capacity to input meaningfully into curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ICT resources can be used, sustained, and replaced without further external funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform work, including resource allocations, on management and administration of ECs, including the availability of suitable numbers of appropriately-skilled teacher educators, is adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{6} Project documentation states ‘Teacher quality assurance system developed for assessment of teacher quality and measurable improvement in student learning’, but the Evaluation Team have not found evidence of plans relating to assessment of teacher quality; improvement in student learning is a much longer-term outcome and should be treated elsewhere.
Work stream 3 – strengthened management and administration of ECs: This also works towards the NESP’s Strategy 2, to improve the quality of pre-service teacher education, and should contribute to Strategy 1, on teacher quality assurance and management.\(^7\)

**Outcomes:** MoE’s capacity (including use of data) to plan for and manage the changes entailed in the EC upgrade is developed sufficiently to enable an effective transition in the short-term, and in the medium-long term to provide ongoing direction to ECs. EC management staff have improved skills and facilities to manage and administrate ECs. These changes enable more effective delivery of the new competency-based degree course, resulting in effective preparation of student teachers who then deliver the new basic education curriculum effectively in schools.

**Outputs:**

1. New EC management and resourcing structures for implementation of the new degree are developed through MoE master planning (including analysis of teacher needs, enrolment and cost projections). To date STEM has focused on developing capacity to use teacher needs simulation models and upgrading ICT facilities.
2. EC management skills are developed, through development and implementation of a management CPD framework and training modules, including in the use of ICT. STEM’s activities in this area have not yet commenced.

**Assumptions**

- Support to MoE planning at central level translates into planning and management at EC level
- Support targeted to MoE in reforming organisation structures is sufficient to pass required approvals from Union Civil Service Board and other authorisers
- CPD framework is developed sufficiently early so that training for EC management can be developed and takes place on time
- Provision of ICT equipment and access to internet is equitable and sufficient for delivery of new curriculum
- MoE is able to sustain the investment required to maintain upgraded ICT facilities
- EC management staff have incentives to upgrade their capacity

Work stream 4 – mainstreaming of inclusive education: aims to mainstream inclusive education, with a focus on the rights of teachers, human rights, gender equality, and peace education, in all other outcome areas.

**Outcomes:** Teacher educators prepare student teachers from diverse backgrounds to deliver quality education that meets the needs of all Myanmar’s children, regardless of gender, disability, ethnolinguistic background, or any other characteristic. This enables delivery of more inclusive education in Myanmar’s basic education classrooms.

**Outputs:**

1. Teacher education reform is informed by evidence from a baseline assessment on inequalities in teacher education in Myanmar. This is due to commence in Q3-4 2019.
2. Ministry of Education and Education College staff supported in capacity building and promotion of inclusive approach in teacher education. Activities to date have predominantly been targeted at MoE in policy dialogue and at CCT members to increase inclusion in the EC curriculum, and have included development of a localised training manual on gender mainstreaming in teacher education, training for student teachers in HIV/AIDS and sexuality education awareness.

**Assumptions**

- Presence of Inclusive Education at a policy and management level translates into greater prioritisation of inclusive education in other reform activities, particularly in ECs
- STEM activities result in reduced constrains and greater incentives for TEs and student teachers to teach inclusively
- Increased awareness and understanding of inclusive education supports progress towards increased capacity to prepare student teachers to embed inclusive teaching practices in the classroom

\(^7\) Although this is not represented in Figure 1 of STEM 2018 Progress Report
3 Evaluation purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress and approach of the STEM project so that, in the long-term, it can better contribute to realization of the teacher education reform agenda of the NESP 2016-21 and the global agenda of Sustainable Development Goal 4 for inclusive and equitable quality education for all.

The evaluation is to assess to what extent the STEM project has made progress along the theory of change so that expected outcomes are achieved by project end, with a focus on the period between 2017 and 2018.

It shall identify key outputs likely to lead to expected outcomes, analyse the enabling factors and obstacles, and scrutinize the challenges encountered and their causes. It shall further assess to what extent the monitoring and evaluation tools are able to effectively identify achievements and challenges, as well as what remedial actions have been or can possibly be taken to address challenges.

As per the ToR, it is intended that the findings of the evaluation shall be used by the Myanmar Ministry of Education, STEM’s donors, and UNESCO to:

- Document the project’s progress so far, as well as the challenges, lessons learned, and areas still to be covered;
- Enhance the project’s relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and, where relevant, provide key recommendations to reorient aspects of the project towards improvements;
- Analyse the extent to which the project is likely to enable a pre-service teacher education reform that is sustainable and how it could evolve to further secure its sustainability;
- Determine the reasons for the observed performance and draw lessons that could be used both in the remaining project implementation period and in future projects, including more broadly in the teacher education reform agenda beyond 2021.
4 Methodology

4.1 Evaluation questions

The evaluation aims to answer a set of 16 Evaluation Questions under the headings of OECD-DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. These 16 questions were developed from an initial set of 27, which had been generated by the STEM team and Steering Committee, and were refined and prioritised between the Evaluation Team and Steering Committee through a 3-week inception phase. The inception phase comprised both desk review of program documentation and relevant MoE policy and legislation, and consultations with representatives from STEM, the three donors and DHE, to clarify expectations and priorities for the evaluation.

### Evaluation Questions

| **Effectiveness** | **EQ1**: To what extent are the Ministry of Education and Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree programme to begin in December 2019, and how effective has STEM’s support to this preparation been?  
**EQ2**: Are the outputs achieved thus far likely to be effective in achieving the expected outcomes as described in the results matrix?  
**EQ3**: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?  
**EQ4**: How has the STEM project adjusted its approach in response to challenges faced over the course of project implementation?  
**EQ5**: Is the governance and modalities of STEM responsive to other work occurring within the education sector, which is likely to affect pre-service teacher education? |
|---|---|
| **Relevance** | **EQ6**: To what extent have STEM results (mainly at output level) supported national priorities, including those of Education Colleges?  
**EQ7**: To what extent has STEM supported activities that prepare ECs and ultimately teachers for supporting inclusive education policy and diversity in the classroom? |
| **Efficiency** | **EQ8**: Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results to date?  
**EQ9**: To what degree has the current approach by the STEM project to guidance and support of stakeholders contributed to co-ordination and harmonisation?  
**EQ10**: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied? |
| **Efficiency & Effectiveness of M&E** | **EQ11**: Are the results in the Results Matrix an accurate reflection of the theory of change, and does it allow for effective scrutiny of the theory of change?  
**EQ12**: How may M&E both more effectively and efficiently provide timely information on progress towards outcomes and other achievements and challenges? |
| **Sustainability** | **EQ13**: Are the supposed benefits of the STEM project likely to last beyond completion of the current support?  
**EQ14**: Does the STEM project approach ensure that there is a capacity development dimension in all aspects of its design, implementation and monitoring? |
| **Impact to date** | **EQ15**: What intended and unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?  
**EQ16**: How are results and good practice being communicated to stakeholders? |

The methodology that follows was designed around these Evaluation Questions, as shown in the evaluation design matrix, at Annex B.
4.2 Data sources

Guided by respondents identified in the ToR, the Evaluation Team finalised in consultation with UNESCO a comprehensive set of stakeholders both directly and indirectly involved in pre-service teacher education in Myanmar that would offer a wide perspective on the project’s design and implementation. These included Education College management, teacher educators, various MoE departments, national education commissions and committees, STEM’s donors, the STEM team, other donor-funded education reform support projects and civil society organisations.

The full set of individuals and organisations consulted to provide evidence for the evaluation is detailed at Annex C. Prior to commencing in-country data collection, the Evaluation Team also performed a short desk review exercise, drawing primarily on Government of Myanmar policy and legislation and STEM project documentation and products. The documents consulted are listed in the bibliography.

4.3 Tools

Data collection from these sources was conducted using a range of tools:

Online surveys: Surveys were developed as an efficient means of gathering data from two critical but geographically dispersed Education College populations: (i) CCT members (who the Evaluation Team understood were predominantly teacher educators) and (ii) EC principals.

The surveys were organised around ten question heads and comprised a mix of numerical responses (rating strength of opinion or degree of change) and free-form text answers. The survey introductory sections also gathered background data, including the respondent’s EC, age, gender and years of experience.

The surveys were drafted in English and translated into Myanmar. The STEM team provided support to refine the Myanmar translations.

Education College visits: Two semi-structured tools were developed for (i) interviews with EC principals and FGDs with other college senior management staff and (ii) FGDs with teacher educators (both CCT members and non-CCT members).

Other KIIs and FGDs: For all other sources, another semi-structured tool was developed to guide key informant interviews and focus group discussions. This included a larger set of questions, the selection of which was adjusted interview to interview based on the category of respondent.

The full set of data collection tools are attached to this report at Annex D. Each question was developed to gather evidence to specific Evaluation Questions. The link between tool questions and Evaluation Questions is demonstrated at Annex E.

4.4 Analysis

To ensure that the evaluation findings are grounded in evidence, the Evaluation Team used a table of evidence, which documented all relevant evidence against each Evaluation Question. From a joint full-team review of this evidence, the full set of findings presented in Section 5 was drawn. The analysis specific to each tool type is described below:

Online surveys

Because the online surveys were ongoing during the first week of the Evaluation Team’s in-country data collection exercise, the two sets of online surveys were analysed in two phases: first, an immediate analysis of all quantitative responses, to identify any remarkable findings, and quick translation and analysis of free-form responses from EC staff in the specific ECs the Evaluation Team was due to visit. Second, the remaining free-form responses were translated and analysed, and numerical results were updated to incorporate survey

---

8 The evaluation team worked with an online survey platform to make available the Myanmar Zawygi font, which was not previously available for Myanmar users. See Box 2, under Annex D.
responses received late. Numerical analysis identified mean and mode responses; while analysis of free-form responses highlighted responses that provided particular insight into the answers and identified recurrent themes across respondents.

**Education College visits, KIIls and FGDs**

On a daily basis The Evaluation Team shared notes and discussed key findings from all meetings and the EC visits. Meeting notes were reviewed and salient observations highlighted and coded against the relevant Evaluation Question(s). As data collection progressed, the Evaluation Team noted where respondent comments recurred and corroborated emerging themes, and where they contradicted other accounts.

**Desk review**

From the review of relevant policy and legislation, key items relevant to STEM and the evaluation were highlighted by the Evaluation Team. Project documentation and outputs were reviewed during the inception phase and again at the end of data collection.

**Consolidating findings**

To ensure that the evaluation findings are grounded in evidence, the Evaluation Team documented all relevant evidence against each Evaluation Question (see Annex I. From a joint full-team review of this evidence, the full set of findings presented in Section 5 was drawn.
5 Key findings

5.1 Effectiveness

EQ1: To what extent are the Ministry of Education and Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree programme to begin in December 2019, and how effective has the STEM project support to this preparation been?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The ECs are not well-prepared for the imminent start of the four-year course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is an urgent need for clear guidance and a structured process for each EC to adjust its pedagogic practice and teaching schedules to the new requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Many Key Informant Interview (KII) respondents have expressed concern about the readiness for the ambitious roll-out to all ECs. Key dimensions of the lack of preparedness include:

- Lack of access to the detail of the new curriculum, hence difficulties with initiating planning
- Lack of dedicated resources for the new curriculum (teaching and learning materials, equipment, etc.)
- Lack of awareness of the magnitude of the required change for their pedagogic practice
- Since January briefing for Principals, they have not all been pro-active – there is a strong feeling of 'awaiting higher approval'
- The organisational structure of the ECs for the delivery of the new course has not yet been approved
- Urgent infrastructure needs (not in all ECs, but in new colleges – like Loikaw – which operate in temporary buildings, infrastructure needs are urgent)

1.2 Although the piloting exercise in Yankin and Mandalay ECs was carried out, there were significant criticisms from staff members regarding its effectiveness, specifically that: (i) only fragments of the materials were made available, so that the bigger picture of the courses was obscured, and (ii) the translation of the materials was poor.

1.3 Awareness of the forthcoming changes was low among both key users and other important stakeholders. Among teacher educators (TEs) interviewed at ECs who were not members of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT), understanding of the changes was usually superficial, giving some concern in respect of their readiness. KIs revealed that a number of key stakeholders outside the colleges, including NEPC and the curriculum development contractor, were unaware that the launch of the new EC programme in December 2019 was to apply to all colleges, and still thought that only two ECs were beginning then. This is despite STEM’s communications of the changes to those stakeholders.

1.4 The CCT are the group that has had greatest exposure to new practices and would seem well-placed to communicate those onwards into the ECs they work in.\(^9\) However, visits to ECs revealed a considerable variation in the extent of familiarisation with the new programme. All of the EC Principals had participated in briefing meetings in January/February 2019, so they were familiar with the overall framework of the new four-year course. The group of CCT members in each EC brought detailed knowledge of those subjects with which they were specifically engaged, alongside their more general understanding of the programme’s intentions and directions. The extent to which this knowledge has been shared with TEs is variable.

\(^9\) 98% of the CCT members in the survey indicated that STEM activities had increased their capacity to carry out college responsibilities
1.5 EC visits made clear that what is missing is clear guidance for each EC on how to prepare for the December 2019 start. The current language of “orientating the ECs after the release of the new syllabuses in mid-September” leaves the period for college-based planning and preparation significantly too short.\textsuperscript{10} The Evaluation Team is concerned that recent efforts and existing plans for communication of the EC degree upgrade will not sufficiently address the need. These include roundtable discussions on the Ministry’s TV channel and bulletins in printed press. The imminent addition to the STEM team of a Communications Specialist with an open remit is very timely. It is important that STEM challenge the MoE to think outside its existing boxes for communications. She/he should focus initially on ensuring that every TE in every EC understands their role in the new course, considering approaches beyond workshops. New initiatives are underway, such as training of student teachers to learn photo documentary skills in order to raise awareness of the reform, which may not directly address the most critical needs for communication between MoE and ECs.

\textbf{Box 1: Case Studies of Three Education College Visits}

\textit{Between 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 6\textsuperscript{th} May, the review team made day visits to three ECs – Yankin, Mawlamyine & Loikaw. Three case studies are presented at Annex F. This note summarises key findings in these ECs:}

1. Staff are all aware that the new four-year degree programme will commence in each college in December 2019. For those teacher educators who are not Curriculum Core Team (CCT) members, this is a step into the unknown.

2. The central task of preparation is likely to be that of ensuring that all the members of the teaching staff who will be involved with this course – the major offering of the colleges – are fully briefed (a) about the change; (b) cognisant of changes in their teaching responsibilities; (c) prepared to begin teaching the new programme in December; and, (d) alert to the new developments in relationships with schools which will be required by the more rigorous intended approach to the practicum.

At this point there is no structure within the colleges to address these priority areas. There appears to be a sense of ‘waiting for MoE’ to trigger the necessary response. We understand that MoE intends to invest in briefing and orientating the colleges in the near future, but on existing plans this will fall well short of the detailed preparations required.

3. Each college does have a unit of resource to assist these preparatory stages – the three or four members of the CCT. Currently, their preoccupation is the preparation of teaching and learning materials for Year 1 of the course. They should have a much stronger role in the preparation process within their college.

4. The intention to break down the barriers between academic and methodology studies will leave some staff members feeling disempowered unless they are brought together in planning. One college expressed anxiety as to whether the Board of Studies, which has oversight of the new course, would allow the fusion of theory and pedagogy, there being a strong lobby for educational theory and psychology to be retained.

5. The STEM project’s investment in ICT provision is bearing fruit. Teacher educators and students are beginning to use smart-phone technology as a teaching and learning resource.

6. Each college will have additional infrastructure needs, Loikaw in particular. The principals of the other two colleges believe their needs can be met.

7. Attitudes to inclusion of student teachers with special needs are poorly formed and, in some cases, quite negative.

8. There is almost no awareness below the level of the principal of the new approaches to the practicum which will come with the new course, and the major changes which will be required in the college’s relationship with partner primary and lower secondary schools.

\textsuperscript{10} Quote from statement at ERG meeting, 10 May 2019
EQ2: Are the outputs achieved thus far likely to be effective in achieving the expected outcomes as described in the results matrix?

Key findings

- STEM’s positive relationship with MoE greatly enhances the likelihood of achieving outcomes
- Many of STEM’s outputs remain at an early stage or are yet to initiate at all
- A high volume of outputs yet to commence raises concern over the likely achievement of outcomes within the current project lifetime
- Assumptions around MoE capacity & resources to develop, approve and implement policy and reforms are critical to achievement of outcomes

The table below presents a brief summary of the outputs achieved thus far under the Outcomes 1-3; outputs achieved under Outcome 4 are discussed under EQ 3. For a fuller description of outputs achieved, see the 2019 quarter one Results Matrix at Annex J.

Table 1: Findings on the status of outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output as per Results Matrix</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: Comprehensive teacher policies informed by international standards are adopted, enabling implementation of the updated competency-based Education College (EC) degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1 Teacher Education Council established to enable teacher representatives to advice and support implementation of NESP Teacher Education and Management</td>
<td>A large number of steps remain before STEM can complete Output 1.1 and be in a position to influence the intended outcome. For example, several activities are planned with the Teacher Task Force (TTF), before recommendations can be made on the TEC, prior to debate/approval of TEC, then – if approved – formation of the TEC, before STEM can then provide support to TEC. All this must take place before the TEC will be in a position able to influence development &amp; implementation of teacher education and management policy. The pace of progress in this output affects other outputs and increase the risk that these may not be achieved to the timelines required. This includes 1.3.2 (TTF leads in development of teacher policies) and 4.1 (mainstreaming inclusive education into policy). The Teacher Task Force was given ministerial approval in May 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2 Teacher Education Council established to enable teacher representatives to advice and support implementation of NESP Teacher Education and Management</td>
<td>TCSF has been drafted, with validation of the draft about to commence. The TCSF has gone through a number of iterations to reach its current stage. STEM has facilitated the participation and consultation of a wide range of stakeholders. This attempt to foster local ownership should increase the prospect that the TCSF is effectively adopted. A number of respondents felt it has been an arduous and – in the view of some, unnecessarily long – process. The TCSF contains more levels/detail than some respondents feel is necessary; by contrast the work supported on the Headteacher CSF has proceeded more quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3 Design and implement an equitable teacher recruitment, promotion, and deployment system to improve management and achieve an appropriate teacher student ratio</td>
<td>Teacher policy options were developed in July 2018 and the draft paper translated into Myanmar in Q1 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2: Education College (EC) two-year diploma upgraded to specialized programs with competency-based teacher education curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1 Competency-based curriculum for four-year EC degree developed with support of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT)</td>
<td>EC curriculum framework approved as of May 2019; materials have been developed for Y1 of the new curriculum with the participation of CCT members. A number of teacher educators reported issues with the suitability of materials for some subjects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Output as per Results Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Midterm evaluation of STEM: Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.2 Teacher Educators supported in delivery of competency-based curriculum and required pedagogies for implementation of the new EC degree program</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Only CCT members have been supported in delivery of new curriculum and required pedagogies (apart from ICT), but this has not extended to the wider population of Teacher Educators&lt;br&gt;• 95% of CCT members reported feeling capable of using the new improved ICT facilities in their ECs&lt;br&gt;• Challenges exist to sustainable use of ICT including limited times and locations at/in which internet is available and costs to teacher educators for using personal data&lt;br&gt;• Work on development of framework for CPD has not commenced, with the completion of the TCSF cited as a required pre-requisite&lt;br&gt;• Training modules of teacher educators have not been developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.1 Comprehensive plan for upgrade of Education College (ECs) to 4-year degree institutions developed and implemented</strong>&lt;br&gt;• STEM has provided technical support to the MoE on master planning, but such plans are not complete&lt;br&gt;• Upgraded structures for management and administration of ECs are not in place, as this is still pending with the Union Civil Service Board. Beyond its initial technical/advisory support, it is unclear if STEM has done enough to help the MoE progress this&lt;br&gt;• ICT facilities have been upgraded and are having an impact: 79% EC principals reported a large impact on management and administration, 14% a small impact, and just 1 of 14 respondents said no impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.2 Capacity development plans implemented with training of Education College management staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;• No progress has been made towards capacity development of EC management staff - CPD framework has not been drafted, and no training modules in management skills have been developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 4: An inclusive education approach mainstreamed through teacher policies, teacher education curriculum, and Education College Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.1 Baseline assessments on inequalities in teacher education in Myanmar informing the teacher education reform process</strong>&lt;br&gt;• As of May 2019, ToR developed but baseline assessment pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.2 MoE and EC staff supported in capacity building and promotion of inclusive approach in teacher education</strong>&lt;br&gt;• See findings under EQ3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 1

**2.1a:** The participatory activities STEM has implemented towards development of teacher education policy enhance the likely effectiveness of their adoption.

**2.1b:** The outputs achieved under Outcome 1 – particularly drafting of the TCSF, development of teacher policy options and establishment of the Teacher Task Force are necessary for adoption of teacher education policy but insufficient, and a substantial risk exists that these are not in place in time to enable or enhance effective implementation.
2.1c: It is unclear to what extent STEM has fully explored and pursued options to help the MoE navigate bottlenecks relating to approval process, particularly as regards the new teacher policy, which is contingent on approvals from outside of the MoE.

**Outcome 2**

2.2a: The materials required for Year 1 of the upgraded, specialised EC program have been developed following a competency-based curriculum, including the syllabus, manuals, textbooks and teacher educator guides. Some teacher educators interviewed held concerns as to the quality and suitability of content for certain subject-specific content. If unaddressed, these concerns may reduce the effective uptake of the new materials.

2.2b: A large investment has been made in developing the capacity of the CCT. The participation of the CCT in the curriculum development process has resulted in substantial changes to the materials, without which their quality and suitability to local context would have been lower.

2.2c: Aside from CCT members who are teacher educators, the majority of teacher educators have not been supported to deliver the new curriculum either in terms of pedagogical skills or in knowledge or understanding of the new content and approaches. There is a substantial skills and knowledge gap, which is unlikely to be sufficiently addressed prior to implementation of the new degree course under STEM and the MoE’s current plans. If unaddressed this will have a major negative impact on the likely effectiveness of STEM’s intended Outcome 2.

2.2d: The investment in the capacity of CCT members has greatly increased their confidence to implement the new degree course. The investment into this and into developing materials for their training could – if appropriately harnessed – enhance the effective and efficient capacity development of the wider teacher educator population.

2.2e: Training in ICT has proven partially effective. Almost all CCT members reported feeling either ‘very capable’ or ‘a little capable’ of using new ICT facilities, but at least one college principal reported that it was not yet been used effectively, and a number of teacher educators expressed concerns that the new curriculum required access to online materials that ECs are still not consistently able to provide.

**Outcome 3:**

2.3a: STEM has supported the MoE’s planning and in the long-term this is likely to enhance the quality of upgrades made to management and administrative structures; however, as of May 2019 this has not translated into tangible action towards delivery of these plans. This raises strong concerns as to the likely effectiveness of implementation of the changes in the short term.

2.3b: Outputs to date include technical advice to MoE on new management structures, including use of teacher projection models, as part of the master plan, and the installation of ICT and internet facilities. Use of the latter in management and administration of ECs has been at least partially effective. Activities on management training have not yet taken place. Rapid further progress is imperative.

**Outcome 4:** Described below, under EQ3

EQ3: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?

**Key findings**

- Some inclusive education concepts have been embedded into new policy documents.

---

11 95% of CCT member survey respondents felt ECs require ‘a lot more’ support to improve use of ICT
12 STEM’s Annual Report (2018) notes that interviews “indicated use of this equipment in management tasks by some EC principals in 2018”. The college principals online survey found that 79% of principals felt STEM’s work on ICT was having ‘very great’ impact EC administration; 21% felt it was having either a little impact (14%) or no impact (7%).
3.1: Inclusion throughout STEM

The majority of STEM’s activities seek to incorporate inclusive education in some way. However, inputs are often limited in scope and sometimes inconsistent. Inclusion is a key feature of policy, in particular the TCSF, where explicit mention of inclusion topics (ethnicity, language and gender) feature within the *knowledge* section, but are only mentioned implicitly later. Disability inclusion is not explicitly mentioned in the TCSF. Given the centrality of the TCSF as a STEM document, the explicit mention of some inclusion topics (and not others) may impact the degree certain areas are prioritised.

There has been a positive improvement in the awareness of inclusive education terminology among STEM stakeholders. EC principals, CCT members are familiar with the features of Inclusive Education (gender mainstreaming trainings, inclusion in the TCSF) and with the vocabulary of IE. Gender, Education for Sustainable Development, and Peace Education all rank among the highest priorities with teacher educators and 57% said their understanding of IE was ‘a little better’ or ‘much better’ as a result. Many respondents were able to clearly articulate areas where inclusion was a challenge, particularly with regard to disability.

3.2 Gender inclusion & coordination

Mainstreaming of gender inclusion has been primarily delivered through a ‘Gender mainstreaming’ training for CCT members who gave very positive feedback on its relevance, in particular with challenging gender-biased language or imagery in curriculum design. However, key stakeholders in the curriculum process expressed concerns that such trainings were not fully coordinated – having been designed and developed by a separate agency without regular curriculum consultation. Such coordination challenges were evident with other trainings and the often ‘competing’ inclusion priorities whereby CCT members were pulled to do trainings in place of existing responsibilities.

3.3 Disability inclusion

Disability inclusion is not sufficiently mainstreamed in STEM activities, despite being frequently mentioned by EC principals in the online survey, who associated ‘disability’ with IE in their responses more than any other subject. Without sufficient mainstreaming in curriculum or policies, EC staff assign low value on disability inclusion and demonstrate poor understanding of how to include TEs or STs with disabilities within ECs. Highly discriminatory attitudes and practice towards student teachers with impairments were frequently observed in ECs.

Of all the STEM inclusion topics – disability was listed as the least important by CCT members and many demonstrated exclusionary attitudes towards their peers and beliefs that “teachers with disabilities can disturb better education”. While staff who attended trainings on Special Education presented more positive attitudes towards disability inclusion, most staff expressed opinions that people with disabilities were damaging or disruptive to the teacher education process. Within the curriculum, disability inclusion forms part of special education in education studies, however the scope of this is limited.

---

13 TCSF
14 42% of TE respondents ‘Peace Education’ most important feature of IE,
15 FGDs, CCT members EC visits.
16 KII Major stakeholder involved in curriculum process
17 EC Principals survey
18 TE survey ‘How important are each of these inclusion subjects’ Disability listed as ‘least important’ by majority of respondents
19 FGD EC visits -
20 Curriculum: Education Studies (limited lessons on Special Education p.207 sem 1)
3.4 Education for Peace

Significant progress has been made in mainstreaming some specific inclusion topics, in particular Education for Peace, which was listed as the most important inclusion priority among Teacher Educators. The majority of respondents had not attended an Education for Peace training but still believed it to be the most relevant. However, there was no unifying definition of what Education for Peace meant (variations included ethnic harmony, national progress and human rights).

EQ4: How has the STEM project adjusted its approach in response to challenges faced over the course of project implementation?

Key findings
- Ambitious & changing timelines for the EC upgrade, limited human resources and protracted policy processes all pose major challenges
- STEM’s reporting is open about and reflects on challenges
- Strong response to challenge of low national curriculum development capacity
- Ineffective response to the accelerated EC timeline and to overcoming hurdles around approvals

4.1 STEM’s reporting is open and reflects sensitively on major challenges. Key counterparts in the DHE and the project’s donors are well aware of these challenges.

4.2 Review processes have complicated finalisation of policy developments, causing a log-jam of key policy approvals, including the finalisation of the beginning level of the TCSF; setting up of a Teacher Task Force; and approval of the EC Curriculum Framework by the Board of Studies. Both MoE and STEM are acutely aware of the urgency of reaching closure with these policy initiatives on which the new four-year EC course is entirely dependent.

Perseverance on these issues has very recently yielded sign-off on the Year 1 EC curriculum and for the Teacher Task Force. While these are notable achievements, the delays have created significant risks and STEM must consider whether alternative approaches might better navigate this challenge.

4.3 Case studies of ECs and interviews with principals indicated that the accelerated timeline for roll-out of the EC degree course has presented a serious challenge for the DHE and STEM. STEM and DHE have responded to this with orientations for college principals and the recent implementation of communications activities, including printed press bulletins and TV roundtable discussions. Given the low levels of awareness found in ECs and among other stakeholders (discussed at EQ1) it is evident that these activities have not yet fully addressed the need. The arrival of a new communications consultant is timely and should support identification of communications needs and the development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy. The anticipated urgent release of the curriculum and teaching materials for Year 1 of the program should open the way for ECs to fully engage in preparatory work.

4.4 At the commencement of STEM, there was limited capacity in Myanmar for curriculum development in the context of teacher education (output 2.1), according to interviews with CCTs, Montrose, CREATE, and the ADB. STEM has reacted strongly to this challenge, through its concerted investment into developing the capacity of the CCT cadre. Draft materials produced have for some subjects suffered from poor localisation and adjustment to the capacity of teacher educators; the development of initial drafts in English has restricted opportunities for review, and translations into Myanmar language have been of very poor quality. STEM has responded by facilitating numerous reviews and re-drafts which, of course, have resulted in extended time-lines.

---

21 TE Survey Question 7 In your opinion how important are these areas in Teacher Education. 38% of respondents said Education for Peace was the biggest priority.
22 Commented by a number of CCT members
23 Reported across the board
EQ5: Are the governance and modalities of STEM responsive to other work occurring within the education sector, which is likely to affect pre-service teacher education?

Key findings

- STEM’s governance, through the project donors and Steering Committee, is a real asset and greatly increases responsiveness to other education reform work
- STEM proactively pursues the participation of a wide range of actors involved in other reform areas, improving responsiveness
- STEM’s implementation through an external contractor for curriculum development suffered from inconsistent communication, partially limiting responsiveness to primary curriculum reform work

5.1: The creation of the Steering Committee, established at the start of Phase 2 and chaired by the Minister of Education, has enhanced the effectiveness of the project. The three donors, who take an active role in the Steering Committee, are all funding significant support to the MoE outside of STEM and occupy key roles in sector working groups. Collectively, the donors bring together close knowledge of a wide range of the other work occurring in Myanmar’s education sector. The additional funding and place on the Steering Committee of DFID has further strengthened this, particularly given that DFID’s ‘Towards Results in Education and English’ (TREE) project, which has just commenced (May 2019), will also work on pre-service teacher education. Integration of activities between STEM and the DFAT-funded My-EQIP programme24 is an example of highly effective responsiveness arising from STEM’s governance. The donor’s representatives are highly qualified and experienced in education reform, which when required allows them to provide wider perspectives.

5.2: There are actors inside the education sector (such as the Board of Studies) and outside (such as the Union Civil Service Board) whose engagement and authorisation are critical for the progress of STEM policy reform, but who are not directly involved in the project’s governance. Generally slow progress with both policy and practice decisions have affected STEM’s own effectiveness thus far.

5.3: UNESCO have embedded as a core principle the participation of a wide range of stakeholders in STEM activities, particularly in development of the new EC curriculum. Stakeholders across the board commented on the proactive attempts to ensure opportunities for them to review. Consequently, in spite of a busy and moving set of parallel reforms, the curriculum appears to relate reasonably effectively to the most relevant other reform work, namely the primary and lower secondary school curriculum reforms. However, despite numerous meetings the authors of the primary curriculum were not satisfied that the EC curriculum reflects the primary curriculum as fully as it should.

5.4 STEM’s modality for development of the EC curriculum is though the CCT and a curriculum development contractor (described also under EQ9). Effective response to other reform work through this modality was hindered by unclear communication between STEM, the contractor and other actors, which caused some confusion among actors working on the new primary curriculum as to roles and communication lines. This uncertainty limited the ability of the primary curriculum development team to effectively offer its support and is reflected in their assessment that the Year 1 EC curriculum could better reflect the primary curriculum (5.3). The primary curriculum authors also expressed concern that those working on the teacher education curriculum, particularly the CCT members, do not have sufficient knowledge of the new primary curriculum.

5.5: Despite proactive attempts to coordinate with its authors, STEM has not yet effectively responded to the new basic education ‘local curriculum’,25 which will be implemented in five States in the 2019-20 school year. CCT members and other teacher educators commonly reflected a view that because delivery of the local curriculum is to be led by teaching assistants, ECs will have little to no role in preparing teachers for its delivery. Given that many teacher educator respondents cited introduction of the local curriculum as the primary initiative currently planned through which Myanmar’s formal education system will better serve ethnic minorities, it seems inadequate to rely purely on often poorly trained local teaching assistants.

---

24 Such as the TCSF validation study, which will be implemented by expertise (ACER) brought in by My-EQIP, or the work My-EQIP is doing on communications, which can inform STEM’s forthcoming communications support

25 The local curriculum was completed recently, at the end of Year 1 EC curriculum development process
5.6 STEM has taken efforts to include some civil society actors into its workshops, which is a positive development given the historical exclusion of CSOs from government processes. However, the CSOs interviewed wanted more meaningful involvement in STEM activities. One expressed a sense that their participation in the TCSF process was simply to validate decisions that have already been made, while another noted that their concerns around disability inclusion in the new curriculum had not been addressed, and that their CSO’s involvement has been limited to the education studies subject. Both MEDG and Teacher Focus have generated training materials based on the ‘beginning teacher’ level of the TCSF, thus encouraging their teachers to use a competency-based approach to their teaching. They stand ready to share their experiences more widely.

5.2 Relevance

EQ6: To what extent have STEM results (mainly at output level) supported national priorities, including those of Education Colleges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s design and its major outputs (TCSF and EC degree first year curriculum) are highly relevant to national priorities, as expressed in the NESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM’s ICT activities are relevant to the priorities of Education Colleges, who rate facilities as a top priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM hasn’t yet succeeded in ensuring the reform tackles some key stated priorities, including improving disability access and CPD for teacher educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 STEM’s major outputs to date are the development of the first year EC degree curriculum (and associated materials), and the drafting of the TCSF. Both of these products are fundamental to realisation of Strategies 1 and 2 of the Teacher Education and Management chapter of the National Education Strategic Plan. Both teachers and teacher educators are supportive of the idea of upgrades to pre-service teacher education, including the degree course and career specialisation tracks.26

6.2: STEM’s contribution to upgrading ICT facilities and capacity is also well-received and needed,27 but not reflective of any priorities expressly-stated in the national policy or legislation.

6.3 However, as noted under EQ2 and EQ3, there are outputs fundamental to the realisation of STEM’s outcomes and national priorities for education reform which are yet to achieve results. In particular, STEM has achieved limited progress towards the development of a CPD framework and upgrading capacity of teacher educators, and likewise to the establishment of a Teacher Education Council and development of a comprehensive teacher policy.

6.4 The relevance of STEM’s results in inclusive education cannot be well-assessed prior to the completion of the baseline assessment of inequalities in teacher education, due for Q3 2019. The National Education Law (2014) and its subsequent Amendment (2015) enshrine into legislation the principle of education for all, including those with disabilities and those from all ethnic groups. However, it can be seen that STEM’s inclusive education activities have made very limited contributions towards addressing exclusion from quality education for disabled students and ethno-linguistic minorities. In particular, the recruitment of student teachers with disabilities is explicitly mentioned in the NEL amendment but is not reflected in STEM activities.

EQ7: To what extent has STEM supported activities that prepare ECs and ultimately teachers for supporting inclusive education policy and diversity in the classroom?

26 Limitation: this is based on interviews with Myanmar Teacher’s Federation (MTF), the survey of CCT members (who are more familiar with the new degree course), and a very limited sample of teacher educators not directly involved in STEM (12, from 3 ECs). An MTF survey found that the vast majority of teachers support the upgraded EC curriculum, specialisation pathways and equal pay for primary teachers

27 90% of CCT member survey respondents felt ECs require ‘a lot more’ support to improve use of ICT
Key findings

- STEM has succeeded in raising awareness of inclusive education among a limited audience (the CCT)
- STEM has not yet addressed skill gaps in inclusive teaching
- Progress in addressing disability and ethnolinguistic inclusion has been particularly limited

7.1: Practical Skills

The current TE curriculum includes important foundational knowledge on IE topics – especially Special Education – but contains very few strategies or skills for implementing IE or guidance or how to identify students with special learning needs. While many EC staff, and principals in particular, were able to clearly identify performance gaps in inclusion (such as gender parity or ST with disabilities) they were less able to articulate how to practically address those issues or what institutional process could to support them. Inclusion trainings, particularly on Gender Mainstreaming, had a positive response from CCT members, but it was unclear what effect this had more broadly on attitudinal changes as the number of attendees to these trainings was limited.

7.2: Disability inclusion

Within the ECs, there is a very low-level of capacity to support STs or students with disabilities, despite a clear provision to hire teachers with disabilities in the National Education Law and a progressive admissions policy which permits student teachers with disabilities to attend. The majority of EC principals said it would be “difficult” to strengthen Inclusive Education at their college, though not impossible – indicating they recognize challenges, particularly with regard to disability inclusion.

Attitudinal barriers towards STs with disabilities were prevalent across ECs with management and principals in particular using highly discriminatory language. Although principals recognized the challenges integrating such students, behaviour was often exclusionary: for example, nicknaming student teachers by their disability and intentionally seeking to exclude them from the main teaching pathway. A common expectation was that they would assume administrative roles (and not become teachers), indicating that base attitudes towards disability are both poor and exclusionary.

7.3 Ethnolinguistic Inclusion

EC staff demonstrated low confidence in supporting students who have a low proficiency of language in the classroom and many were unable to give practical strategies or explain why such inclusion was important. A common assumption was that the assistant language teacher would take sole responsibility for this and that identifying linguistic challenges among students was not necessary. The education studies curriculum does provide guidance on supporting broad student needs but less specific about practical instructions for how to support ethnic minorities lacking Myanmar fluency. This is likely to have a disproportionate impact on rural ECs/regions where the proportion of non-native Myanmar speakers is greatest.

Such findings mirror the overall low value placed on linguistic inclusion by TEs; no survey respondent gave this as the most important feature of IE. Similarly, EC management and principals appeared to lack a formal system for recording the languages spoken by student teachers, instead recording only ethnicity or where they were from. These approaches echoed the concerns of key stakeholders that teacher's language skills may not be taken into account during deployment. While ethno-linguistic inputs into the curriculum are

---

28 Education Studies TB Semester 2 9.3 Inclusive Education pg 74
29 Education Studies TB Semester 2 - 9.3.2 Special Education
30 National Education Law amendment 2015
31 EC Principals Survey ‘How easy do you think it will be to strengthen Inclusive Education in ECs?’ 11/14 said it would be difficult
32 EC visits - All ECs included student teachers with disabilities
33 EC visits - Focus group discussion with Student Teachers and Teacher Educators
34 Online Survey ‘What do you think is the most important feature of Inclusive Education?’
35 KII - Key stakeholder "no way to ensure that teachers with languages are deployed to the right places"
necessary and welcome, both students and EC staff had limited understanding or planning for how to ensure this happens in practice.

7.4 Localization/contextualisation

Many of the inclusion inputs in the curriculum are relevant and necessary for IE, however they are often not sufficiently localized for the Myanmar context, with many special educational needs listed in the curriculum but not defined (e.g. dyslexia, attention deficit disorder). A limited awareness of SEN among teachers in Myanmar means that TEs are unlikely to understand these concepts without clarification, impacting readiness among teachers to identify and support such students. Multiple stakeholders involved in the curriculum process also echoed concerns that the curriculum was not sufficiently contextualized for Myanmar or that some inclusion subjects, such as gender, were not fully integrated and felt like an afterthought.

7.5 CCT

The input of subject specialists in inclusion has had a positive impact on curriculum development. However, the extent of knowledge sharing on inclusive education topics between CCT attendees and ECs is unclear, as the process for communicating varied from EC to EC. Key stakeholders involved in the CCT expressed concerns over how effectively complex IE topics would be taught to TEs, as many inclusive education topics were new and unfamiliar to teachers in Myanmar. EC staff who attended ‘Special Education trainings’ spoke highly of the content and could better articulate inclusion challenges, but the availability of such training is not widespread and selection process for attending is not clear.

5.3 Efficiency

EQ8: Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results to date?

Key findings

- STEM’s VfM reporting is inadequate and information currently available on budget and inputs precludes full VfM analysis
- STEM’s budget is underutilised; curriculum development has justifiably received the greatest share of activity spend

8.1: After two years of Phase 2 implementation, STEM had spent USD 2,429,615, leaving USD 3,992,249 for the remaining year and a half. STEM’s own reporting assesses its Value for Money (VfM) positively, and bases this on the sustainability of its capacity building approach, the volume of concrete outputs achieved (including its high number of workshop days), efficiencies in the membership of the CCT, and the quality of products. The Evaluation Team shares the view expressed by a number of the project’s donors that this reporting is inadequate. The annual reporting on VfM is extremely light-touch, is not clearly grounded in reference to cost and uses definitions (or examples) of cost effectiveness which are not well-founded in progress towards outcomes.

8.2: UNESCO’s current financial reporting is organised in a way that does not support high quality VIM analysis. The majority of costs are attributed to project ‘outcomes’, but these are not disaggregated beyond the four work streams (i.e. to outputs) or by the nature of the cost (such as to workshops, or consultant fees). This means that the costs of activities as different in nature as the development of curricula and investment in teacher educator ICT equipment and capacity are bundled together. As more STEM activities come on line, there will be an increasing strategic need for analysis of how well STEM is investing in those activities that are working and those that are not. The current structure of UNESCO’s financial management of STEM will limit the project’s ability to do this effectively.

36 KIIIs, stakeholders involved in CCT
37 STEM Annual Report 2018, Annex C
**8.3:** STEM has spent 28% of funds on programme management and 57% of funds to date on activities related to its four outcome areas.\(^{38}\) Of this USD 1.38m spent on outcome-related activities, by far the greatest portion (74 per cent, USD 1.01M) has been spent on Outcome 2. This can be justified in view of the much higher volume of products (curricula, manuals, textbooks and teacher guides for the new degree course) under this work stream, which is not atypical for a project of STEM’s nature.

As highlighted under EQ2, STEM has not (yet) spent heavily on supporting the preparation of teacher educators to implement the new curriculum. While STEM’s written products are an important, necessary part of the reform, its outcomes will not be realised without substantial investment in upgrading the capacity of teacher educators to effectively utilise those products.

**8.4:** The curriculum development process has experienced some cost inefficiencies resulting from quality issues. For example, the low-quality translation of draft materials (cited frequently by CCT members and MoE stakeholders) rendered those costs largely wasted. The quality of new curriculum materials for some of the subjects was questioned by a number of CCT and MoE respondents; earlier drafts of some materials were reported as insufficiently responsive to the capacity of Myanmar’s teacher educators; respondents\(^{39}\) often viewed the process of drafting both the curriculum and the TCSF as excessively lengthy. The Evaluation Team assumes that the requirement for potentially excessive iterations of re-drafting – which may have been avoidable – has increased the cost of this work.

**8.5:** One stakeholder involved in the curriculum development process observed that the heavy involvement of the CCT in the review process reduces the efficiency of curriculum development. However, the investment in developing the CCT’s capacity should yield increasing returns in quality and efficiency as STEM moves into development of the curricula for Years 2–4.

**8.6:** Contracted services take up more than half of the project’s budget; and equal more than double the budget for UNESCO’s full-time team.

**8.7:** STEM has spent a low proportion of the budget (16-17%) on expenses that are not attributed directly to project outcomes (‘equipment and maintenance’, ‘indirect costs’ and ‘other expenses’).

**8.8:** The slow rate of expenditure to date is attributable to a number of project activities having not yet commenced. Full utilisation of the remaining funds in the existing planned timeframe for Phase 2 will require the rate of expenditure to more than double, and STEM’s ability of the project to do so effectively will be highly contingent on the pace of reform progress. With both MoE counterparts and UNESCO’s team already at (or beyond) full capacity, it is uncertain if STEM’s team at current resource levels will have the bandwidth to manage the scale-up in activities.

EQ9: To what degree has the current approach by the STEM project to guidance and support of stakeholders contributed to co-ordination and harmonisation?

**Key findings**

- STEM has ensured strong coordination with most stakeholders, including MoE and STEM’s donors
- Coordination has not always been successful among actors involved in teacher education curriculum development
- STEM has not sufficiently supported the MoE to provide guidance and support to ECs.

9.1 Relationships with several organs of government are critically important to STEM’s progress. They include NCC, NEPC and NAQAC. Communication has been, and continues to be, strong between these important bodies, as with those in the MoE responsible for delivery of the reform.

---

\(^{38}\) The 57% figure reflects costs attributed explicitly to outcome areas; however, because of the budget structure there is time/ expenditure (such as programme management, which includes the time of core UNESCO personnel) which is spent on outcome areas but not directly categorised as such

\(^{39}\) in government and among wider education focused development partners
9.2 Development partners interviewed universally praised the proactive engagement — both formal and informal — made by the STEM team. STEM’s guidance to its donors has allowed efficiencies to be identified, as in the case of STEM’s collaboration with the Australia-funded My-EQIP project to deliver the TCSF validation study.

9.3 However, there is a clear example of ineffective coordination between STEM, CREATE and the external supplier (Montrose) contracted to implement the EC curriculum development. From varying accounts, it is clear that roles and lines of communication were not initially understood, and that direction given was initially inconsistent. The effects of this are exemplified both in the back-and-forth in integrating CREATE’s teacher education materials into the EC curriculum, and issues in aligning the timelines for development of the EC and basic education curricula. It was also evident from KIIs that communication and responsibilities regarding UNFPA in the teacher curriculum development process were unclear.

9.4 A key stakeholder group which has not yet received the level of attention needed is the teacher educators in the ECs. The ECs are the end-users of all of the innovation efforts under STEM. They should therefore be seen as the ultimate beneficiaries (along with their student teachers), of co-ordination and harmonisation of the STEM work. It might be argued that this responsibility sits squarely with MoE, which is true, but the partnership between MoE and STEM is at the centre of this key prioritisation. Support to teacher educators has not yet been fully pursued. CCT members have benefitted from a very considerable investment by STEM; the ECs have also been recipients of substantial upgrades of their ICT facilities and capacity. But the run-of-the-mill teacher educator has still, with six months to start date, only the barest idea of the implications of the new program for their central role of teaching to deliver the new curriculum, in what is supposed to be a quite new pedagogic culture. The role of CCT members in this process deserves attention; their knowledge has been systematically disseminated to all TEs at best in some colleges.

EQ10: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied?

Key findings

- STEM’s model of partnership with the MoE is highly appropriate, although:
  - Resource limitations at MoE and in STEM team limits the volume of work this modality can handle
  - Some opportunities have not yet been taken, such as to better utilise CCTs in ECs

10.1 The partnership between UNESCO and MoE in this project demonstrates a high level of trust and cooperation, based on interviews with UNESCO, development partners and MoE staff. Both parties wish to drive forward these important changes in the way teachers are prepared in Myanmar, particularly in the context of the challenge of enhancing the performance of the nation’s primary schools. It is notable that the three main donor funders all categorise this project as ‘low risk’, largely on the basis of the strength of the partnership.

10.2 The development of teacher education curriculum materials through an externally contracted supplier (Montrose) working with both international experts and local colleagues (the CCT) has been an appropriate modality for producing the new curriculum, with evident benefits. The CCT model brings together typically three or four staff from each EC, around 80 members in all, who work together with the international team.

However, there are indications that coordination with the evolving primary curriculum has not been fully efficient: for instance, the teacher education curriculum has not always been developed after the primary curriculum modules have been finalised, leading to repeating tasks and redoing existing modules. UNESCO could have more explicitly tasked Montrose to engage directly with JICA and CREATE to synchronise work plans.

Some CCT members expressed that their primary role in curriculum development was in review of materials principally authored externally. A number of CCT members and some external stakeholders questioned the

---

40 29% of college principals responded that they were not well informed about the changes).
subject expertise of some subject authors. Furthermore, in the view of some respondents and the Evaluation Team, some materials have not been well localised. A number of respondents involved in the process expressed frustration at the number of reviews and iterations required. Some noted that the approach limited the regularity or consistency with which CCT members could communicate with the international authors. CCT members and authors of the basic education school curriculum suggested greater initial consultation (such as through Subject-Wise Committees) would reduce the need for re-drafts, and more regular interaction between local and international counterparts (either through locally-based international experts, and/or through full-time CCT members) would be more expeditious. For CCTs, attempting to continue work via email/online once back in their college has been challenging.

10.3 For its clear advantages in sustainability, the current modality is constrained by the human resource capacity of the MoE and the time available to work through the full range of activities entailed in the reform. STEM’s support has been provided from an entirely Yangon-based team. Locating more key project personnel – whether from UNESCO or external suppliers – closer to the MoE team leading STEM, probably in Nay Pyi Taw, would likely bring benefits. This would offer the possibility of greater economy by reducing travel and DSA costs, but also efficiency in communication and adaptive support. For example, the consultant supporting the STEM team’s communication could likely be more effective if they were working directly to Dr May San Yee in her office.

10.4 UNESCO has leveraged high-calibre expertise through external partners and UNESCO internal networks.

While the current modalities for STEM are broadly appropriate, UNESCO could consider amending them for future rounds by:

- UNESCO playing a more active coordination role between different support teams working on tasks that require close alignment to maximise efficiency, including facilitating joint meetings between suppliers working on the primary and secondary curriculum development – and now assessment – materials and the supplier working on the teacher education materials, in order to enable suppliers to coordinate their work plans and avoid repetition.

- The MoE and STEM team sharing early drafts of materials with a broader group of teacher educators (not just CCTs) in order to obtain wider feedback and offer an earlier opportunity for EC comprehensive engagement.

5.4 Monitoring & evaluation

EQ11: Are the results in the Results Matrix an accurate reflection of the theory of change, and does it allow for effective scrutiny of the theory of change?

Key findings

- Results matrix largely captures the understood logic, although less so at outcome level, and it does not reflect assumptions
- STEM’s Results Matrix is lacking performance indicators that allow it to monitor progress against real intended outcomes

41 For example, in Myanmar language subject, there are some lessons and texts from Grade 1 and 2) which use stories like Cinderella, and Midsummer Night’s Dream, despite the availability of many Myanmar stories or texts
STEM’s theory of change (ToC) document is outdated and not used by the STEM team; in answering this question the evaluation considers the ToC implicit in the project’s design (and described at Section 2.3).

11.1: STEM’s Results Matrix contains a heavy emphasis on the project’s activities and relies largely on simple output indicators relating to their implementation.\(^{42}\) The project’s stated outcomes are actually outputs, and the (implicitly) intended outcomes are not stated explicitly. In addition to prohibiting accurate assessment of progress towards outcomes, another consequence of this is the risk of losing sight of activities’ purpose. For example, STEM has invested heavily in developing the capacity of CCT members as curriculum developers, but the benefit of this is not well reflected in the Results Matrix.\(^{43}\) Similarly, many outputs are expressed without reference to the change that should result from them,\(^{44}\) which prohibits analysis of whether assumptions made are valid. Conversely, some output statements actually contain the intended outcome, which is also counterproductive, as it means the change aspect is measured only in terms out of outputs.\(^{45}\)

11.2: Monitoring and evaluating progress against STEM’s theory of change is inherently challenging: (i) as described further under EQs 2 and 12, STEM’s activities are currently a number of years from achieving impact in schools and therefore assessment of this is currently premature; (ii) the MoE’s strong ownership of STEM and STEM’s integration into the reform process complicate identification of results specific to STEM and therefore so too attributing change to STEM\(^{46}\) is challenging. If, as described at Section 2, the essential ToC is that through its support STEM improves the probability that reforms are realised, and enhances the pace, quality and sustainability of those reforms, what STEM must consider is measurement of how effectively it is doing that. STEM currently appears not to be doing this in a systematic way.

11.3: STEM’s current implementation makes a number of assumptions critical to STEM’s ToC holding true, which are not effectively reflected in the Results Matrix. These include particularly those relating to capacity of the MoE to maintain the pace of reform, those around implementation and use of the new curriculum and policy, and those around the supportive environment and set of materials for teachers to deploy their skills in classrooms. The framework inadvertently de-emphasises difficult to measure but important system characteristics, such as adaptiveness to demands; more effective scrutiny of the theory of change would imply a more serious examination of system changes.

11.4: The Results Matrix contains very little disaggregated data, which will curtail any serious analysis of the extent to which STEM has an impact on inclusive education.

EQ12: How may M&E both more effectively and efficiently provide timely information on progress towards outcomes, and other achievements and challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• STEM lacks an operational M&amp;E plan, indicators are not fully defined, and the timing of data collection is insufficiently frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM does not systematically capture and review indicators of progress towards outcomes beyond hard output results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{42}\) See, for example, the large numbers of performance indicators relating to number of workshops held and percentages of personnel trained, or the [draft] / [approved] / [in use] indicators for policy

\(^{43}\) Instead, this is inaccurately used as a measure of teacher educators trained in delivery of the competency-based curriculum (2.2.1)

\(^{44}\) For example, Output 2.2 “Teacher educators supported in delivery of competency-based curriculum and required pedagogies for implementation of the new EC degree program”, whose performance indicators include the percentage of teacher educators trained and the number of orientations about the upgrade held in ECs. Nowhere in the Results Matrix is the fundamental change of improved TE’s skills to teach the new degree course effectively captured

\(^{45}\) For example, Output 1.2 “Teacher quality assurance system developed for assessment of teacher quality and measurable improvement in student learning”, which is measured in terms of development, validation and implementation of the TCSF but not learning; or 1.3, “Design and implement an equitable teacher recruitment, promotion, and deployment system to improve management and achieve and appropriate teacher student ratio”, which is measured by development and implementation of policy, but not improved management or teacher-student ratio

\(^{46}\) That is, what change is STEM causing that would otherwise not have occurred if the MoE did not have STEM’s support
12.1: STEM’s Results Matrix does not give sufficient prominence to the changes intended to occur as a result of its activities. Reorganisation to highlight and then measure these changes, would enhance the effective generation of information on outcomes. There is a clear need to more accurately describe the project’s actual intended outcomes, which are currently obfuscated in three ways, all described under EQ 11:

(i) the four outcome statements do not describe outcomes but in fact outputs (or short-term outcomes) of STEM activities and consequently the performance indicators against them are a measure of outputs;  
(ii) in some cases the implicit intended outcomes are not described (see a suggestion of how these might be represented at Figure 2), such as the development of curriculum development capacity in Myanmar through the CCT;  
(iii) Some of the intended outcomes are stated but are lost, embedded in an output statement;  
(iv) As a consequence of (i), (ii) and (iii), STEM does not have performance indicators that allow it to accurately monitor progress against its real intended outcomes.

12.2: While the nature and timing of STEM makes monitoring of outcomes challenging (see discussion under EQ11), STEM should – but does not currently – utilise indicators that capture measures of progress towards outcomes and signs that outcomes are likely to be achieved and sustained. As identified under EQ2, STEM must achieve a wide set of outputs and short-term outcomes in order to enable sustainable long-term change. Traffic lights or another visual tool would allow efficient presentation of STEM’s progress. The incorporation into STEM’s reporting of qualitative feedback on workshops and training is a move in the right direction towards understanding the immediate effectiveness of activities, but has been limited in its application.

12.3: STEM updates its Results Matrix quarterly, to coincide with Steering Committee meetings. While this provides a useful accountability tool for all major stakeholders, this is likely to be most useful in checking the status of milestones and progress against the work plan and limited in its use for detailed strategic review. STEM’s reporting reflects openly on challenges, and (as described under EQ4) has developed plans to respond to those challenges it has identified.

12.4: However, reliance primarily on quarterly updates to the Results Matrix and the Steering Committee as the forum for strategic review may prove ineffective, particularly where key reform activities have become blocked. It is not clear that the current approach to M&E and strategic review allows STEM to sufficiently frequently identify such challenges, develop solutions and engage the Ministry promptly. STEM lacks an operational M&E plan, which could include precise definitions of indicators, the timing of data collection and methodology for data collection.

As noted at EQ8, improved capture of information on STEM’s effectiveness will allow much more effective reporting on Value for Money.

---

47 For example, PI1: “...teachers being trained”; P1.1 “teacher policy developed”, P1.2 “Teacher promotion policy revised”. Use of teacher policies (P1.3) is more appropriate as an outcome indicator.  
48 (see footnote 45)  
49 In the case of policy reform outcomes, this will require the use of qualitative indicators that capture soft signs of commitment to and progress with reform in the MoE and the effectiveness of change management.
This is intended to represent STEM's implicit theory of change at outcome level. The position of STEM's stated Outcomes 1-4 at the bottom of this highlights the volume of change required for STEM's objectives to be realised. At present, STEM is not sufficiently generating information on how effectively its activities are enabling these changes.

If this representation were to detail all the activities and outputs required to achieve even the lower level outcomes, it would be seen how failure to progress in a single area (such as the TEC or CPD framework) will fundamentally restrict overall progress.
5.5 Sustainability

EQ13: Are the supposed benefits of the STEM project likely to last beyond completion of the current support?

Key findings

- MoE’s strong engagement with and ownership of STEM strengthen the prospects of lasting benefits
- The policy and curriculum products STEM is supporting the MoE to develop are likely to endure, although potential poor implementation of the new degree in 2019-20 poses a risk
- STEM’s participative capacity development approach strengthens sustainability
- Limited progress in addressing the status of primary school teaching represents the major threat to sustainability
- Weak EC management capacity will also limit the benefits of STEM without strengthened support

13.1: The benefits of significant reform of the practice of the ECs in the production of beginning teachers of good quality will only be sustained if the enabling conditions are in place for solid career structures for those who graduate from the four-year course (salaries; professional development opportunities; societal and parental esteem). The weak status of primary teachers may mean that effective teachers trained in the new approaches do not remain primary teachers for long, and that experienced primary teachers are not part of the teacher educator teams.

13.2: Continued commitment from the MoE and in particular EC leaders and TEs to the reform is key to sustainability. Relevant policy documents (TCSF) and a new curriculum provide a strong basis for change but for their benefits to be sustained beyond the STEM project’s lifetime there must be concerted efforts from those responsible for training new teachers to put them into practice. Interviews suggested that these individuals are currently motivated to do this. Typically, sustaining this motivation would require a set of incentives for TEs, including performance monitoring and perhaps rewards, and a concerted communications campaign that convinces them of the value of changing the way in which they teach and what they teach. On the basis of interviews with NAQAC and a review of draft policies, no action has been taken to date on incentives for TEs to deliver new courses, including performance monitoring and professional development opportunities.

The capacity of CCTs to continue producing material in line with the new curriculums at primary and secondary level is also key. Currently this is strong, but the mixture of demands to produce new material while embedding the existing material across colleges may require adding new members to CCTs and/or developing from existing CCTs a leadership cadre with specific responsibility for embedding this material.

STEM’s investment in upgrading ICT facilities and their use has already yielded short-term impact in EC administration. As a clear majority of TEs and their students already possess smartphones, there is huge potential for them to be used as teaching and learning resources, but this is not yet occurring.50 A number of sources observed that coverage is not yet sufficiently comprehensive in ECs.51 Budgeting to support their serious use through internet access has significant financing and equity implications.

Given the centrality of the TCSF in the conceptualisation of the new approach to teacher education in the four-year program, it should be a priority to ensure that all teacher educators are familiar with, and bought into, the new thinking.

---

50 One EC principal noted that EC wi-fi is used largely for social media and online games
51 Survey responses expressed a desire for 24/7 comprehensive internet access; as also noted under EQ15, a number of respondents during EC visits noted that teacher educators are currently having to pay through their own data to access online materials and references
13.4: The following risks to sustainability have been identified:

- Motivation for TEs in ECs is likely to be lacking in respect of the root and branch reform to the preparation of beginning teachers which they clearly need to embrace if they are to deliver a dynamic teacher preparation four-year course.
- Student teachers will vote with their feet at the moment of course specialisation at the end of Year 2, with very few opting for the Primary Education route and many choosing the Junior Secondary School channel. The response of ECs may well be to reflect this route, as it relates more closely to the present strengths of many of their teaching staff, whose knowledge of, and engagement with, best primary school practice, is very slight.
- Without the development and implementation of teacher policy reform, the current limited status of primary teachers (as established by the current teacher promotion pathway and route to becoming a teacher educator) means both that there are unlikely to be many experienced primary teachers delivering the primary teacher education curriculum and that any effective beginning teachers trained in the new materials are unlikely to remain primary teachers for long.
- The management capacity of education colleges and the resources available to them may limit their continued effectiveness in delivering the new reforms once the initial STEM support ends. In particular, if teacher education is to remain adaptive to new demands from the wider education system, it is not currently clear where the capacity lies to adapt. This includes both change management capacity and the capacity to make use of new technology as it develops.

EQ14: Does the STEM project approach ensure that there is a capacity development dimension in all aspects of its design, implementation and monitoring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- STEM’s design and implementation prioritises capacity development through MoE participation and leadership in all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activities focused on the CCT represent a significant capacity development effort and achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capacity development in monitoring is not strongly built into STEM’s approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.1 A review of the project documents make clear that the STEM project is entirely oriented towards building capacity to improve teacher education, and this is explicit in Outcome 2.

14.2 Interviews have made clear that STEM has worked in partnership with the relevant parts of the MoE, specifically with the DHE, in the implementation and monitoring of the progress of the programme. Reporting to the Steering Committee has been led throughout by MoE personnel.

14.3 So far, this capacity strengthening has not systematically percolated down to the level of the individual ECs, except in an ad hoc way when CCT members have been invited to share their learning with staff colleagues. As discussed earlier, case studies in ECs indicate that they have barely begun to prepare for December 2019 start-up, in large part because they have not seen the draft syllabuses (recently approved by the Board of Studies. After early orientation, the ECs should be responsible for their own preparations for December 2019, through subject working parties, so that each staff member feels well-prepared to begin teaching the new courses. The change in pedagogic practice required will, for some TEs, be very challenging. The CCT members in each college should be used as a key resource in this process.

14.4: There has been significant capacity development through the engagement of the CCT cadre in the production of curriculum materials for the four-year programme. To date, this has been focused on the finalisation of the subject syllabuses and the generation of the Year 1 materials. This should lead to a smooth process for the production of the equivalent Years 2 – 4 materials. According to interviews with CCTs and UNESCO, there is now potential for the CCT cadre to have a wider role in EC preparations for the December 2019 start.

52 In the opinion of Teacher Educators and PPTT students interviewed
14.5 There are no clear indications that capacity has been built to monitor the effectiveness of STEM reforms (see also EQ12). Effective monitoring and then adaptation will be critical to the sustainability of STEM reforms (see EQ13), but currently it isn’t clear where capacity to do this lies within the MoE, and a document review indicates no overarching strategy for monitoring and evaluation.

Building capacity to run these processes is resource intensive and from a project document review and donor interviews it is not clear that there has been sufficient resource tasked to do this from external suppliers. At the same time, donor interviews indicate that given the extremely high volumes of technical assistance already being provided across the MoE, it is not obvious that the MoE has further absorptive capacity. A specific strategy for the development of MoE capacity to design and monitor (in particular) STEM reforms that takes account of these absorptive limitations could help address this.

14.6 As with many development projects, there appears a tension between the ab initio requirement to produce outputs (such as materials or a policy) and the desire to generate the capacity within the MoE to own these outputs. Specific activities targeted to develop this capacity could resolve this tension.

14.7 Two STEM priority areas – ICT for the ECs and teacher planning needs for DBE – fully engage with relevant personnel, providing an environment of continuous capacity development. Autonomy of practice by MoE is the appropriate target for both areas.

5.6 Impact to date

EQ15: What intended and unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?

Key findings

- Clear impact on capacity of CCT members
- All ECs have benefitted from strengthened ICT capacity for administration and teaching
- Policy development not sufficiently progressed to have effected institutional change at this point
- STEM has placed high demands on the time of CCT members

15.1 Institutionally, STEM’s work to support the Ministry on policy reform is laying the groundwork for critical institutional change. The Teacher Task Force, for example, is a key step on the path to establishing a Teacher Education Council; the TCSF, when finalised, will contribute to enabling enhanced professional development, teacher assessment, and quality teaching. However, on the basis of interviews with NEPC and the NCC and a review of the TCSF, these activities have not yet reached sufficient maturity that they could be considered to have realised institutional change at this point: STEM’s work on policy reform is a work in progress.

15.2 STEM’s work on mainstreaming gender into policy quickly achieved a specific impact in the decision of MoE to allow student teachers a free choice between domestic or industrial sciences, regardless of their gender.

15.3 A clear impact at individual level has been in the development of a cadre of 80 CCT members, who understand the curriculum development process, have gained curriculum development expertise, and in many cases have gained confidence in their day jobs in ECs. According to interviews with CCTs and EC case studies, they have made important inputs to the new curriculum materials for TEs and students.

53 When asked if their participation in STEM activities had affected their capacity to deliver the new curriculum in December 2019, 98% responded positively (of which 65% very positively). FGDs with CCT members at the ECs visited also revealed the positive impact on these individuals. 93% of CCT members surveyed felt ‘very capable’ or ‘capable’ of using the new ICT facilities
15.4 Institutionally, the impact of CCTs on their own ECs has been variable, according to EC case studies and interviews with CCTs and UNESCO. Impacts are typically stronger where the Principal or Vice-Principal has been a CCT member; in that context, they have typically briefed all their colleagues on return from their engagement with materials production. Overall, the Evaluation Team considers that the enhanced skill-sets of the CCT members could be better utilised in their ECs (and possibly in clusters of ECs) to form a conduit between the curriculum developers and the ECs. Some CCT members showed hesitation and a feeling of perceived lack of agency when this enhanced role was proposed to them. An unintended change was reported by some CCT members who warned their workload was already excessive, thus: “…there are no weekends this year”.

15.5 The forthcoming role changes for the teaching staff following from the integration of theory and practice in the new course appears to have created some tension in ECs among TEs who have become aware of the change. Case studies indicate that the extent to which this represents a critical tension among the staff cadre appears to vary between institutions, from not being a significant issue to one which may create new barriers to collaboration.

15.6 All ECs have benefitted from investment in strengthening ICT capacity – in administration and in teaching, according to EC case studies. At individual level, the increased requirement of TEs, who do not yet have comprehensive access to internet provided by the college, has had the unintended impact that teacher educators have had to fund access to those materials from their own resources (i.e. mobile phone data).

15.7 CCT members reported increased burden of work through their participation in STEM. DHE is now considering whether for the drafting of the EC curriculum for Years 2-4 to replicate the model used by CREATE, in which a smaller number of teacher educators would work full-time (or at least more intensively) on curriculum development.

**EQ16: How are results and good practice being communicated to stakeholders?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of results to Steering Committee stakeholders is consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of results and good practices to teacher educators and students is very weak; an opportunity has been missed to utilise CCT members to communicate good practices in their own/ nearby ECs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.1 Key government and donor stakeholders receive regular updates on STEM’s progress and results through quarterly updates to the results matrix, which are presented at Steering Committee meetings (and evidenced in Steering Committee meeting minutes). STEM’s annual reports detail project results in greater depth. STEM participates actively in informal coordination meetings with other donor-funded projects, and also participates actively in education sector working groups. Representatives from development partners had good understanding and awareness of what STEM is doing, based on interviews.

16.2 Although the Steering Committee provides a structured forum for a select group of key stakeholders, overall the evaluation finds little evidence of systematic onward communication of results and good practices developed through STEM to larger audiences, specifically to the key group – the ECs. As noted elsewhere, and evidence from EC case studies, there is weak communication with ECs and particularly teacher educators outside the CCT. This responsibility appears to have fallen between STEM and the MoE.

16.3 In terms of sharing results and good practices beyond the Steering Committee, the CCT are the group that has had greatest exposure to new practices, and would seem well-placed to communicate those onwards into the ECs they work in. However, visits to ECs revealed a considerable variation in the extent to which CCT members had communicated about their STEM work to their colleagues. CCT members in each EC brought detailed knowledge of those subjects with which they were specifically engaged, alongside their more general understanding of the programme’s intentions and directions.

---

54 Interview with CCT member during EC case study visit
16.4 It appears that lessons learnt on the curriculum development process may not be well-communicated. One active CCT member expressed concern that the feedback gathered from workshops is not acted upon:

“There are very few cases where they did evaluations. Even where they ask for our feedback at workshops, we’re not sure how much they consider it… If there is a disagreement in the CCT group, the feedback doesn’t go anywhere.”

5.7 Conclusions

From a short-term perspective, and in light of the (highly challenging) accelerated timeline for implementation of the new EC degree course, STEM’s activities have not effectively prioritised support to aid MoE’s and ECs’ preparation ahead of December 2019. STEM’s work in policy (the TCSF and teacher policy) has effectively ensured extensive consultation and will result in policy that is better grounded in evidence and aligned to international standards. However, this has come at the cost of the pace of progress, and while key policy pieces remain unfinished, the project has made almost no progress in supporting the MoE to address critical teacher educator capacity gaps. At more than halfway through the project’s lifespan, there remain a concerning number of activities yet to come online, which casts doubt on the likeliness that intended outcomes will be achieved within the project’s current funding window.

The project’s activities on inclusive education show partial progress insofar as the awareness of key agents working on reform has improved and key products (TCSF and EC year 1 curriculum) include ‘new’ concepts, and this in itself represents progress. However, the progress to-date is currently a long way from addressing critical skills gaps in classroom practice. STEM’s governance and modalities are generally effective in ensuring alignment with other reform activities, but unclear roles and communication with the curriculum development contractor have inhibited effectiveness. From a longer-term perspective, the project’s approach to government capacity development and ownership is likely to improve the prospects for achieving its outcomes.

STEM is clearly well-aligned to national priorities on pre-service teacher education, seen both in the delivery of key outputs stated in MoE policy, as well as other activities (such as on ICT) that are not as strongly emphasised in MoE policy but identified as essential by ECs. However, STEM ECs’ immediate priorities for the upgraded degree course have not yet been met, and the activities STEM has pursued on inclusive education to date are not sufficiently well-aligned to increasing inclusive education and diversity at classroom level, particularly in the dimensions of exclusion most acutely felt in Myanmar (such as disability and ethnolinguistic exclusion).

STEM’s costs appear proportionate to its outputs to date, but its financial management structure precludes strong VfM analysis. Coordination has been proactive, covered many stakeholders and been positively received, but there have been challenges in integrating CREATE’s work. STEM’s modalities are generally appropriate but unclear roles and communication with the curriculum contractor have resulted in some inefficiencies. Development of the new curriculum and the TCSF have not been highly efficient processes.

STEM’s Results Matrix captures activities and outputs comprehensively, but the outcome level of its Theory of Change is not well articulated. Progress towards outcomes is not adequately measured to enable well-evidenced strategic review of effectiveness. STEM lacks an operational MEL plan and does not articulate indicator definitions, the timing of measurements, or the communication of results.

MoE’s ownership of STEM, and the capacity development approach taken provide strong prospects for sustainability. However, the long-term impact of STEM rests on some key assumptions both beyond and within STEM’s control, including MoE capacity and incentives for teacher educators and teachers to develop new competencies. Addressing the weak status of primary teachers through development and implementation of new teacher policy is critical to the enduring impact of the teacher education curriculum reform.
At the individual level, STEM has had a strong impact on the limited population engaged through the CCT, but evidence of impact across the broader TE population is weak. STEM has supported the MoE in progress towards critical institutional (policy) changes, but these have not yet been realised and so impact cannot yet be claimed for these.
6 Lessons learnt

In all significant educational reforms, there are two key dimensions. They are (a) understanding of change management, which often involves institutional and policy changes; and (b) human resource development to carry forward the reform. What lessons have been learned from the STEM/MoE reform of pre-service teacher education in the Education Colleges, when viewed from these perspectives?

The introduction of a four-year degree programme, replacing a two-year diploma programme is a significant challenge at many levels, but ultimately its success or failure will be entirely dependent on the day-to-day performance of those who teach the programme, the cadre of close to 2,000 teacher educators and their leadership, in the twenty-five colleges for whom the necessary change of pedagogic culture will be profound. In order for a successful launch of the programme to take place, STEM and MoE has identified several key policy areas which need to be addressed in order to provide an overarching framework for the new programme. The key areas are:

- Re-setting the culture of being a primary teacher
- Development of the Teacher Competency Standards Framework
- Creation of a Board of Studies to oversee the new courses being offered

In addition, there is a key practical area – the generation of a new curriculum framework, curricula/syllabuses for each subject area, and the production of new student textbooks and manuals for teacher educators.

The latest quarterly report from STEM (Quarter 1, 2019) shows clearly that, assessed against progress in the results matrix, these policy and practice areas, along with others of less immediate importance, such as ICT developments and forecasting of teacher needs, remain works-in-progress.

The Board of Studies, in its meeting of 17 May 2019, gave its blessing to the curricula/syllabuses for the fourteen subjects in the new course. This is an important breakthrough.

Taking for a moment a chemical analogy, it is well understood that, in a chain of linked chemical reactions, the overall speed of the reaction is governed by the speed of the slowest step in the chain – the ‘rate-determining step’. Using this analogy, and of course recognizing the importance of sound policies, it appears that the rate-determining step in this reform is very much the likely performance of those who have to deliver the new courses – the TEs in the ECs. At present, with six months to go to programme launch, they are seriously off the pace of preparation. With the exception of the cadre of CCTs, along with those TEs who received fragmentary materials as part of the two-college pilot, they have no resources with which to ground their planning, nor has the college leadership systematically structured the process of generating new courses (Who will teach? Do we have the necessary resources? What new skills do we need to develop?).

What then to do? The developmental needs are addressed in the next section, but, given that syllabuses/curricula are now expected to be made available as a matter of urgency, the onus should be on each college to generate its own change management team (perhaps Principal, Vice-Principal, Heads of Department, CCT members) to work towards the preparation of detailed schemes of work to cover Year 1 of the course, showing how TEs will engage, how teaching resources will be made available, and how each college will begin to strengthen its links with local potential partner schools. How soon exactly the colleges may have first sight of the key learning materials – student texts and tutor manuals – is of great concern. Not only are these critical for planning of the teaching programme, they are also repositories of best practice in key areas like: How do primary children learn? How is reading and writing introduced? What can we learn from observation of primary classrooms? For some newly-appointed TEs, who have no background in the craft of primary school teaching, these will be precious resources as they learn a whole new skill-set.

Following the recent approval of the Board of Studies, the DHE’s plans to urgently distribute these materials is highly encouraging.

55 [For further reading on change management in the Education sector, see anything by Michael Fullan, specifically: (i) Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform (1993) or (ii) The New Meaning of Educational Change (1996) The mechanisms for change in these writings are very generic in their application to education systems].
Having set the urgent needs of the Teacher Educator cadre as the central task, how then to proceed? The existing responses of both STEM and MoE offer a diet of one-off orientation, workshops and training. The online survey conducted for this review showed that even after orientation in January 2019, a clear majority of college Principals felt less than fully prepared for the new course start-date. Is orientation and training working for the reform? There is a comprehensive literature on the impact of training on changes in professional practice – see Joyce & Showers meta-study, of more than 1,000 studies, (1987) of ‘Effect sizes for training outcomes in different contexts’. The simple conclusion is that, in the sequence presented below, effective transfer of training only occurs if there is speedy and on-going follow-up with practice, feedback and coaching/mentoring.

**New Knowledge & Theory & Skills -> Demonstration & Practice -> Early Practice, Feedback and Coaching**

This is a tough but necessary condition, which can be applied to the needs of the ECs over the coming months. So:

- **Unlikely to be successful in the existing time-scale**: management training courses for College Principals;
  Large-scale cross-college orientation workshops
- **Potentially successful in leading to preparation for the December 2019 start**: college-led subject-focused working groups; CCTs developed as resource people and supporters of working groups

It seems that the cadre of CCTs, already college-based with in many cases some seniority, are a strong resource as potential supporting coaches or advisers on implementation of the new course. STEM may wish to provide them with some intensive preparation for this role, with immediate practice back in their own colleges. Clustering of the colleges, already agreed, may provide broader subject coverage and problem-solving opportunities, but should not deflect from the responsibilities of each, individual college to forge its own response.
## 7 Recommendations

### Table 2: Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. STEM to support the MoE to generate and use a working version of the TCSF, as it pertains to the beginning teacher emerging from the new EC degree program</td>
<td>This key tool frames all the proposed developments in strengthening the teaching force for Myanmar. Its completion has been delaying commencement of key activities around CPD. The framework should be a living document that is regularly updated; it is counter-productive to strive for the perfect framework.</td>
<td>2.1b: substantial risk that policy not in place time to enable or enhance effective implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Urgently discuss with the DDG of DHE the possibility of providing additional units of resource in her office, based in NPT, to assist work planning and prepare for the EC degree program</td>
<td>Critical period over next six months, getting the ECs geared up for the start of the new program, beginning from a low base (see next Recommendation). Additional resource could support development of short-term action planning for roll-out of EC degree course, and (partially) address capacity constraints in processing high volumes of work</td>
<td>Table 1: CPD activities have not commenced in part because the TCSF has not been finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Appoint a STEM/MoE Communications Officer to support EC preparations and roll out of the new degree course – a Myanmar language speaker</td>
<td>It is highly probable that there will be widespread demand for information during the early roll-out of the new degree course. Assessment of communications needs, development of a communications strategy and support to the MoE’s implementation of that strategy will better ensure that all stakeholders receive the information they require for effective preparation and implementation of the EC degree.</td>
<td>1.1, 1.3: Concern about extent of preparation &amp; readiness for EC degree roll-out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes:
- **Table 1:** CPD activities have not commenced in part because the TCSF has not been finalised
- 8.4: respondents often viewed the process of drafting both the curriculum and the TCSF as excessively lengthy
- *The tool has been in development since 2016*
- *TEs involved expressed frustration at the level of effort invested*
- *CPD activities have not commenced because the TCSF has not been finalised*
- *Other DPs urged that STEM not seek a perfect document and keep sight of the immediate benefits of a well-formed (even if not perfect) expression of what good teaching practice looks like*
- **1.1, 1.3:** Concern about extent of preparation & readiness for EC degree roll-out
- **10.3:** the current modality is constrained by the human resource capacity of the MoE and the time available to work through the full range of activities entailed in the reform
- *The DHE (Teacher Education) is operating at full capacity and a high volume of additional work is anticipated*
- *STEM’s support to date has been Yangon-based with travel to Nay Pyi Taw*
- **1.1, 1.4:** Staff in ECs have very little understanding of what guidance or support will be provided in implementation of the new EC degree course
- **13.1, 13.4:** The perceived status of primary school teachers is low and is a fundamental barrier to achieving STEM’s intended outcomes. In addition to policy, this requires a shift in attitudes not just among prospective teachers but more broadly in the public domain.
**Recommendation**

2c. STEM supports MoE to co-ordinate each EC’s creation and delivery of an action plan covering the next six months of preparation for the new program.

3. Strengthen STEM’s senior-level engagement, for example with the appointment of a senior education adviser.

4. STEM/MoE to recognise the important skill-set of the Core Curriculum Team (CCT) cadre in the new EC program, identifying developmental roles for them within each EC, and reflect the intended outcomes of STEM’s support to the CCT in the Results Matrix.

---

**Rationale**

Shifting the perceived status of primary teachers will require a concerted and wide-reaching communications strategy, which will have to compete with DHE’s many priorities. External support may be used to generate evidence in favour of this and to address limited capacity to implement. Failure to achieve sufficient preparation in ECs risks a weak beginning to the new programme. In addition to reducing the effective preparation of the first cohort(s) of EC degree course students, reputational damage could have longer-term consequences for the effectiveness of the reform. In large measure, the ECs will have to mobilise their internal leadership and innovation resources to create their own programs, with allocation of staff and resources. STEM may be able to offer college-by-college support, possibly through ECs coming together in clusters, but ECs should not rely on external workshops.

More regular engagement at the highest levels (DG, Minister) will improve STEM’s ability to engage with MoE thinking and move key policy issues up the agenda. Many CCT members have gained knowledge, skills and confidence, which if so directed would make them value resources to support preparation for and implementation of the new EC degree course. In some cases, this may simply mean institutionalising what is already informal good practice in the communication of new skills and knowledge. The leadership of each EC must use this unit of resource. The leadership of each EC must use this unit of resource.

**Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement**

4.3: MoE has made progress with some communications initiatives, but interviews in ECs suggest these have not a sufficiently widespread impact. There is a need for ongoing communications as well as one-off pieces. STEM is now mobilising a communications consultant.

*All 25 ECs will be required to implement the new degree course from December 2019*

1.1: ECs have not had essential tools (syllabi, tutor manuals, other resources) to allow them to engage effectively in planning

14.2: STEM has a strong, highly responsive relationship with MoE; however:

2.1, 4.2: Key issues (TCSF development, CPD framework, EC curriculum) requiring senior engagement/sign-off have moved forward slowly or not at all

10.3: STEM’s engagement with MoE is funnelled through one highly capable but overworked DDG of DHE

8.6: STEM spends much less funding on its core team than on external consultants

---

1.3, 9.4: Onward communication from CCTs to colleagues regarding the content of the new curriculum and plans for its implementation has been varied, and often limited to the CCT members’ subject peers. Lack of authorisation to do so is the most common explanation.

---

**Table 1:** CT members have experienced strong gains in capacity development and feel much more confident about their ability to implement the new degree course than their non-CCT colleagues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. STEM/MoE to ensure implementation of the comprehensive professional development plan for all teacher educators in ECs receives sufficient priority, so that teacher educators' capacity to deliver the new course is not left neglected in favour of the more visible aspects of EC preparation | Reviewing the format (number of people and the frequency, duration and nature of input) of CCT members' involvement in development of Years 2-4 of the EC degree curriculum would have benefits for the efficiency of the process and likely for the quality of outputs. It may not be efficient for CCT members who are also senior college management to remain regularly involved in curriculum development. More intensive involvement (for example full-time) of a smaller number of CCT members might address some of the issues identified. | *Most CCT members expressed support for the idea of their taking on a role in roll-out of the degree course  
*Some CCT members identified that only when participating in workshops were they able to effectively contribute, whereas work on their remote 'homework' was difficult to balance with other commitments and required use of sometimes unreliable online facilities  
*Some CCT members commented on the increase to their workload as a result of STEM  
*The calibre of some subject authors was questioned by some CCT members  
*The localisation of some content was questioned by some CCT members  
*Some CCT members preferred the full-time model they have observed the CREATE team use; some individuals in DHE like that model, although resourcing is a major constraint  
*Teacher educators teach as little as two hours per week in some colleges and in some subjects |
| 6a. STEM to ensure the Years 2-4 curriculum development process includes consultation with basic education subject authors and other actors in curriculum before developing first drafts | Beyond the urgent needs generated by the December 2019 launch of the new program, the substantial cadre (~2000) of TEs need systematic CPD experiences, as they will be treading on ‘new ground’ for four years at least. Failure to develop their capacity will result in ineffective delivery of the new degree course. As with any other professional group, they should have structured CPD options and opportunities. | 2.2c: The majority of teacher educators have not been supported to deliver the new curriculum either in terms of pedagogical skills or in knowledge or understanding of the new content and approaches  
14.3: The change in pedagogic practice required will, for some TEs, be very challenging |

Table 1: STEM has planned activities in professional development for TEs but these have yet to take place  
*Many of the present cadre have no (or only historic) experience of basic school teaching; they have weak links with partner schools; they have low credibility as practitioners with their own student teachers  
*The STEM project is well-placed to bring together interested stakeholders, under the broad aegis of the TCSF |

| 5.4: Meetings between STEM and CREATE did not fully effectively result in integration into the curriculum.  
5.5: STEM has not yet effectively responded to the new basic education ‘local curriculum’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6b. Further clarify roles and lines of communication between all actors in curriculum development, particularly for curriculum development contractor(s)** | While there is value in STEM's team maintaining the primary relationship with key actors, the curriculum authors must have all relevant information to effectively; a greater degree of autonomy to engage directly with other actors may facilitate this. | 5.6: CSO's want more meaningful involvement in STEM activities  
*Basic education curriculum authors feel they have had to push for engagement, and suggest Subject-Wise Committee meetings to take place at the beginning of the process*  
9.3: The role of the curriculum development contractor vis a vis engagement with other actors was initially unclear to both contractor and external actors and created some inefficiencies. This improved following a concerted effort to clarify roles and responsibilities |
| **6c. Clarify role and required use of CREATE’s Teacher Education materials** | As above | |
| **7. Identify STEM’s intended changes (outcomes), reflect these in results matrix (with an appropriate measurement plan). Develop an operational MEL plan** | Making explicit the implicit intended outcomes, and the assumptions these rest upon, will enable more effective strategic review of progress towards those outcomes and of which approaches are and are not working.  
An operational MEL plan, including disaggregated indicators, will ensure timely collection of the data needed to assess progress.  
Incorporating communication of results and good practices (particularly to regular participants in STEM activities) will enhance coordination, maximise the gains of good practices developed, and improve relationships with STEM participants. | 11, 12: *STEM’s theory of change document is outdated and not used; the Results Matrix is the closest representation of the understood theory of change  
*STEM’s Results Matrix focuses heavily on outputs and does not accurately reflect all implicit outcomes or assumptions  
*STEM’s does not have a detailed results measurement plan (including frequency/timings, definitions of indicators, sources for data collection)  
*STEM’s M&E does not clearly delineate the impact of STEM’s inputs from those of MoE, and so does not generate information that enables analysis of how effective STEM’s approaches are  
*STEM does not sufficiently disaggregate data to allow fully effective analysis of progress towards mainstreaming inclusive education  
*STEM has not comprehensively communicated results and good practices to important stakeholders outside of the Steering Committee, such as CCT members* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Define and agree Value for Money indicators</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of costs in terms of the results they achieve will allow STEM to make more informed spending decisions and better enable the project’s donors to assess the value of their investments. Given the project’s emphasis on evidenced-based planning, introducing the MoE to VfM analysis could strengthen their capacity to critique the use of STEM’s funds and also their own funds, and therefore would have benefits for the sustainability of MoE’s reform efforts.</td>
<td>8: STEM does not report on Value for Money in a sufficiently meaningful way to satisfy the requirements of some of its donors. Currently there is no real connection between costs and results in STEM’s reporting. “STEM’s current financial reporting is constrained by the cost categories available from UNESCO financial management system. Currently STEM costs are broken down either by ‘outcome’ (i.e. the four work streams) plus categories such as Program Management, M&amp;E and equipment, or by a broader set of general categories. With this system STEM and its donors cannot assess specific cost categories within work stream areas. For example, this means costs spent directly on the CCT are not clearly distinguished from costs spent on the contracted curriculum development supplier.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusive education recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Disability</th>
<th>The inclusion of this (alongside gender, ethnicity and language) would give it greater currency in curriculum and additional trainings and would bring the TCSF more in line with the NESP and national education law amendment—which explicitly mention disability.</th>
<th>3: Disability inclusion is not sufficiently mainstreamed in STEM activities. Disability was listed as the least important by CCT members. 1: Disability is not included in the TCSF, despite featuring in the National Education Law and NESP 3: Highly discriminatory attitudes and practice towards student teachers with impairments were frequently observed in ECs 7: Within the ECs there is a very low-level of capacity to support STs or students with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. STEM to support inclusion of explicit mention of disability inclusion in the TCSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop Special Education Needs/disability awareness training for EC management</td>
<td>EC principals and management have different inclusion priorities and responsibilities to TEs, especially with regard to supporting staff with additional needs. Awareness training targeted specifically toward the them would help address discriminatory behavior and provide practical steps toward better inclusion for TEs and STs. A student teacher or tutor with an interest in Inclusive/Special education should be encouraged and supported to attend workshops or additional trainings on SEN throughout their pre-service training. While not every ST will have an interest in this, a select few will and they will benefit from it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provide pathways &amp; learning opportunities for educators wishing to specialise in SEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. STEM to support greater emphasis on SEN in the curriculum</td>
<td>should be made aware of professional development opportunities and relevant talks/trainings. This can create an SEN ‘specialist’ in any given EC who has expertise in Inclusive Education which can be shared/used as a resource. Dedicate a chapter to this within Education Studies rather than a sub section. This would broaden existing topics such as language inclusion and allow for greater contextualisation of SEN terms.</td>
<td>7.3: EC staff demonstrated low confidence in supporting students who have a low proficiency of Myanmar in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethno-linguistic inclusion</td>
<td>While the current curriculum does help teachers to address a wide range of student needs, it lacks specific and comprehensive advice on supporting students who do not have fluency in Myanmar language. This would allow teachers to better understand how children respond to a second language at different ages and what problems they are likely to have and how teachers can identify them. Greater awareness of speech impediments would enable teachers to recognize the difference between a speech impediment and the difficulties second language learners face.</td>
<td>7.3: The education studies curriculum is not specific about practical instructions for how to support ethnic minorities lacking Myanmar fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop practical strategies in the curriculum for teaching students whose mother tongue is not Myanmar language, such as introductions to speech/second language acquisition among children and on speech impediments</td>
<td>EC management and TEs should maintain records on languages spoken by student teachers or teacher educators and actively use this information to better inform EC management to recognize and utilize the diversity and capabilities of staff.</td>
<td>EC case studies: ECs did not maintain records of the mother tongues of students. There are examples of progress in this area, such as the quota implemented in Loikaw to ensure representation from all townships of the state; however, because data on language is not collected, it is not possible to be sure this initiative is resulting in more speakers of other ethnic languages taking places as student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strengthen institutional capacity to support language diversity</td>
<td>The current gender mainstreaming trainings have shown to be effective and to have had a positive impact on participants but are so far limited in scope. Future trainings should be broadened to invite a wider range of participants and/or open to those teachers wishing to gain a greater specialist knowledge in gender.</td>
<td>3.1: Gender ranks among the highest priorities for inclusive education, according to CCT members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender: Expand and coordinate gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>7.1: Trainings on gender mainstreaming had a positive response 7.2: Key stakeholders in the curriculum process expressed concerns that trainings on gender were not fully harmonised with other parts, having been designed and developed by a separate agency</td>
<td>3.2: Key stakeholders in the curriculum process expressed concerns that trainings on gender were not fully harmonised with other parts, having been designed and developed by a separate agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create a coordinated communication strategy between CCT and ECs to influence transfer of knowledge and attitudes</td>
<td>Formalize the transfer of inclusion-specific updates and workshops from CCT members to the ECs/management</td>
<td>7.5: The extent of knowledge sharing on inclusive education topics between CCT attendees and ECs is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Link to the findings which point to a need for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>team. While some ECs had a more defined approach to communicating, others did not.</td>
<td>unclear, as the process for communicating varied from EC to EC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex A  Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Evaluation of the “Strengthening pre-service Teacher Education in Myanmar” Project
Terms of Reference

Background

Through the ‘Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar’ (STEM) project, funded by the Governments of Australia, Finland, and the United Kingdom, UNESCO has been supporting the Myanmar Ministry of Education (MoE) in its reform of the Myanmar pre-service teacher education system. The STEM project (funded at over $9 million for 5 years) will help the MoE, and particularly the Department of Higher Education (DHE), in upgrading Myanmar’s 25 Education Colleges (ECs), spread throughout the country, from 2-year diplomas to 4-year specialized programmes, with a focus on a new competency-based curriculum in line with international standards, human rights, gender equality and teacher rights. STEM includes support to complementary reforms to policy as well as EC management and technology infrastructure. The reform is in response to and aligned with the Myanmar Ministry of Education’s National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-21.

Phase I of the STEM project began in 2015, and Phase II began in 2017. The STEM project since the beginning has contributed to both the upstream and downstream work of improving pre-service teacher education in Myanmar. The upstream work focuses on advocacy and capacity building for developing the necessary policy and curriculum frameworks for the system. The downstream work’s approach focuses on capacity development of teacher educators and department personnel to develop and deliver new courses in ECs, to improve pedagogy, to strengthen EC management systems, ICT equipment and skills, and to create a knowledge platform and networks among ECs. UNESCO and the MoE work with other partners toward these reforms, including those supporting basic education curriculum frameworks and in-service teacher education.

With the current Phase II of the project having started in 2017, a mid-term evaluation of Phase II of the project is to be conducted in the form of an external evaluation. The evaluation report will be reviewed by the STEM Steering Committee, its core members consisting of the Ministry of Education, UNESCO, and the three donors, to inform decisions as necessary to adjust or refine project priorities, costed annual work plans and deliverables.

Purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress and approach of the STEM project so, in the long-term, it can better contribute to realization of the teacher education reform agenda of the NESP 2016-21 and the global agenda of Sustainable Development Goal 4 for inclusive and equitable quality education for all. The findings of the evaluation shall be used by the Myanmar Ministry of Education, Donors, and UNESCO to:

- Document the project’s progress so far, as well as the challenges, lessons learned, and areas still to be covered;
- Enhance the project’s relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and, where relevant, provide key recommendations to reorient aspects of the project towards improvements;
- Analyze the extent to which the project is likely to enable a pre-service teacher education reform that is sustainable and how it could evolve to further secure its sustainability
- Determine the reasons for the observed performance and draw lessons that could be used both in the remaining project implementation period and in future projects, including more broadly in the teacher education reform agenda beyond 2021.

Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation is to assess to what extent the STEM project has made progress along the theory of change so that expected outcomes are achieved by project end, with a focus on the period between 2017 and 2018.

It shall identify key outputs likely to lead to expected outcomes, analyse the enabling factors and obstacles, and scrutinize the challenges encountered and their causes. It shall further assess to what extent the monitoring and evaluation tools are able to effectively identify achievements and challenges, as well as what remedial actions have been or can possibly be taken to address challenges.

The STEM project should be assessed against the following standard assessment criteria and should focus on the subsequent indicative questions. The indicative questions may be refined during the inception period.

Effectiveness in Implementation:
1. What progress has been made towards the results identified in the results matrix of the STEM project? What challenges have been faced, and how have they been addressed thus far? Are the outputs achieved likely to be effective in achieving the expected outcomes? Particularly, have the outputs achieved thus far demonstrated progress toward the outcome of mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education
reform? Has the STEM project extracted lessons learned from experiences at country level and made them available for others?

**Relevance of Project Results and Governance:**

2. To what extent have STEM results (mainly at output level) supported national priorities, as well as priorities of the Education Colleges? How has STEM been positioned within larger national aid and sector coordination frameworks? Is the governance and modalities of STEM responsive to other work occurring within the education sector, which is likely to affect pre-service teacher education? Is the STEM project consistent with the global priorities and objectives of both its donors and UNESCO as implementer?

**Efficiency of Implementation:**

3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the manner in which the STEM project undertakes planning, management, implementation and monitoring? Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results? To which degree have the current tools and guidance notes contributed to improved coordination, harmonization and information among stakeholders? Has the project efficiently coordinated with other development partners? Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied? To what extent has the intervention of different UNESCO entities under the ‘UNESCO family approach’ been efficient regarding the coordination and implementation of activities in STEM country projects?

**Effectiveness and Efficiency of Monitoring and Evaluation:**

4. Are the results in the monitoring and evaluation framework an accurate representation of the theory of change, and does the framework allow for effective monitoring and evaluation of the theory of change? Are the indicators and means of verification likely to provide meaningful information about progress towards outcomes? How may monitoring and evaluation of STEM both more effectively and efficiently provide timely information on achievements and challenges? How may STEM monitoring and evaluation be better integrated to MoE’s processes for M&E?

**Sustainability:**

5. Are the supposed benefits of the STEM project likely to last beyond completion of the current support? Does the STEM project approach ensure a capacity development perspective in the design, implementation and monitoring of country projects? Does the approach allow for sustainability even as there may be significant contextual changes?

**Results to Date:**

6. What intended or unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual level by the STEM project? To what extent has the STEM project supported activities that are likely to contribute to national policies and strategies? To what extent has the STEM project supported activities that are likely to contribute to gender equality, equity along other forms of marginalization, and fulfilment of human rights, including teachers’ rights? To what extent has the project generated support from other partners and funding mechanisms? Are results being communicated well to all stakeholders, and were good practices disseminated?

**Scope of Work**

1. **Tasks to be Performed**

   The evaluators’ activities should include, but not be limited to:

   - Desk study of all relevant documents including the reports of the project, documents, guidelines and templates that were published or issued in the course of project implementation;
   - Interviews of key stakeholders and participants, as well as possible other sources of relevant information, such as consultation through online survey. Information should be gathered from the following stakeholders:
     - The Ministry of Education, particularly the Deputy Director-Generals responsible for teacher education in Department of Higher Education, and representatives from Departments of Basic Education; Education Research, Planning and Training; and Monitoring and Evaluation.
     - Representatives of the National Education Policy Commission (at minimum 1-2 representatives)
     - Members of the Teacher Competency Standards Framework Working Group (at minimum 2-3 members)
     - Members of the Curriculum Core Team, a group of teacher educators leading development of the new EC curriculum (at minimum 3-5 members)
     - Principals and others involved in management of ECs (at minimum 1-2 ECs)
     - Members of the gender working group for teacher education (at minimum 1-2 members)
     - Representatives from STEM project donors
     - Representatives from relevant development partners as well as civil society
   - Field visits should be undertaken to visit 1-2 Education Colleges that participate in the STEM project
• Analysis of the STEM project approach against relevant trends and conditions for capacity development in teacher education globally.

2. Deliverables

The contractor is required to submit the following expected outputs to UNESCO:

1. By 25 March 2019, an Inception Report which contains a summary of the theory of change of the project and synopsis of the project's operational context drawn from the desk study, an evaluation design matrix, a list of stakeholders to be consulted, and a list of reviewed documents. The evaluation design should contain the proposed data collection methods and data sources to be used for answering each evaluation question and a plan for their validation. The evaluation design should also contain a timeline and key deadlines.

2. By 8 April 2019, a revised Inception Report following stakeholder feedback and, based on proposed data collection methods, and draft data collection instruments

3. By 10 May 2019, a half day workshop for presenting the preliminary findings and recommendations to the Reference Group for the evaluation, the STEM Steering Committee.

4. By 24 May 2019, a draft evaluation report of no more than 30 pages, excluding annexes.

5. By 14 June 2019, the final evaluation report of no more than 30 pages excluding annexes which should be structured as follows:
   - Executive Summary
   - Program Description
   - Evaluation purpose
   - Evaluation methodology
   - Key Findings
   - Lessons learnt
   - Key Recommendations
   - Annexes (including interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, Terms of Reference)

The deliverables must be written in English. The report should focus on highlighting both key findings and the key recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, so that stakeholders can take forward learnings and re-orient project as appropriate. The annexes should provide an adequate level of evidence to sustain the findings and recommendations. Multimedia presentation of evidence and findings is a welcome addition to the evaluation report.

4. Proposed payment arrangements

The fee is payable in the following proposed payment instalments upon certification by UNESCO of satisfactory performance by the contractor of the work corresponding to each payment. All payments shall be effected by bank transfer. UNESCO shall be responsible for its own banking fees but any possible intermediary banking fees, as well as the beneficiary’s own banking fees, shall be the responsibility of the contractor. As such, please take these banking fees into account when preparing the financial proposal/price schedule.

5. Conditions for the Evaluation

The evaluation is external. It is not anticipated that the deliverables of the evaluation will be published, but they will be shared with all members of the STEM Steering Committee. The STEM Steering Committee will be the reference group for this evaluation and will be responsible for overseeing and advising on the evaluation process and methodology. It is expected that all deliverables will be reviewed by the members of the Steering Committee, and they will provide feedback to the evaluators as appropriate. The STEM Steering Committee comprises the representatives from the Myanmar Ministry of Education, UNESCO, and the Governments of Australia, Finland, and the United Kingdom.

6.1 Responsibilities of the Reference Group (the STEM Steering Committee) include but are not limited to:
   - Providing guidance for the overall methodology and approach of the evaluation
   - Providing feedback on all draft materials in the evaluation, with emphasis on the Inception Report, data collection tools, preliminary findings, and draft evaluation report
   - Provide timely and appropriate feedback to submitted draft deliverables
   - Ensure availability for the presentation of preliminary findings

In line with UNESCO's overall gender mainstreaming strategy, the contractor is expected to integrate a gender perspective in all activities and apply gender analysis and mainstreaming concepts whenever feasible.

The work shall be completed by 14 June 2019 at the latest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness EQ1: To what extent are the Ministry of Education and Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree programme to begin in December 2019, and how effective has the STEM project support to this preparation been?</td>
<td>Perceived likelihood of achieving outcome; Causal link between outputs and outcomes; Perceived validity of assumptions; Recognition of risks in programme design &amp; management</td>
<td>MoE EC Principals Teacher Educators UNESCO</td>
<td>TE FGD 6,6; TE Survey 1,2; CM FGD 7, CP Survey, Other KIIs 1,11 (MoE, donors, STEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2: Are the outputs achieved thus far likely to be effective in achieving the expected outcomes as described in the results matrix?</td>
<td>ToC Teacher training reform literature Project staff MoE EC management teacher educators DPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review; Other KIIs 7 (MoE, donors, STEM) ; Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?</td>
<td>Presence and quality of inclusive intervention <em>throughout</em> reform activities; Stakeholder perceptions of progress; Attitudes exhibited</td>
<td>Stated policies MoE TCSF WG Gender WG EC management Teacher educators Curriculum</td>
<td>Desk review TE FGD 3 TE survey 6,7 CM FGD 10 CP survey 5,6,7 Other KIIs 6 (MoE, donors; STEM team) Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4: How has the STEM project adjusted its approach in response to challenges faced over the course of project implementation?</td>
<td>Listing and analysis of challenges, with recorded responses</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Desk review; Other KIIs 3 (donors, STEM); Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5:</td>
<td>Are the governance and modalities of STEM responsive to other work occurring within the education sector, which is likely to affect pre-service teacher education?</td>
<td>Perceptions of other relevant actors in the sector</td>
<td>MoE, Donors, Other DPs, NEPC, NCC, NAQAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td><strong>EQ6:</strong> To what extent have STEM results (mainly at output level) supported national priorities, including those of Education Colleges?</td>
<td>Perceptions of Ministry &amp; EC stakeholders</td>
<td>MoE, EC principals, Teacher educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ7:</strong> To what extent has STEM supported activities that prepare ECs and ultimately teachers for supporting inclusive education policy and diversity in the classroom?</td>
<td>Attitudes exhibited; Presence &amp; quality of inclusion; Use of appropriate language; Allocation of resources</td>
<td>Teacher Educators, EC Management, CCT members, TCSF WG, Gender WG, MoE, MoE project documents</td>
<td>Desk review; TE FGD 9; TE survey 8; CM FGD 10; Other KIIs 1, 6 (MoE, Donors, CSOs, DPs, STEM); Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>EQ8:</strong> Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results to date?</td>
<td>Perceptions of value for money; Comparison with budget/spend of similar projects in Myanmar</td>
<td>Project budget data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ9:</strong> To what degree has the current approach by the STEM project to guidance and support of stakeholders contributed to co-ordination and harmonisation?</td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions</td>
<td>MoE EC management, Teacher educators, DPs, Project staff</td>
<td>Other KIIs 8 (MoE, Donors, CSOs, DPs, STEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ10: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied?</td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions</td>
<td>MoE management, Teacher educators, DPs, Project staff</td>
<td>Desk review; EC survey 8; CP survey 12; Other KIIs 8 (MoE, Donors, CSOs, DPs, STEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of M &amp; E</td>
<td>EQ11: Are the results in the Results Matrix an accurate reflection of the theory of change, and does it allow for effective scrutiny of the theory of change?</td>
<td>Correlation between ToC and Results Framework</td>
<td>Project documents, Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ12: How may M&amp;E both more effectively and efficiently provide timely information on progress towards outcomes, and other achievements and challenges?</td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions</td>
<td>Results matrix, Project documents, Project staff, DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>EQ13: Are the supposed benefits of the STEM project likely to last beyond completion of the current support?</td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions of likelihood of benefits persisting; Evidence of irreversible/’sticky’ changes in routines</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ14: Does the STEM project approach ensure that there is a capacity development dimension in all aspects of its design, implementation and monitoring?</td>
<td>Visibility of capacity building in the various activities</td>
<td>Programme documentation, ToC, Project staff, MoE, EC principals, Teacher educators, CCT members, TCSF WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to date</td>
<td>EQ15: What intended and unintended changes have occurred at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?</td>
<td>Changes in performance at institutional level; Changes in individual performance</td>
<td>Results matrix, Project documentation, MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Outcomes</td>
<td>STEM Outputs</td>
<td>Mapping Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> Comprehensive teacher policies informed by international standards are adopted, enabling implementation of the updated competency-based Education College (EC) degree</td>
<td>1.1 Teacher Education Council established to enable teacher representatives to advise and support implementation of NESP Teacher Education and Management (NESP S1C1) 1.2 Teacher quality assurance system developed for assessment of teacher quality and measureable improvement in student learning (NESP S1C2) 1.3 Design and implement an equitable teacher recruitment promotion and deployment system to improve management and achieve an appropriate teacher: student ratio (NESP S1C3)</td>
<td>EQ4 [1.1, 1.2, 1.3] EQ7 [1.1, 1.2, 1.3] EQ13 [1.3] EQ14 [1.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2:</strong> Education College two-year diploma upgraded to specialised programs with competency-based teacher education curriculum (NESP S2C2)</td>
<td>2.1 Competency-based curriculum for four-year EC degree developed with support of Curriculum Core Team (CCT) 2.2 Teacher educators supported in delivery of competence-based curriculum and required pedagogies for implementation of the new EC degree program</td>
<td>EQ6 [2.1, 2.2] EQ10 [2.1, 2.2] EQ14 [2.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Strengthened management and administration of Education Colleges (NESP S2C4)</td>
<td>3.1 Comprehensive plan for upgrade of Education Colleges to four-year degree institutions developed and implemented&lt;br&gt;3.2 Capacity development plans implemented with training of Education College staff</td>
<td>EQ3 p[3.1, 3.2]&lt;br&gt;EQ10 [[3.1, 3.2]&lt;br&gt;EQ13 [3.2]&lt;br&gt;EQ14 [3.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: An inclusive education approach mainstreamed through teacher policies, teacher education curriculum, and Education College Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs</td>
<td>4.1 Baseline assessments of inequalities in teacher education in Myanmar informing the teacher education reform process&lt;br&gt;4.2 Ministry of Education and Education College staff supported in capacity building and promotion of inclusive approach in teacher education</td>
<td>EQ3 [4.1, 4.2]&lt;br&gt;EQ6 [4.1, 4.2]&lt;br&gt;EQ13 [4.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex C  List of sources

### List of stakeholders consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of Education</strong></td>
<td>Department of Higher Education</td>
<td>Dr May San Yee, Deputy Director General, TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education Research, Planning &amp; Training</td>
<td>Dr Zaw Latt Tun, Deputy Director General, Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Competency Standards Framework Working Group</td>
<td>Dr Aung Min, Retired Rector YUOE and TCSF WG Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Su Thwin, Pro-Rector, Department of Educational Theory, YUOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Kay Thwe Haing, Pro-Rector, YUOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Khin Mar Khine, Pro-Rector, YUOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Working Group for Teacher Education</td>
<td>Dr. Aung Aung Min, Chairman Gender responsive in teacher education team; DDG DHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daw Thuzar Shein, Team member and Vice Principal, Myaungmya EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Commissions</strong></td>
<td>National Education Policy Commission</td>
<td>Dr Win Aung, Member, NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U Mya Kyaw, Member, NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Lwin Lwin Soe, Member, NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Accreditation and Quality Assurance Committee</td>
<td>U Mae Aung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEM Donors</strong></td>
<td>UK Department of International Development</td>
<td>Laura Brannelly, Education Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khaing Phyu Htut, Education Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thazin Kyaw Lin, Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Australia Department of Foreign Affairs &amp; Trade</td>
<td>Esther Sainsbury, First Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland</td>
<td>Silja Rajander, Head of Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montrose International</td>
<td>Hannah De Vries, Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Vinson, Curriculum Consultant (former staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Ikuko Shimizu, Education Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREATE (JICA, Padeco)</td>
<td>Tomoko Masuda, Teacher Education Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My-EQIP (DFAT, Cardno)</td>
<td>Susan Atkins, Team Leader &amp; Education Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EYE (ADB, e-Gen)</td>
<td>Marion Young, Consultant for Institutional Capacities for Education Sector Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFECT / TREE (British Council)</td>
<td>Rebecca Picton, Director Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar Education Consortium</td>
<td>Cliff Meyers, Acting Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>Myanmar Special Education Association</td>
<td>U Tha Uke, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khin Htwe Kyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar Teachers Federation</td>
<td>Zaw Myo Hlaing, Secretary of Higher Education Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monastic Education Development Group</td>
<td>Aung Aung Oo, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D  Data collection tools

This annex presents the outline structure of five probes to be used during the investigative part of the review:

1. All Education College Principals: Online survey (25)
2. Sample Teacher Educators from all Education Colleges: Online survey (4 x 25)
3. Interview Protocols for College Principals in colleges chosen for case study (3)
4. Interview Protocols for Teacher Educators in colleges chosen for case study (3 x 4)
5. Interview Protocols for all other stakeholders – see Annex G for full listing of stakeholders

Box 2: Developing a Myanmar-friendly bilingual online survey platform

The Evaluation Team selected SurveyHero as the platform for roll-out of the online survey. This was selected over alternatives because its multilingual survey feature, which offered advantages over alternative platforms:

- **More user-friendly entry of the second language**, including the ability to clearly compare specific sections, side-by-side
- **Instant data analysis in either language**. This meant that although responses were provided in the Myanmar version, the Evaluation Team could immediately analyse numerical answers in English.

Although the platform already supported Myanmar Unicode font, it did not offer the Myanmar Zawgyi font, which is the font more familiar to EC staff. OPM’s team worked together with SurveyHero to successfully develop and test compatibility with Zawgyi. The SurveyHero team have now also made Zawgyi available as one of the limited number of languages that can be used as the primary language of a multilingual survey. This means that on the platform a survey can be developed and entered in Myanmar and subsequently translated into English.

Figure 3: Online surveys for ECs

Online survey Education College Principals (English)
Focus: Education College Principals

Approach: Online Survey

To the College Principal
We are very grateful to you for the time to be spent completing this survey – we anticipate it will consume not more than 40 minutes of your time.

Please be assured that, although we ask for the name and details of your college, in our analysis and reporting, no individual’s response will be identifiable with her/his institution.

Since 2014 UNESCO has been implementing the STEM project (Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar), which is supporting the Ministry of Education to reform pre-service teacher education through development of teacher policies, competency-based teacher education curriculum, Education College management including ICT, and inclusive education.

We understand that you have already been engaged in STEM project activities, as part of the Pilot Orientation Workshop, held to prepare teacher educators to pilot the Year 1 curriculum; the Pilot Orientation Workshops were held 24 to 26 January in Mandalay Education College and 31 January to 2 February in Yankin Education College. We also note that some of the Teacher Educators in your Education College are participating in STEM through the Curriculum Core Team (CCT). The major purpose of this questionnaire is to use your EC’s and your personal experience and feedback/comments to evaluate the impact of the STEM project thus far and to improve the project’s support to pre-service teacher education reform in the future.

**Completing the questionnaire**

In some of the questions which follow, you are asked to (a) Put an X in the box which gives the response nearest to your view, and (b) Write a sentence, or two, explaining your view, in the space provided.

E.g., *Do you agree that every child should experience at least one inspiring teacher?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>4[ X ]</th>
<th>3[ ]</th>
<th>2[ ]</th>
<th>1[ ]</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 1: Please update your college key data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student numbers</th>
<th>Present Year 1 Female:</th>
<th>Male:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Year 2 Female:</td>
<td>Male:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teaching staff numbers | Female: | Male: |

How many years have you been an Education College Principal? .......... years

**Question 2: Following the January/February 2019 Pilot Orientation Workshop, how well informed do you personally feel about the contribution of the STEM project to the pre-service teacher education reform?**

| Very Well Informed | 4[ ] | Well informed | 3[ ] | A little informed | 2[ ] | Not Informed | 1[ ] |

What do you understand as the key components of the STEM project?

.....

**Question 3: Since the Pilot Orientation Workshop, how much have you communicated to Teacher Educators in your Education College about the reform?**
1 - A lot  2 - a little  3 - not at all

If 1 or 2, please explain how you have communicated this.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Question 4: Some of your colleagues are members of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT), which is supported by the STEM project. To what extent have CCT members shared information about the new curriculum within your Education College?

1 – Very Actively  2 – A little  3 – Not at all

If 1 or 2, please explain what type of information CCT members have shared about the new curriculum, or the pre-service teacher education reform overall.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Question 5: Do you or your EC staff have a better understanding of inclusive education as a result of your participation in STEM project activities?

1 - Much better  2 - a little better  3 – not better

If so, please describe how improved inclusive education is being used at your EC (for example, in college management and policies, classroom management, learning activities, etc.)

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Question 6: The STEM project is supporting the MOE’s pre-service teacher education reform with activities to strengthen inclusive education in teacher education. How easy do you think it will be to strengthen inclusive education in ECs?

Very easy  4[ ]  3[ ]  2[ ]  1[ ] Very difficult

What challenges do you anticipate they will face?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Question 7: STEM has been supporting improvements to ICT facilities in ECs, including the provision of broadband Internet access, ICT equipment (such as laptops and tablets) and ICT training manuals. What impact do you expect the increased emphasis on ICT, being supported through the STEM project, to have on teaching and learning in your Education College?
What specific aspects of the ICT strengthening do you see as most important?

Question 8: How is strengthened ICT provision impacting on Education College administration and management?

Question 9: To what extent have you made changes to your practices as the Education College Principal since your engagement with STEM project activities?

1 – A lot 2 – a little 3 – no changes

Please explain

Question 10: Since the Pilot Orientation Workshop, in late January/early February, how frequent has further communication been from the MoE regarding the forthcoming upgraded teacher education degree programme?

What kind of additional support would you welcome?

Question 11: STEM will support the MoE in promoting clustering of local schools linked to the Education Colleges. How do you feel this may change interactions between the Education College and the schools used for students’ school experience (practicum)?
Question 12: Are the current delivery activities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results?

| Most Appropriate | 3 | Partly appropriate | 2 | Not appropriate | 1 |

What alternative approaches could be applied?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you so much for your thoughtful responses.

Table 3: Mapping of survey questions to EQs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Survey question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EQs 1,3,7,10,15,16 are those for which we feel this survey can generate relevant evidence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1: To what extent are Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree course in December 2019, and how effective has STEM’s support to this preparation been?</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ7: To what extent has the STEM project supported activities that are likely to contribute to increasing inclusive education priorities in Myanmar?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ10: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ15: What intended and unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?</td>
<td>8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ16: How are results and good practice being communicated to stakeholders?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online survey Teacher Educators

Completing the questionnaire

Since 2014 UNESCO has been implementing the STEM project (Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar), which is supporting the Ministry of Education to reform pre-service teacher education through development of teacher policies, competency-based teacher education curriculum, Education College management including ICT, and inclusive education.

We understand that you have already been engaged through the STEM project as a member of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT). The major purpose of this questionnaire is to use your experience and feedback/comments to improve the STEM project.

In several of the questions which follow, you are asked to (a) Put an X in the box which gives the response nearest to your view, and (b) Write a few sentences to explaining your view in the space provided. The scales used (1-3, 1-4, 1-5) vary between questions.

e.g. Do you agree that every child should experience at least one inspiring teacher?

| Strongly agree | 1[ X ] | 2[ ] | 3[ ] | 4[ ] | Strongly disagree |

Background:
1. Which Education College do you work at?
2. Your experience.
   a. How many years teaching in basic education schools do you have?
   b. How many years working as a teacher educator at an Education College/University of Education?
3. Your gender: M [ ] F [ ] Other identity [ ]
4. Age
5. Job title: Tutor [ ] Assistant Lecturer [ ] Lecturer [ ] Head of Department [ ] Vice Principal [ ] Principal [ ] Other _____
6. Please list the STEM-related activities you have participated in:
   a. CCT workshops
   b. TCSF workshops
   c. Annual ICT training
   d. ICT Competency Standards Development
   e. Workshop on education for peace
   f. Workshop on education for sustainable development
   g. Pilot testing of Year 1 curriculum
   h. Gender review of curriculum
   i. Development of gender mainstreaming manual
Survey questions

Question 1: In December 2019, the new 4-year teacher education degree programme will commence. As a Teacher Educator, do you feel confident that you will be able to effectively deliver the new curriculum by 2019?

A: 1 Very confident – 2 Quite confident – 3 Not very confident - 4 Not confident at all

B: Please explain why

Question 2: How do you think your participation in STEM activities has affected your capacity to deliver the new curriculum in December 2019?

A: 1 Affected very positively - 2 Affected a little positively – 3 Not affected – 4 Affected a little negatively – 5 Affected very negatively

B: Please explain how

Question 3: Has your participation in STEM activities affected your capacity to carry out your responsibilities in your Education College in any other ways?

A: 1 Affected very positively - 2 Affected a little positively – 3 Not affected – 4 Affected a little negatively – 5 Affected very negatively

B: Please explain how

Question 4: Because of STEM, has anything changed about your responsibilities at your Education College or how you do your responsibilities at the Education College?

A: 1 Affected very positively - 2 Affected a little positively – 3 Not affected – 4 Affected a little negatively – 5 Affected very negatively

B: Please explain what and how.

Question 5: STEM has been supporting improvements to ICT facilities in ECs, including the provision of broadband Internet access, ICT equipment (such as laptops and tablets) and ICT training manuals.

A: Do you feel capable of using these facilities?
   1 – Very capable 2 – A little capable 3 – Not capable

B: Do you think ECs require more support to improve use of ICT?
   1 – A lot more 2 – a little more 3 – no

C: How may ICT facilities be further improved in ECs?

Question 6: STEM conducts activities focused on inclusive education (including gender and education for peace).

A. From your participation in STEM project activities, what do you think is the most important feature of inclusive education? (short answer here)

Please explain why you feel this feature is most important:

B. In your opinion, how important are these areas in teacher education?
   1 – Very important 2 – Quite important 3 – Unimportant - Very Unimportant
   - Gender
   - Education for peace
   - Education for sustainable development
   - Disability inclusion
- HIV/AIDS and sexuality education
- Ethnic inclusion
- Rights of the teacher
- Human rights

C. Has your participation in STEM activities affected your attitudes and values about these topics?
1 - Very much 2 – A little 3 – Hasn’t affected

D. Please explain how

**Question 7**: Do you feel more able to provide inclusive teacher education as a result of STEM’s activities?

A: Do you have a better understanding of inclusive education as a result of your participation in STEM project activities?

1 - Much better 2 – A little better 3 – no change 4 – a little worse 5 – a lot worse

B: Have you used this better understanding of inclusive education while teaching at your Education College?

1 - A lot 2 – A little 3 – Not at all

C: If so, please describe how you used inclusive education in your teaching (for example, in classroom management, learning activities, etc.).

**Question 8**: The STEM activities’ that you participated in are suitably designed for achieving their objectives. Do you agree?

A: 1 – Strongly agree 2 – Agree 3 – Neutral 4 – Disagree 5 – Strongly disagree

B: How could they be improved?

**Question 9**

STEM project activities have mainly included teacher educators as part of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT), and other teacher educators have not been directly involved so far. What kind of impact, if any, do you think your participation in STEM activities have had for the other Teacher Educators you work with?

1 – Major benefit 2 – Some benefit 3 – no impact 4 Negative impact 5 Very negative impact

B: Please explain

**Question 10**

How do you feel that the teacher education reform will change relationships between the Education College and the basic education schools used for practicum?

**Table 4: Mapping of survey questions to EQs and STEM outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>STEM outputs answers should relate to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1: To what extent are Education Colleges prepared for implementation of the 4-year degree course in December 2019, and how effective has STEM’s support to this preparation been?</td>
<td>Q1, Q2</td>
<td>Indirectly, all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3: Have the outputs achieved so far demonstrated progress towards mainstreaming an</td>
<td>Q6, Q7</td>
<td>Directly: 4.1.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2 Indirectly, all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusive education approach in the pre-service teacher education reform?</td>
<td>EQ7: To what extent has the STEM project supported activities that are likely to contribute to increasing inclusive education priorities in Myanmar?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ10: Are the current delivery modalities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results, and what alternative approaches could be applied?</td>
<td>Q8, All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ14: Does the STEM project approach ensure that there is a capacity development dimension in all aspects of its design, implementation and monitoring?</td>
<td>Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q7, All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ15: What intended and unintended changes have been brought about at institutional and individual levels by the STEM project?</td>
<td>All (apart from 7-8) relate to change caused by STEM. Qs3-4 most direct, All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ16: How are results and <strong>good practice</strong> being communicated to stakeholders?</td>
<td>Q9, All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Protocol for College Principal/Senior Management Team FGDs

**Approach**

*One-to-one interview with college principal*

Time – 60 minutes  

*Focus group discussion with senior management team (including finance officer)*

Time – 60 minutes

**Key answers needed:**

1. Attitudes to the proposed changes  
2. Contributions of the STEM project  
3. Level of preparation for the proposed changes  
4. Expectations of enhanced graduate performance and destinations  
5. Inclusion

**Key Probes**

1. College background and fact base – size (Staff/students), resources  
2. College management structure  
3. College finances – changes resulting from the doubling of course duration  
4. Experience of college teacher educators  
5. Changes, if any, in the backgrounds and expectations of entering students (inclusivity) resulting from the introduction of the four-year course  
6. Changes to the destinations of graduating students  
7. Extent of Principal’s personal engagement with the STEM reform; response to the January/February Orientation Training event  
8. Engagement in outreach to college staff of those teacher educators who have been engaged with the STEM project through the TCSF/CCT work  
9. Impact of STEM supported enhancement of ICT in the college (for both administration and teaching)  
10. Implications of changes to:  
   - Curriculum  
   - Assessment  
   - Teaching and learning approaches; focus on inclusivity  
   - Relationships with schools (practicum)  
11. College preparation priorities over the next six months
## Protocol for Teacher Educators

### Approach
- Focus group discussion – maximum 5 tutors, minimum 2 tutors
- Possibly two sessions – one academic tutors, one methodology/pedagogy tutors
- Time – 45 to 60 minutes

### Key answers needed:
1. Attitudes to the proposed changes
2. Contributions of the STEM project
3. Level of preparation for the proposed changes
4. Attitudes around inclusion

### Key Probes
1. Backgrounds and skill-sets of those being interviewed
2. Existing and anticipated responsibilities
3. Extent of engagement with, and knowledge of, overall reform process
4. Extent of engagement with specific inputs of the STEM project
5. Extent of briefing/interactions with colleagues who have already been engaged with aspects of the STEM project work
6. Collective readiness within the college for teaching the four-year programme
7. Personal readiness for teaching the four-year programme
8. Expectations of gains from the reform in relation to the competencies of the graduating new teachers
9. To what extent has the issue of inclusivity been a feature of the reform process?
10. What effect will the reform have on the relationship between the EC and partner schools? Teaching practice?
**Protocol for other stakeholders (MoE, Donors, CSOs, DPs, STEM team)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Starter Probes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent to which new, enabling policies for teacher education are in place. Strength of consistency with the NESP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How have STEM results supported national priorities for teacher education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extent of adjustment of STEM approach in response to implementation challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of adjustment of STEM being responsive to other work in the education sector which may impact on pre-service teacher education. How well does STEM coordinate with other actors and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent have issues related to recruitment and deployment of graduate teachers into basic education schools been addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you feel that issues of inclusivity are being sufficiently addressed by the STEM project, within the wider reform agenda?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How effective have the STEM inputs on ICT been and how impactful and sustainable will they be? For EC teaching? For EC management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discuss the present delivery modalities of the STEM project. Appropriateness? Alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are the costs of the STEM project justified by its results to date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How useful, as a guiding tool, do you find the present Theory of Change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the current approach to M&amp;E provide useful and timely information for programme development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Going forward, what are the anticipated levels of support for Education Colleges in relation to staffing, infrastructure, resourcing? Are the plans adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How effective has capacity development in the STEM project been? What are the obstacles to the long-term sustainability of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact to date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What changes thus far can you identify at both individual and institutional levels resulting from STEM project activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Communication of results and good practice to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online survey Education College Principals (Myanmar)**

ဗိုလ်ချုပ်အားလုံးများအတွက် အခြေခံပြည့်စုံမှုနှင့် ပြည်ထောင်စုများ (STEM) project

စိုးစွဲမှုတစ်ခုခု – Online Survey
ဗိုလ်ချုပ်ဆိုင်၊

ဗိုင်းရပ်စ်ရေးပိုလာရေးကာလအလိုက်သားတို့၏အမျိုးသားအားဖြင့် အခြေခံလေ့လာမှု၏ဆီမာစိတ်ချောင်းကို ဆရာကြီးဦးချုပ်မှာ စီမံချောင်းချက်ထုတ်ချက်များအဖြစ် ပေးခဲ့သည်။

ပညာရေးဆိုင်ရာသားများနှင့် အလိုအပ်ချက်များအဖြစ် ပြည်သူချုပ်သူများအတွက် အခြေခံမှတ်ချက်များအဖြစ် ပေးခဲ့သည်။

(STEM) ပရိုဂရမ်များကို ဆိုင်ရာသားများအဖြစ် အမျိုးသားအားဖြင့် အသုံးပြုမှုသို့ ရေးသို့ ရရှိရေးဦးစီး၏ အလုပ်စုများအဖြစ် ပေးခဲ့သည်။

ပုံသဏ္ဌာန် (UNESCO) အတွက် ကျွန်တော်သား၏ ကျွန်တော်သားများသည် အပျက်သားအားဖြင့် ဆီမာစိတ်ချောင်းကို ဆရာကြီးဦးချုပ်မှာ စီမံချောင်းချက်ထုတ်ချက်များအဖြစ် ပေးခဲ့သည်။
သေဘာတူပရသည် စလားါလံုး၀သေဘာတူပရသည်။

ေစ်းခန္းမ်ား

(၃) သေဘာတူပရ သေဘာတူပရ (X)

(၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၄)

(၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၅)

(၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၃)

(၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၄)

(၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၅)

(၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၆)

(၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၇)

(၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၈)

(၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၉)

(၁၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၀)

(၁၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၁)

(၁၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၂)

(၁၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၃)

(၁၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၄)

(၁၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၅)

(၁၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၆)

(၁၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၇)

(၁၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၈)

(၁၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၉)

(၂၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၀)

(၂၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၁)

(၂၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၂)

(၂၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၃)

(၂၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၄)

(၂၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၅)

(၂၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၆)

(၂၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၇)

(၂၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၈)

(၂၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၂၉)

(၃၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၀)

(၃၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၁)

(၃၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၂)

(၃၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၃)

(၃၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၄)

(၃၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၅)

(၃၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၆)

(၃၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၇)

(၃၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၈)

(၃၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၃၉)

(၄၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၀)

(၄၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၁)

(၄၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၂)

(၄၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၃)

(၄၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၄)

(၄၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၅)

(၄၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၆)

(၄၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၇)

(၄၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၈)

(၄၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၄၉)

(၅၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၀)

(၅၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၁)

(၅၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၂)

(၅၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၃)

(၅၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၄)

(၅၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၅)

(၅၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၆)

(၅၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၇)

(၅၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၈)

(၅၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၅၉)

(၆၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၀)

(၆၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၁)

(၆၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၂)

(၆၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၃)

(၆၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၄)

(၆၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၅)

(၆၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၆)

(၆၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၇)

(၆၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၈)

(၆၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၆၉)

(၇၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၀)

(၇၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၁)

(၇၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၂)

(၇၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၃)

(၇၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၄)

(၇၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၅)

(၇၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၆)

(၇၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၇)

(၇၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၈)

(၇၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၇၉)

(၈၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၀)

(၈၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၁)

(၈၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၂)

(၈၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၃)

(၈၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၄)

(၈၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၅)

(၈၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၆)

(၈၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၇)

(၈၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၈)

(၈၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၈၉)

(၉၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၀)

(၉၁) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၁)

(၉၂) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၂)

(၉၃) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၃)

(၉၄) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၄)

(၉၅) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၅)

(၉၆) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၆)

(၉၇) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၇)

(၉၈) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၈)

(၉၉) သေဘာတူပရ (၉၉)

(၁၀၀) သေဘာတူပရ (၁၀၀)
ဗုဒ္ဓ ၄ (ဆ) အားလုံးလိုလာသော စီမံခန္ဓာင့်များ အားလုံးအတွက် အထောက်အပံ့ အတွက် အခြေအနေကြောင်း၊ (CCT)၏ ဆိုင်ရာ ပြောပြပါ။ အမှန်ချက်အတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။ အသုံးပြုနေသော စီမံခန္ဓာင့်များကို တိုက်ရိုက် အလွန်းသော မှတ်သားပေးပါ။

(1) အခြေအနေ ၁ ခုနှင့် ၂ ခုမှစ၍

(2) အခြေအနေ ၃ ခုတွင်သာ တိုက်ရိုက် မှတ်သားပါ။

(3) အခြေအနေ ၄ ခုမှ ပြန်လည် အလွန်းသော တိုက်ရိုက် မှတ်သားပါ။

(4) အခြေအနေ ၅ ခုမှ ပြန်လည် အလွန်းသော တိုက်ရိုက် မှတ်သားပါ။

(5) အခြေအနေ ၆ ခုတွင် သော်တော်လာသော တိုက်ရိုက် မှတ်သားပါ။
STEM အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းမှာ တွေ့ရှိပြီး အသိအမှတ်ပေးသော အားဖော်ပေးခွင်နှင့် Internet ဖော်ပြပေးမှုလေးပေးသော laptops and tablets တို့ဖြင့် ICT အချိန်တွင်ဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်းကို ရှာဖွေပေးနိုင်သည်။

STEM အားနောက်တစ်ပါးဖြင့် တွေ့ရှိမှု နောက်တစ်ပါးဖြင့် ICT ဆိုင်ရာ အချိန်တွင် စီမံခန်းဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် ပိုမိုသော စီမံခန်းဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးသည်။

ဗ) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

ရ) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

ထ) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

စ) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

အ) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

ည) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။

င) အစ်မှု ၏ ICT အားဖော်ပေးခြင်းကို အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများနှင့် အဆင့်မြင့် ဆောင်ရွက်မှုများကို ဖော်ပြပေးနိုင်သည်။
၃ [ ] စုစုပေါင်း ဗဟိုရေးချင်းစဥ်ပြု

(၁) အခြေခံတွင် ယီ၀န်အာရှ ကျော်ချူး
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မသင္႔ေတာ္ပရါ  (ခ) မည္သကု႔ေသာ္္ခား  ယ  ေ္ပာင္းလြဲမမမ်ကိဳး္ပိဳလုပ္ႏွကုင္ပရသနည္ါ  

...

သင္၏ ယ  ေသခ်ာစ  ာ  စ္္းစားေ္  ၾားမမ  ္တ ၾ္  ယ  ေၾ်းေူး္ဇူးတင္ရွကပရသည္ါ  

အတိုင္းအတူ စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှု အောင့် အောင်မြင့်ရန်အတွက်စီမံခန့်ခွဲမှုနာ
Online survey Teacher Educators (Myanmar)

STEM (STEAM) project

- Myanmar teachers

- Online Survey

- Online survey Teacher Educators

The UNESCO (UNESCO) project teacher educators survey aims to assess the effectiveness of the STEAM project in Myanmar. The survey was conducted using ICT tools to collect data from teacher educators. The survey aims to gather feedback from teacher educators regarding the effectiveness of the STEAM project.

The survey contains questions on the impact of the STEAM project on the teaching methods of teacher educators. The survey also asks for suggestions for improving the STEAM project.

The survey results will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the STEAM project in Myanmar. The survey results will also be used to improve the STEAM project for future implementation.

Thank you for participating in the survey.
ဗိုလ်ချုပ်

ဒီဇိုင်း:

(၁) အတည်အခြေမှာ အမေရိကန် တိုက်ပိုင်း ပညာသင်ပွဲများကို သင်ကြားခြင်း

(၂) အတြင်းရေးကို ပြုလုပ်ခြင်း

(၃) အဆင့်များစွာ သင်ကြား အဖွဲ့များ ကူညီခြင်း

(၄) အားလုံး အစိုးရာ အဖွဲ့များ ကူညီခြင်း

(၅) ပညာရေးနှင့် လုပ်ငန်းများ အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၆) STEM အချက်အလက်များ အလိုအလျောက် လုပ်ဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်း

(၇) အားလုံး အသင်းအဖွဲ့များ (CCT) အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၈) အားလုံး အသင်းအဖွဲ့များ (TSCF) အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၉) ပေးပေါင်းသူများ:

(၁၀) ဆရာများ အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၁၁) ICT အသင်းအဖွဲ့များအဖွဲ့ချိုးများ အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၁၂) စစ်ပြားများ အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၁၃) အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၁၄) အားလုံး အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း

(၁၅) ရေးသားမှုများ အားလုံး အလုပ်ပေးခြင်း
မြန်မာစာတမ်း

ပညာသင်ချိန်စာပေ (၄) သင်သည် ဗဟုသုတော် ပညာတရားအား သင်ကြားရမည်ဆိုသည်များ တင်ရေးရန် စီမံချန်မှုကို အထောက်အကူပေးမည်။ ဒီတစ်နှစ်တွင် ဗဟုသုတော်များကို သင်ကြားရေးမှု အတွက် အစိုးရအဖြစ် အထောက်အကူပေးမည်။

(၁) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၂) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၃) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၄) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

STEM ဆိုင်ရာ အထောက်အကူပေးမှုများကို အထောက်အကူပေးရန် အကောင်အထက် ဆီးမှုတွင် သင်ကြားရေးမှုအတွက် အထောက်အကူပေးမည်။

(၁) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၂) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၃) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု

(၄) အထောက်အကူပေးမှုနှစ်ခု
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>အကြောင်းအရင်းအမြစ်များ အစိတ်အပိုင်းအဖွဲ့စ်အစိတ်အပိုင်း</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>၁ [ ] အကြောင်းအရင်းအမြစ်များ အစိတ်အပိုင်းအဖွဲ့စ်အစိတ်အပိုင်း</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၂ [ ] အကြောင်းအရင်းအမြစ်များ အစိတ်အပိုင်းအဖွဲ့စ်အစိတ်အပိုင်း</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၃ [ ] အကြောင်းအရင်းအမြစ်များ အစိတ်အပိုင်းအဖွဲ့စ်အစိတ်အပိုင်း</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>၄ [ ] အကြောင်းအရင်းအမြစ်များ အစိတ်အပိုင်းအဖွဲ့စ်အစိတ်အပိုင်း</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(၁) ဆောင်ရွက်ရေးစိတ်ချောင်းများ အာရုံစိုက်မှုအာရုံစိုက်မှုများ
(a) ပညာသင်္ချင်းစွဲမှုများနှင့် ICT အသုံးပြုခြင်းများ အားလုံးကို စီမံချေရာ ပညာပေးမှုသို့ မြောက်ခြင်းအဖြစ်ဖြင့် တင်းၾက်ကြည့်ပေးသည်

(b) STEM နှင့်များပြားလာရောက်သည် (ပညာရေးကို ပြုလုပ်ခြင်းနှင့်ပြုလုပ်ခြင်း (Peace Education)ကို ပြုလုပ်နေသည်) အားလုံးကို အထောက်အပံ့ပေးရာ အခြေခံသောအခါသို့ ဆိုဖော်ပြပေးသည်

(1) ဆားများစွာ ရေးယူသည့် ပညာသင်္ချင်းစွဲမှုများ အထိမ်းအမှားပေးခွင့် (စီမံချက် အရ)

  □ သုံးစွဲခြင်း  [ ]
  □ မြန်မာစာမျက်နေ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးစကားလုပ်စီမံချက်  ပြောင်းလဲ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးသိပ်သား အမှတ်တရ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးစကားလုပ်စီမံချက် ပြောင်းလဲ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးသိပ်သား အမှတ်တရ  [ ]
  □ သုံးစွဲသော  [ ]
  □ မြန်မာစာမျက်နေ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးစကားလုပ်စီမံချက်  ပြောင်းလဲ  [ ]
  □ ပညာရေးသိပ်သား အမှတ်တရ  [ ]
  □ သုံးစွဲပါသည်  [ ]

(2) ပညာသင်ကြားရေးအရ အဓိက အခြေခံသော ဆားများစွာ ရေးယူသည်

(3) ဆားများစွာ ရေးယူသည့် ပညာသင်္ချင်းစွဲမှုများ အထိမ်းအမှားပေးခွင့် (စီမံချက် အရ)
(3) STEM စင့်စပါသည် စီမံခန်းစံများအဖြစ် ပြောပြစ်သည်။ အရာရှိများသည် အဆိုကို အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ရရှိသည်။

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) STEM စင့်စပါအတွက် အရာစုစုပေါင်အဖြစ် များသည် အဆိုကို အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ရရှိသည်။

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) STEM စင့်စပါအတွက် အရာစုစုပေါင်အဖြစ် များသည် အဆိုကို အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ရရှိသည်။

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) STEM စင့်စပါအတွက် အရာစုစုပေါင်အဖြစ် များသည် အဆိုကို အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ရရှိသည်။

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
အပေါ်မြောက်၊ (၁) ကျေရုံဖြစ်စေသော အလုပ်အယူအဆိုပေါ် မော်လ်ကျေရုံများသည် ကျေရုံအဆိုပေါ် ဖြစ်စေသောအလုပ်များကို အလုပ်အယူဖြစ်စေသော အလုပ်များကို ဖြစ်စေသောအလုပ်အယူဖြစ်စေသော အလုပ်များကို ဖြစ်စေသောအလုပ်များကို ဖြစေ
(၆) အသက်ရှင် မိသားစုများက ဆေဧကာကြီး အခမ်းအနားကို မိသားစုဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်း


### Annex E  Evaluation Tools’ coverage of Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>College Management</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>MoE</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>Development partners</th>
<th>STEM team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Management FGD</td>
<td>Principals survey</td>
<td>KIBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>To what ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Have the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Has the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>To what ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>To what ext</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Efficiency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Are there exs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>How many exs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>Does the S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>What data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td>Are the curr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FGD**: Focus Group Discussions
- **Survey**: Survey
- **Management FGD**: Management Focus Group Discussions
- **Principals survey**: Principals Survey
- **KIBs**: Key Information and Backgrounds

Q1: 1.1
Q2: 1.2
Q3: 1.3
Q4: 1.4
Q5: 1.5
Q6: 1.6
Q7: 1.7
Q8: 1.8
Q9: 1.9
Q10: 1.10
Q11: 1.11
Q12: 1.12
Q13: 1.13
Q14: 1.14
Q15: 1.15
Q16: 1.16
Annex F  Case studies

Loikaw EC

Figure 4: PPTT class, Loikaw Education College (in Loikaw Computer University)

Local profile

College management reported that Kayah State typically had teacher shortages as before infrastructure improved and increased communication, local people were not interested [or not able?] to become teachers. New teachers might come from Yangon and then leave their post for another one elsewhere within two years. Within Kayah State, Loikaw and Demoso townships are significantly more developed than the other four townships, which include some mountainous, poorly-connected areas. Six different ethnic languages are spoken locally.

College profile

Loikaw EC was established in 2015 and since then has been housed in a wing of Loikaw Computer University. Construction of a dedicated college building, including on-set accommodation was due to commence imminently at the time of visiting. It is intended to open in September 2019, but this assumes successful construction from start to finish over the monsoon season. It currently has approximately 400 diploma course students, which will double to 800 by the fourth year of EC degree implementation. Of 51 college staff, 3 are from Kayah State. State government maintains an active interest and involvement with the college.

Student profile

The first two years’ Diploma course student intake came from across the country, but following an instruction from the Kayah State Chief Minister, intended to address local teacher shortages, the two most recent batches have only accepted applications from within Kayah State. Even like this, teachers only came from the two townships with highest matriculation scores and so now a quota by township is in force. Consequently, Loikaw EC receives student teachers with matriculation marks considerably lower than those that would enter ECs in Yangon, for example.\textsuperscript{56} Loikaw EC currently

\textsuperscript{56}It was anecdotally suggested that in Yangon a matriculation score of 450 would not be sufficient to enter an EC, whereas in Loikaw 320 would suffice; 240 is the pass mark
has two student teachers with disabilities, enrolled on the PPTT course (who were singled out to meet the evaluation team).

**Ethno-linguistic inclusion**

In terms of access, the college does not have data on the languages spoken by its student teachers. Although there was awareness of the new local curriculum, respondents largely did not express concern, believing that its delivery was the responsibility of local teaching assistants.

**Disability inclusion**

In terms of access, the college currently has two students with disabilities. College management commented that this was a requirement placed upon them as of three years ago. Although there was some variation, attitudes in the main mirrored traditional views that teachers must display no physical abnormalities, and felt uneasy about the inclusion of two disabled students at the college. Although some respondents noted they had taken measures to ensure equal students, it was also commented that some teacher educators call the disable students by nicknames that relate to their disabilities. Although from it was evident that there is little to no preparation of student teachers for teaching students with disabilities, the presence of disabled student teachers in the EC was pointed to by multiple respondents as giving confidence that beginning teachers would be equipped to teach disabled students.

**College priorities and challenges**

There is high turnover of teacher educators, who typically come with plans of staying a short time before transferring elsewhere.

Administration and operation of the college is difficult: most office staff are daily wage workers and there is high turnover; the college has no operational staff (like caretakers or cleaners), and so these functions are filled by teacher educators. There are some subjects for which the college does not have a teacher educator. Teacher educators spend a great deal of time on paperwork.

Facilities are a real concern for management, both under the temporary arrangement in the Computer University and for the new site, where there will be 75 students per classroom, there is no science lab and no library.

**EC degree upgrade**

Beyond the two staff in the CCT and the principal, who attended the orientation event, understanding of the new course is very limited. College management expressed real concern, and expect many challenges. One member of senior leadership, who has had experience of the CREATE project, noted: “I don’t think we will have enough time… I’m worried for the future students. If Teacher Educators are not ready, they will still have to teach, even if they don’t fully understand the new curriculum.” Teacher educators not involved in STEM asked what plans were in place for their training.
One respondent praised the practical elements of the new curriculum, but expressed concern that teacher educators across would be able to handle them. CCT members were concerned about the likely effectiveness of cascade training and proposed that CCT members would be more effective in delivering training. CCT members were concerned by the timings, noting that draft materials remained in English and previous Myanmar versions were poor. It was noted that from rumours other Teacher Educators had picked up, they were shocked by what they were hearing about the combination of pedagogy and academic subjects. CCT members felt very strongly that sharing the curriculum as soon as possible was critical to enabling preparation for the new degree.

Teacher educators and management share a concern that the new facilities will not befit the status of a degree-issuing college. Management were not clear on what resourcing plans were in place to ensure they could manage and implement the upgrade.

**Impact of STEM**

*CCT*: Participation in the CCT has had a strong impact on the two CCT members. One of whom is now applying for scholarships in Australia and noted “my teaching has really improved, and I’ve become more interested in curriculum development”. However, the efficiency of the model was questioned, with a preference expressed for STEM to follow the full-time model used by CREATE. One member complained about the demands on her time, “There are no weekends for us this year!”

CCT members questioned the extent to which their feedback at the end of workshops was considered, noting that “feedback doesn’t go anywhere”.

*TCSF*: A number of comments on the process of the TCSF were made by a CCT member who had had some involvement with it: in the pilot survey the Myanmar language could not be understood and the internet safe usage topic was not understood by many. She had heard (and could not believe that) the TCSF was now on its seventh draft.

*ICT*: The 8MB internet connection provided by UNESCO sometimes works, but sometimes does not, and demand sometimes outstrips the availability of computers/internet. Management expressed concern that for initiatives in ICT to be relevant, there has to be ICT infrastructure in schools and that the lack of power in many rural schools or even in Loikaw (which had had 5 hours of blackouts per day) would limit this.

At present online resources included in the new EC curriculum are in English. Concern was raised as to whether teacher educators knew what they were downloading. The curriculum expects use of PowerPoint, but CCT members noted that projectors would typically not be available.
Policy: Of, the PPTT student teachers, none had ambitions to remain a primary school teacher. However, when asked if they would like to become career primary school teachers, almost all commented that an increase in the status of primary teachers would change their thinking.

Mawlamyine EC

Visit to Mawlamyine EC: 5-6 May

Introduction: The review team of two visited the college over parts of two days. We were made very welcome by the Principal and her colleagues. We undertook four sets of interviews, as follows:

- With the Principal
- With members of the college management team
- With the four members of the Core Curriculum Team (CCT)
- With five other non-involved staff members

We assured them of the confidentiality of the exercise. The account that follows attempts to digest views from across the full interview set.

1. The Principal's Perspectives

1.1 The principal is an active member of the CCT. She is thoroughly appraised of the intentions of the STEM project and the new structures of the college programme.

1.2 The college sits on an urban site near the town centre, with no room there for expansion. The Principal indicates that she has submitted a master plan for development, which requires taking over a piece of redundant military land in order to build additional student accommodation. This will not be a pressing need in the first two years, where student numbers will be approximately the same.

1.3 All students come from Mon State; nearly all go on to teach in the State, apart from perhaps 10% who go to UoE’s. There is some attempt to plan supply and demand, but last year around 100 of her graduates were not absorbed into Mon schools.

1.4 She is optimistic about the adaptability of her staff to the new programme, although she knows there is a good deal of preparatory work to be done. She believes that the old distinction between academic and methodology tutors is already fading and will gradually disappear.
1.5 She acknowledges that the present arrangements for school experience are inadequate. She anticipates fostering closer relationships with local, partner schools.

2. CCT members

2.1 The Principal and Vice-Principal are CCT members, along with History and Geography tutors (the latter two are already working together on preparing for Social Studies).

2.2 These four are clearly active, lively contributors. On return from CCT duty, the other college staff are briefed by the CCT members, so there is a good level of general awareness of the new up-coming programme across the college.

2.3 Mon language is not visible in college teaching. Even work on local curriculum is carried out in Myanmar. The local primary schools – in the town – are said to be completely Myanmar medium both in formal and informal (playground) settings.

2.4 The CCTs highlight the issue of translation from English language drafts into Myanmar, which they indicated was a significant issue in their work on curriculum development in their subject areas.

2.5 CCT members indicated some attention to issues of inclusion, specifically with two disabled students participating in the current PPTT programme. They note that the CREATE programme contains a module on social inclusion. Unsurprisingly, there is little dialogue about catering for children in normal classes who have special educational needs. [We saw several PPTT classes briefly. Around 50 students sitting, gender segregated, in rows, totally passive unless chanting responses to questions. Teaching aids restricted to a piece of chalk and chalkboard. Teacher talk dominating.]

3. Managing the change

3.1 As with Yankin EC, the central task of preparation is likely to be that of ensuring that all the members of the teaching staff who will be involved with this course – the major offering of the college – are fully briefed (a) about the new structures; (b) cognisant of changes in their teaching responsibilities; and, (c) alert to the new developments in relationships with schools which will be required by the more rigorous intended approach to the practicum.

3.2 At this point there is no structure or process within the college to address these priority areas. The Principal appears comfortable with the idea of beginning to get working groups operating in the appropriate subject areas, although their work may be severely hampered by the absence of curriculum/syllabus documents except in areas represented by the CCT members. Here, too, there appears to be a sense of ‘waiting for MoE’ to trigger the necessary response and actions.

Recommendation: The college should immediately, not waiting for MoE or UNESCO, set up a working group, composed of a broad range of staff members, including the CCTs who have privileged knowledge deriving from their work over the past two years. The working group should devise a programme combining knowledge sharing about the new course alongside preparation for teaching the first-year course, so that a clear, detailed structure is in place and ready to operate by December.

4. ICT developments

4.1 Some developments are going forward. The college has a fully equipped IT laboratory. IT facilities are being used for all college administration.

4.2 There is a willingness among teaching staff to engage with ICT, and many use material downloaded from their smart-phones. We were told that all the student teachers have functioning smart-phones, mostly used for messaging rather than for locating learning resources.

5. Relationships with schools (practicum)

5.1 It was very clear that staff had not been given access to the new thinking about the organisation of the practicum, therefore they could hardly be expected to have worked through the implications for their communications with their partner schools. This is another necessary part of their briefing.

Yankin EC

Visit to Yankin EC: Thursday 2 May
Introduction: The review team of four visited the college for a major part of the day. We were made very welcome by the Principal and his colleagues. We undertook four sets of interviews, as follows:

- With the Principal
- With members of the college management team
- With three members of the Core Curriculum Team (CCT)
- With three other non-involved staff members

We assured them of the confidentiality of the exercise. The account that follows attempts to digest views from across the full interview set.

1. Overall knowledge base in the college

1.1 Staff were fully aware of the 2 – 4-year course duration change, with the anticipation of becoming a degree-awarding college. They expected a start from the Year 1 semester beginning in December 2019.

1.2 Some had gained greater awareness through their involvement in pilot testing of the Year 1, Semester 1 materials.

1.3 Significant infrastructure developments are occurring, as a response to the potential doubling in the number of enrolled students.

2. Managing the change

2.1 The central task of preparation is likely to be that of ensuring that all the members of the teaching staff who will be involved with this course – the major offering of the college – are fully briefed (a) about the change; (b) cognisant of changes in their teaching responsibilities; and, (c) alert to the new developments in relationships with schools which will be required by the more rigorous intended approach to the practicum.

2.2 At this point there is no structure within the college to address these priority areas. There appears to be a sense of ‘waiting for MoE’ to trigger the necessary response. We understand that MoE intends to invest in briefing and orientating the colleges in the near future, but this will inevitably fall well short of detailed preparations.

Recommendation 1: The college should immediately, not wait for MoE or UNESCO, set up a working group, composed of a broad range of staff members, including the CCTs who have privileged knowledge deriving from their work over the past two years. The working group should devise a programme combining knowledge sharing about the new course alongside preparation for teaching the first-year course, so that a clear, detailed structure is in place and ready to operate by December.

3. Core Curriculum Team

3.1 Four members of the college staff have been engaged as CCT members working with the MoE/UNESCO STEM programme. They represent the college curriculum areas of: Educational Studies; Mathematics; Chemistry and Art. Three are female; one male.

3.2 They have clearly gained significant knowledge from their work about the meaning and potential significance of the TCSF, the new curriculum and the change processes. What seems surprising to the team is their caution about sharing their experience more widely within the college, almost feeling that they were ‘not allowed to share their new skills and understandings’. They identify younger staff members as being more open to consideration of the new approaches – unsurprising but disappointing. They are familiar with the revised intentions relating to the practicum and the challenges that will raise.

3.3 The CCTs highlight the issue of translation from English language drafts into Myanmar, which they indicated was a significant issue in the pilot.

4. Concerns of college staff
4.1 From what has already been said, it is no surprise that the teaching staff feel poorly briefed regarding the new world. Apart from a small-scale pilot, they have had almost no access to new curricula and course materials (teacher manuals and student textbooks). There was significant criticism of the pilot as being fragmentary, not enabling them to see the bigger picture, even though Yankin was one of only two colleges engaged with it.

4.2 There is a fundamental structural problem in the staffing composition of the college, viz. half of the teacher educators identify themselves as ‘academics’, while the other half are committed to delivering ‘methodology’. There is clearly a status divide. The new curriculum is intended to erode/demolish this divide, with the integration of subject knowledge with preparation for teaching, responding to the notion of PCK (Pedagogic content knowledge). And, the ‘academic’ staff have degrees, but typically very limited, historic experience of, for example, successful primary school teaching. They are concerned about this.

4.3 We heard that 19 new members of staff were starting in the college in the coming week. We were disappointed to hear that they were all coming from degree backgrounds and the teaching of high school subjects. As of now, they will have only a very limited contribution to make to the increased emphasis on best primary school practice.

Recommendation 2: What, then, is to be done to close the long-standing gap between the different arms of the teaching staff? Any solution should be a central part of the working groups remit under Recommendation 1. We understand that the two groups share offices but do not plan their teaching jointly. Surely they will need to plan together, probably team teach together, so as to present to their students a joined-up version of teacher preparation. [As we put to one ‘academic’ colleague, it is perfectly possible to present an intellectually rigorous approach to a Grade 3 History topic, alongside working out how it should be best presented to a class.]

5. Perspectives on inclusion

5.1 It was not easy to take forward a substantial conversation regarding notions of inclusion within the STEM project, due to the low level of current engagement for most of the staff members. Some concern was expressed about the meaning of the subject area ‘Local Curriculum’, and how students were to be prepared for it. There is clear resistance to the idea that potential students with various disabilities should be allowed to train as primary teachers, perhaps reflecting a wider societal caution.

6. ICT developments

6.1 Some developments are going forward. The college has a fully equipped IT laboratory.

6.2 There is a willingness among teaching staff to engage with ICT, and many use materials downloaded from their smart-phones. We were told that all the student teachers have functioning smart-phones, mostly used for messaging rather than for locating learning resources. Both staff and students have to finance resource acquisition themselves, a significantly restrictive condition.

7. Relationships with schools (practicum)

7.1 It was very clear that staff had not been given access to the new thinking about the organisation of the practicum, therefore they could hardly be expected to have worked through the implications for their communications with their partner schools. This is another necessary part of their briefing.
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Online survey Education College Principals

Focus: Education College Principals

Approach: Online Survey

To the College Principal

We are very grateful to you for the time to be spent completing this survey – we anticipate it will consume not more than 40 minutes of your time.

Please be assured that, although we ask for the name and details of your college, in our analysis and reporting, no individual’s response will be identifiable with her/his institution.

Since 2014 UNESCO has been implementing the STEM project (Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar), which is supporting the Ministry of Education to reform pre-service teacher education through development of teacher policies, competency-based teacher education curriculum, Education College management including ICT, and inclusive education.

We understand that you have already been engaged in STEM project activities, as part of the Pilot Orientation Workshop, held to prepare teacher educators to pilot the Year 1 curriculum; the Pilot Orientation Workshops were held 24 to 26 January in Mandalay Education College and 31 January to 2 February in Yankin Education College. We also note that some of the Teacher Educators in your Education College are participating in STEM through the Curriculum Core Team (CCT). The major purpose of this questionnaire is to use your EC’s and your personal experience and feedback/comments to evaluate the impact of the STEM project thus far and to improve the project’s support to pre-service teacher education reform in the future.

Completing the questionnaire

In some of the questions which follow, you are asked to (a) Put an X in the box which gives the response nearest to your view, and (b) Write a sentence, or two, explaining your view, in the space provided.

E.g., Do you agree that every child should experience at least one inspiring teacher?

- Strongly agree [X] 3[ ] 2[ ] 1[ ] Strongly disagree

Question 1: Please update your college key data

- Response rate: 14/25 = 56%
- Respondents’ gender: Female –12  Male - 2
- How many years have you been an Education College Principal?
- Range 0.4 years to 5.0 years [Mean 1.6 years]
- Ages: Mean 55 years

Question 2: Following the January/February 2019 Pilot Orientation Workshop, how well informed do you personally feel about the contribution of the STEM project to the pre-service teacher education reform?
What do you understand as the key components of the STEM project?

- Curriculum reform for four-year degree colleges (10 responses)
- Training for TEs for the reform (4)
- TCSF: Content to competency (3)
- Enhanced ICT (2)
- Links to primary new curriculum (1)

Question 3: Since the Pilot Orientation Workshop, how much have you communicated to Teacher Educators in your Education College about the reform?

1 - A lot (29%)  2 – a little (71%)  3 – not at all (0%)

If 1 or 2, please explain how you have communicated this.

- Some very comprehensive briefings of all staff
- Most CCTs have been engaged in the communication process
- Heads of Department briefed (Only specifically mentioned by one Principal)
- One mention of introduction of local curriculum

Question 4: Some of your colleagues are members of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT), which is supported by the STEM project. To what extent have CCT members shared information about the new curriculum within your Education College?

1 – Very Actively (43%)  2 – A little (43%)  3 – Not at all (14%)

If 1 or 2, please explain what type of information CCT members have shared about the new curriculum, or the pre-service teacher education reform overall.

- Some discussions with CCTs in their particular subject areas
- Understanding from the CCT experience that: “The new curriculum has been prepared based on the TCSF, the subject structure of the new curriculum, ICT as a subject, the need for TEs to be competent in ICT”

Question 5: Do you or your EC staff have a better understanding of inclusive education as a result of your participation in STEM project activities?

1 - Much better [21%]  2 - a little better [71%]  3 – not better [8%]

If so, please describe how improved inclusive education is being used at your EC (for example, in college management and policies, classroom management, learning activities, etc.)

- Now accept students with disabilities
• Some insecurity in knowing how to integrate them into classes
• “Now disabled students and ethnic people from the remote areas are selected as student teachers; there is helping one another in collaboration and teaching.”

Question 6: The STEM project is supporting the MOE’s pre-service teacher education reform with activities to strengthen inclusive education in teacher education. How easy do you think it will be to strengthen inclusive education in ECs?

• Very easy 4[0%] 3[21%] 2[79%] 1[0%] Very difficult

What challenges do you anticipate they will face?

• Frequent mention of practical difficulties within their colleges
• “Difficulty of working with TEs who don’t have much awareness of inclusive education.”
• Provision of technology and facilities

Question 7: STEM has been supporting improvements to ICT facilities in ECs, including the provision of broadband Internet access, ICT equipment (such as laptops and tablets) and ICT training manuals. What impact do you expect the increased emphasis on ICT, being supported through the STEM project, to have on teaching and learning in your Education College?

• Very Great Impact 3[79%] A little impact 2[21%] 1[0%] No impact

What specific aspects of the ICT strengthening do you see as most important?

• Many references to need for reliable technology, including good internet access, regular electricity supply, software and hardware
• “The technical capacity of the ICT tutors, and ability to integrate the use of IT into lessons.”

Question 8: How is strengthened ICT provision impacting on Education College administration and management?

• Very Great Impact 3[79%] A little impact 2[14%] 1[7%] No impact

Question 9: To what extent have you made changes to your practices as the Education College Principal since your engagement with STEM project activities?

1 – A lot [29%] 2 – a little[64%] 3 – no changes[7%]
Please explain

- Created and submitted master plans for needs in infrastructure and resources for the new course
- Several references to the heightened engagement with ICT
- “To be helpful in implementation of the 4 year degree college curriculum, to provide assistance for improvement the attitudes and competencies; conducting the presentations and discussions; training and practicing to improve critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving skills, communication skills, leadership skills”.

Question 10: Since the Pilot Orientation Workshop, in late January/early February, how frequent has further communication been from the MoE regarding the forthcoming upgraded teacher education degree programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequent</td>
<td>4 [29%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>3 [29%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>2 [42%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No communication</td>
<td>1 [0%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What kind of additional support would you welcome?

- Strengthened and reliable access to the internet (several responses)
- Need for HRD programme for TEs to prepare them for teaching the new degree course
- “Complete sets of TGs and other resources ON TIME”
- “Need more effective teaching techniques and methods for the new curriculum.”

Question 11: STEM will support the MoE in promoting clustering of local schools linked to the Education Colleges. How do you feel this may change interactions between the Education College and the schools used for students’ school experience (practicum)?

- Generally, responses very positive regarding strengthened collaboration and communication with practice/partner schools
- But: “I think the willingness and welcoming response from the practice schools will be weak”
- “More friendship among partner schools, cooperation and networking in teaching technology, and use of educational facilities and resources”
- “Strengthening the cooperation between the EC TEs and local teachers”

Question 12: Are the current delivery activities of the STEM project the most appropriate for the achievement of the project’s results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Appropriate</td>
<td>3 [0%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly appropriate</td>
<td>2 [21%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not appropriate</td>
<td>1 [79%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What alternative approaches could be applied?
• Recognise that there will be necessary changes to teaching and learning – it should be a continual process, with TEs properly supported

• Confident that, after the four-year course, “very excellent teachers for primary and lower secondary schools will be produced”

• “Providing the assistance for EC teachers to do the research; training for teaching and learning capacity; upgrade and giving more study tours program for the improvement of teaching learning capacity”.
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Completing the questionnaire

Since 2014 UNESCO has been implementing the STEM project (Strengthening Pre-Service Teacher Education in Myanmar), which is supporting the Ministry of Education to reform pre-service teacher education through development of teacher policies, competency-based teacher education curriculum, Education College management including ICT, and inclusive education.

We understand that you have already been engaged through the STEM project as a member of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT). The major purpose of this questionnaire is to use your experience and feedback/comments to improve the STEM project.

In several of the questions which follow, you are asked to (a) Put an X in the box which gives the response nearest to your view, and (b) Write a few sentences to explaining your view in the space provided. The scales used (1-3, 1-4, 1-5) vary between questions.

e.g. Do you agree that every child should experience at least one inspiring teacher?

| Strongly agree | 1[ X ] | 2[ ] | 3[ ] | 4[ ] | Strongly disagree |

Background:

1. Which Education College do you work at?  [22 college responses]
2. Your experience.
   a. How many years teaching in basic education schools do you have? [Mean = 7.4 years, but 24 have less than 1 year]
   b. How many years working as a teacher educator at an Education College/University of Education? [Mean = 13.8 years]
4. Age  [Mean = 47 years]
6. Please list the STEM-related activities you have participated in:
   a. CCT workshops [48 responses]
   b. TCSF workshops [36]
   c. Annual ICT training [2]
   d. ICT Competency Standards Development [4]
   e. Workshop on education for peace [5]
   f. Workshop on education for sustainable development [21]
   g. Pilot testing of Year 1 curriculum [21]
h. Gender review of curriculum [10]
i. Development of gender mainstreaming manual [1]

Survey questions

**Question 1:** In December 2019, the new 4-year teacher education degree programme will commence. As a Teacher Educator, do you feel confident that you will be able to effectively deliver the new curriculum by 2019?

A: 1 Very confident [32%] – 2 Quite confident [15%] – 3 not very confident [18%] - 4 Not confident at all [0%]

B: Please explain why

- Having engaged as CCTs, good level of confidence in their own understandings of the reform
- Some have developed links with other TEs in their ECs, but not often mentioned
- Strong links with the new basic curriculum welcomed
- Some caution about the likely results of the reform – will know better after one year of teaching

“*I have experiences in attending TE/CB training and sharing the information of the attending workshops continuously*”

“*Should change from English to Myanmar version for full confidence*”

“*Because I have confidence that I've participated in developing new curriculum subject, and TEs are also familiar with the learning activities*”

**Question 2:** How do you think your participation in STEM activities has affected your capacity to deliver the new curriculum in December 2019?

A: 1 Affected very positively [72%] - 2 Affected a little positively [28%] – 3 Not affected [0] – 4 Affected a little negatively [0] – 5 Affected very negatively [0]

B: Please explain how

- Comprehensive engagement as a CCT has led to confidence
- Several positive references to the competency standards as populating the curriculum
- Recognise they have accessed more effective teaching and learning activities

“*Due to the knowledge gained from the STEM project, I gain benefits like improving teaching skills, intercommunication with other colleges, and preparing to deliver the new curriculum*"

“*1. Self-improvement 2. Sharing information with colleagues, students and also the public.*”

“*It is getting more interesting and more fun.*”
Question 3: Has your participation in STEM activities affected your capacity to carry out your responsibilities in your Education College in any other ways?

A: 1 Affected very positively [45%] - 2 Affected a little positively [53%] – 3 Not affected [0] – 4 Affected a little negatively [2%] – 5 Affected very negatively [0]

B: Please explain how

- Some suggestions about sharing and collaboration, but weak responses in this area
- Strengthen ICT
- Mention of Action Research (1)

“I can do learning for self-development, and consider the activities for student competency.”

“Learn and analyse strengths and weaknesses of current curriculum framework, sharing new teaching methods through the STEM project”

“Improvement in teaching methods, collaboration and teamwork through knowledge gained in workshops”

Question 4: Because of STEM, has anything changed about your responsibilities at your Education College or how you do your responsibilities at the Education College?

A: 1 Affected very positively [45%] - 2 Affected a little positively [53%] – 3 Not affected [0] – 4 Affected a little negatively [0] – 5 Affected very negatively [0]

B: Please explain what and how.

- Still mostly about self-improvement, with a lighter focus on sharing new skills
- No sign of a structured use of new skills in college, even with ten Principals among the responses
- A Principal wrote: It will change the structure of duties and responsibilities in the college

“I am overloaded with extra responsibilities from these workshops but I have chances to learn new things”

“1. Learning the competency standards of teachers; 2. Combination of academics and methodology; so there are constructive feedback and suggestions among colleagues, and showing knowledge about gender and making arrangements focused on administration and teaching.”

Question 5: STEM has been supporting improvements to ICT facilities in ECs, including the provision of broadband Internet access, ICT equipment (such as laptops and tablets) and ICT training manuals.

A: Do you feel capable of using these facilities?

B: Do you think ECs require more support to improve use of ICT?
1 – A lot more [90] 2 – a little more [8] 3 – no [2]

C: How may ICT facilities be further improved in ECs?

- Clearly very positive about present use of new facilities and the great potential in teaching and learning.
- Of course, would like an upgrade so that there was a laptop and PP projector in every classroom
- No mention of frivolous use!
  “Can increase student interest and manage the time well if teachers teach with ICTs”
  “It will be more effective in teaching and learning, and administration, if we have enough resources in IT”

Question 6: STEM conducts activities focused on inclusive education (including gender and education for peace).

A. From your participation in STEM project activities, what do you think is the most important feature of inclusive education? (short answer here) [Peace: 19; Gender: 10; Disability: 1]

Please explain why you feel this feature is most important:

- “The most important is to include and implement the context of education for all”
- “Gender rights is the most important pillar in Education for All.”

B. In your opinion, how important are these areas in teacher education?
1 – Very important 2 – Quite important 3 – Unimportant 4 - Very Unimportant

Results are ranked from 1 - 8
- [3] Gender
- [4] Education for peace
- [1] Education for sustainable development
- [8] Disability inclusion
- [6] Ethnic inclusion
- [5] Rights of the teacher
- [2] Human rights

C. Has your participation in STEM activities affected your attitudes and values about these topics?

D. Please explain how
STEM has been very influential in attitude formation.

“Educational development can only happen in a peaceful environment.”

“Peace for education, is equal rights for all, no discrimination, respect for collaboration and negotiation.”

“Having consideration for different perspectives to avoid gender discrimination, and free from religious obsession and racism.”

Question 7: Do you feel more able to provide inclusive teacher education as a result of STEM's activities?

A: Do you have a better understanding of inclusive education as a result of your participation in STEM project activities?

1 - Much better [42%] 2 - A little better [57%] 3 - no change [2%] 4 - a little worse [0] 5 - a lot worse [0]

B: Have you used this better understanding of inclusive education while teaching at your Education College?

1 - A lot [43%] 2 - A little [57%] 3 - Not at all [0]

C: If so, please describe how you used inclusive education in your teaching (for example, in classroom management, learning activities, etc.).

- Most of the responses are about aspirations going forward, rather than experience.
- The CCTs have picked up the language register to which they have been exposed in STEM, and the key issues promoted by STEM

“I can teach my subject integrating about discussions on gender, giving equal chances to the disabled, different races, and sustainable peace education.”

Question 8: The STEM activities that you participated in are suitably designed for achieving their objectives. Do you agree?

A: 1 – Strongly agree [25%] 2 – Agree [75%] 3 – Neutral [0] 4 – Disagree [0] 5 – Strongly disagree [0]

B: How could they be improved?

- More shared learning with international experts
- Myanmar language used for teaching

“CCT members need capacity building.” Editor: More?

“Receive feedback and comments from in-service teachers during school curriculum roll-out.”

Question 9
STEM project activities have mainly included teacher educators as part of the Curriculum Core Team (CCT), and other teacher educators have not been directly involved so far. What kind of impact, if any, do you think your participation in STEM activities have had for the other Teacher Educators you work with?

1 – Major benefit [20] 2 – Some benefit [38] 3 – no impact [0] 4 – Negative impact [0] 5 Very negative impact [0]

B: Please explain

“It is useful not only for me but also for my colleagues because I share and ask feedback from them beginning from TCSF till current Textbook Teacher book”

“After attending each workshop, need to make sharing sessions with colleagues and received feedback. There were discussions and questions raised by teachers. There is an interest in new curriculum in which there is not differentiation between academic and methodology. As a CCT member, I share all knowledge without missing any facts.”

**Question 10**

How do you feel that the teacher education reform will change relationships between the Education College and the basic education schools used for practicum?

- Many responses suggest improved collaboration with local schools, even mentioning teamwork
- Results should show a much better deal for the student teachers in their practicum
- College and primary school will have more communication and better support necessary for more effective practice teaching/practicum

“Hope for positive change; can learn the weaknesses and strengths of students from practice teaching and have the chance to revise, and can produce well-qualified teachers; there is a need of mutual understanding needs between basic education school teachers and degree college teachers.”

“Very beneficial as it promotes relationship and teamwork; Need to support by the authorised and responsible people for the smooth teaching.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>Outcome/Output</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Source/evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>ECs are not well prepared for the 12/19 start date:</td>
<td>EC visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>ECs have almost no access to the new curriculum, nor to teaching and learning resources</td>
<td>Many interview respondents in ECs “Need more effective teaching techniques and methods for the new curriculum” [EC Principal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>There is limited awareness in ECs, among their TEs, of the likely required extent of pedagogic change</td>
<td>EC visits, non CCT members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Organisational structure of the ECs has not been confirmed</td>
<td>EC visits, principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Some ECs have major infrastructural needs</td>
<td>“Not fit to call this a degree college. It will be a struggle… I’m not sure if the upgrade will be included in 2019 budget” (EC Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Principals have received orientation, but this has not been systematically followed up</td>
<td>EC principals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Communications presently deficient</td>
<td>CCT members, TEs “Sometimes I’m a little bit confused [about the upgrade in December]. Is it really possible? Looking at my school, the infrastructure isn’t complete, we don’t have a separate library, we don’t have enough human resources – most teacher educators don’t want to come here.” (Non-CCT teacher educator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Most outputs remain at early stage</td>
<td>Results Matrix; Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>There are implicit assumptions which if they don’t hold or if unaddressed may prevent achievement of outcomes</td>
<td>Results Matrix; Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Teacher task force has been approved</td>
<td>Results Matrix; MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>A number of steps remain prior to achievement of Output 1.1 (several activities with TTF before recommendations on TEC, then debate/approval of TEC, then formation of TEC, then support to TEC - all before TEC can be able to influence development &amp; implementation of policy</td>
<td>Results Matrix &amp; work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Some substantial aspects of policy development are due to have been completed by the time the TEC is likely to be functioning effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/Output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The pace of progress in this output affects other outputs, including 1.3.2 (TTF leads in development of teacher policies) and 4.1 (mainstreaming inclusive education into policy)</td>
<td>Results Matrix; work plan; Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The Teacher Task Force was given ministerial approval in May 2019</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>TCSF has been drafted, with validation of the draft about to commence</td>
<td>Development partner: “TCSF process has been quite slow. They are striving for an ideal; too much detail. It seems the TCSF is led by higher education department, but users are under DBE. How aware is whole DBE?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The TCSF has gone through a number of iterations to reach its current stage; a number of respondents felt it has been an arduous and in the view of some unnecessarily long process</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The TCSF contains more levels/detail than some respondents feel is necessary; by contrast the work supported on the Headteacher CSF has proceeded more quickly</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Teacher policy options were developed in July 2018 and the draft paper translated into Myanmar in Q1 2019</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>EC curriculum framework approved as of May 2019, materials have been developed for Y1 of the new curriculum with the participation of CCT members</td>
<td>DHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>CCT members have experienced strong gains in capacity development</td>
<td>CCT member survey: 45% reported very positive and 53% a little positive change in their ability to carry out their responsibilities in their EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Results experienced in capacity development of CCT members don't relate strongly to the sustainability of the outcome as described in the current results matrix, which makes no mention of curriculum development capacity or other elements of CCT capacity</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Not certain how substantive CCT members’ involvement in decision making has been</td>
<td>EC visits; 1 active CCT member (who features in a STEM annual report case study) observed that CCT members’ involvement in decision making was more to validate decisions made by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Only CCT members have been supported in delivery of new curriculum and required pedagogies (apart from ICT)- this has not extended to the wider population of Teacher Educators</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>95% of CCT members reported feeling capable of using the new improved ICT facilities in their Ecs</td>
<td>CCT survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Challenges exist to sustainable use of ICT including limited times and locations at/in which internet available, costs to teacher educators for using personal data</td>
<td>“There is WiFi in the computer lab but student teachers often end up having to use their own data”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Work on development of framework for CPD has not commenced</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Training modules of teacher educators have not been developed</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Upgraded structure for management and administration of Ecs are not place, as this is still pending with the Union Civil Service Board. Beyond initial technical support, it is unclear if STEM has done enough to help the MoE progress this</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ICT facilities have been upgraded and are having an impact:</td>
<td>79% EC principals reported a large impact on management and administration, 14% a small impact, and just 1 of 14 respondents said no impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>No progress has been made towards capacity development of EC management staff - CPD framework has not been drafted, and no training modules in management skills developed</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>See EQ 3</td>
<td>TCSF - Mention of 'special education' only in 'Knowledge and skills sections'. No explicit mention of disability and not present in practical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disability inclusion not present in TCSF or policy documents</td>
<td>Online survey - Disability listed as 'least important' by ??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher Educators see some inclusion needs as a low priority</td>
<td>EC visits - &quot;teacher with disabilities can disturb better education&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC visits - Student teachers with disabilities pushed into administration roles. Not expected to become teachers because of impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online survey - Teacher educators list Disability inclusion as least important aspect of inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discriminatory attitudes towards student teachers or those with disabilities</td>
<td>Curriculum - 2 lessons on Special Education only. No dedicated chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum - Disability inclusion only briefly mention in assessment section (Education studies, pg 207 sem 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KIIs - concerns that unfinalized TCSF has impact on curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disability inclusion less present than other inclusion themes in curriculum</td>
<td>Online survey - 57% of Teacher Educators felt their understanding of Inclusive Education was a 'little better' or 'much better'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher educators, principals and staff can articulate Inclusive Education (IE) concepts and understand relevance to STEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/Output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Differing definitions and priorities of IE between STEM stakeholders</td>
<td>EC visits - CCT members, principals, TEs demonstrated understanding. Online survey - Peace Education was biggest inclusion priority (38%) among TEs but no consistent definition between them (e.g. ethnic harmony, national progress, human rights). Online survey, EC visits - Principals &amp; TEs has very different IE priorities (Principals 42% said 'Disability' was biggest priority as opposed to 'Peace Education' for TEs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inclusion present, in some form or another, in all levels of STEM (policy, curriculum, CCT, trainings)</td>
<td>TCSF - References to most inclusion needs (C1.1.1 respect languages &amp; culture, Curriculum - addresses all inclusion themes, albeit briefly (Education Studies, Local Curriculum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gender mainstreaming trainings have had positive impact on curriculum development</td>
<td>Curriculum, CCT focus groups - Sensitive to gender bias in imagery selection. Tangible and applicable. EC Visits - CCT members spoke highly of gender trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gender mainstreaming trainings have limited reach</td>
<td>KIs - limited number of training participants (CCT). Plans to extend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inclusions trainings are not always integrated/coordinated with curriculum</td>
<td>KIs - Gender training manual created separately from curriculum development team. KIs - Key Stakeholder: Approach to Gender &quot;not thoughtful, comes across as having been stuck it at the end&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/1.1</td>
<td>There is a log-jam of policy approvals. There have been notable achievements but there are significant risks. Whose responsibilities?</td>
<td>KIs all recognise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Unable to identify what strategies STEM has put in place to navigate slow approval processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>CCTs are the response to the Myanmar capacity deficit in curriculum development for teacher education (Material on CCTs too scattered and probably verging on the unrealistic when all added up)</td>
<td>CCTs, Montrose, CREATE, ADB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Accelerated timeline to 12/19 poses serious challenges to DHE/STEM due to low level of awareness of detail in the ECs</td>
<td>EC case studies; EC Principal interviews. EC management: &quot;It's challenging because of the changing timeframe. We haven't seen the new textbooks – we're not sure what they'll be like.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>STEM is governed by a Steering Committee, which was introduced at the outset of Phase 2 and includes representatives from across the MoE and the projects' donors.</td>
<td>Desk review, Donor KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>The Steering Committee strengthens accountability for the project's performance, and STEM's donors play a proactive role in steering the project.</td>
<td>UNESCO, donors, ET observation of SC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Between them the project's donors are supporting several other activities in the education sector in Myanmar, including some of the most closely linked to STEM (eg My-EQIP, EFECT/TREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>The project's donors occupy key positions on sector and sub-sector working groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>STEM and DFAT's My-EQIP project have collaborated directly on the TCSF validation study, which is using resources sourced by My-EQIP, and on communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>The responsible DDG in DHE is highly engaged in the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>The most directly related activities in the sector include work on pre-service teacher education through the new DFID-funded TREE project, work on basic education curriculum development (supported by JICA's CREATE project for primary education and the ADB's EYE project for secondary), work on in-service teacher training and continuous professional development (supported by UNICEF), and work on quality assurance, monitoring &amp; evaluation and use of technology (supported by DFAT's My-EQIP project).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Much of the key other work relevant to teacher education in the sector falls under other departments, particularly the DBE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>These departments are represented on the Steering Committee, but the extent to which they play an active strategic or operational role is unclear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some of the reform areas depend on the approval of government actors inside the education sector (eg the Board of Studies) and outside of the MoE (for example, the Union Civil Service Board). These actors are not directly involved in the governance of STEM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The modality STEM has used to develop the EC curriculum has been through a contracted supplier to provide international and national curriculum authors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Implementation through this modality caused some confusion for the primary curriculum authors as to who they should communicate with and how.</td>
<td>CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The contracted curriculum development supplier was not authorised or empowered to communicate directly with other actors.</td>
<td>Montrose, CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Direction from STEM to the contracted curriculum development supplier regarding the use of teacher education materials produced by other actors (UNFPA, CREATE) was unclear and inconsistent</td>
<td>Montrose, curriculum development consultant, CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The primary curriculum authors were not effectively consulted in development of the EC syllabi</td>
<td>CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The primary curriculum is better integrated in the EC curriculum for some subjects (eg Maths) than others (eg Myanmar language)</td>
<td>CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2</td>
<td>As of 2019-2020 teachers in five ethnic minority States will be required to support local teacher assistants to deliver a new local curriculum</td>
<td>Desk review, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2</td>
<td>Teacher educators -including CCT members - are aware of the new local curriculum but do not see a need for ECs to begin preparing student teachers for its delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>One CSO reported that its advice on disability inclusion had not been actioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Development of the new EC degree syllabus and draft curriculum and of the draft TCSF are two of STEM's major outputs and align clearly with Chapter 9 of the NESP, on teacher education and management</td>
<td>NESP Ch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Teachers and teacher educators are supportive of the idea of upgrades to pre-service teacher education, including the degree course and career specialisation tracks</td>
<td>EC visits - positive attitudes of many TEs; Myanmar Teacher's Federation “I'm excited [about the change]. Those graduates won't need to attend correspondence course. It will produce better teachers” (Non-CCT teacher educator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2, 3.1</td>
<td>Teacher Educators and college management strongly support strengthening the use of ICT</td>
<td>Comments from EC principals &amp; management; 98% of CCT members felt further support required to improve use of ICT (90% responded 'a lot more')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2, 3.1</td>
<td>Strengthened use of ICT is emphasised in the NESP, but not specifically in relation to teacher education or EC management</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2, 3.2</td>
<td>The development of a CPD framework and capacity development of teacher educators as well as the establishment of a Teacher Education Council and comprehensive teacher policy are also key tenets of Chapter 9 of the NESP, but STEM has achieved limited progress in these areas</td>
<td>NESP ch9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>National priorities in terms of inclusive education in teacher education are not well-defined; a baseline assessment of inequity in teacher education has not yet taken place (now due for Q3 2019)</td>
<td>Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disability inclusion is provided for in national education legislation (MEL and amendment), including explicitly the recruitment of student teachers with disabilities</td>
<td>Myanmar Education Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STEM has made highly limited efforts towards addressing ethno-linguistic and disability inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>In Loikaw EC, for principal, managements and Teacher Educators, the college's facilities were a top priority - fears of not having adequate number of classrooms, proper library, etc</td>
<td>EC visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>DHE (May San Yee) is concerned at the qualifications of Teacher Educators to teach the degree course - emphasis on their having/not having Master's degree</td>
<td>DHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>For DHE (May San Yee) completion of the teacher specialisation policy in time (by Dec 2021) is a real concern, esp given national elections before then</td>
<td>DHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STEM has not yet incorporated any substantive aspect of addressing ethno-linguistic issues in teacher education</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STEM has provided opportunities for some CSOs to participate in STEM activities. The opportunity for CSOs to participate in a government-led process represents an achievement, given historic record</td>
<td>STEM team, SC feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>At least one CSO that participates in STEM activities feels that their participation is superficial, restricted to box-ticking validation on decisions that have already been made</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principals and Management aware of student teachers with disabilities but unable/unaware how to offer support</td>
<td>EC visits - Student teachers with disabilities present in all ECs visited (positive admission policy) &lt;br&gt;EC visits, KIIS - discriminatory language &amp; behavior used by TEs (referring to STs by their disability, singling them out in class, side-lining into administrative roles only) &lt;br&gt;Online survey - 79% of principals say it would be 'difficult' to strengthen IE in their school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low confidence of student teachers in dealing with ethno-linguistic inclusion</td>
<td>EC visits - Student teachers could not explain strategies for including children with additional languages in the classroom. &lt;br&gt;Curriculum - (Semester 2, Local Curriculum pg 32) MTB learning and multilingualism present (value &amp; background) but no practical strategies for linguistic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low value placed on ethno-linguistic inclusion by EC staff</td>
<td>EC visits, KIIs - Assumption among TEs that 'local language teacher' would deal with language inclusion, not them &lt;br&gt;EC visits - Management/Principals unaware of what languages student teachers/TEs spoke and how this affects deployment &lt;br&gt;Online survey -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/Output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curriculum uses inclusion terminology, concepts and theory not widely understood or which don't exist in Myanmar language</td>
<td>No respondent cited Linguistic inclusion/ethnic inclusion as the most important feature of IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TEs do not have the resources to identify student inclusion needs in the classroom</td>
<td>Curriculum - Common impairments such as ‘dyslexia’ &amp; ‘attention deficit disorder’ listed in Education Studies (9.3.2 Special Education) but with no explanation of these. Not widely known in Myanmar Kils - key stakeholders involved in the curriculum process expressed multiple concerns that materials/skill level not suitable for Myanmar teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>After two years of Phase 2 implementation, STEM had spent USD 2,429,615, leaving USD 3,992,249 for the remaining year and a half</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>UNESCO's financial reporting is organised by categories which do not allow detailed VFM analysis: either (as for Finland) budgetary data is organised by component category (outcome 1-4, programme management, M&amp;E, etc) or (as for Australia and UK) by more detailed cost categories (breaking down types of personnel and expenses) without allocation to specific components</td>
<td>Annual Reports, budget data, STEM team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Preparation of combined overall project financial reports (which follow the format used by Finland) require painstaking manual analysis of expenditure data</td>
<td>STEM team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Value for Money indicators for the project have not been explicitly defined or agreed by STEM or the donors</td>
<td>STEM, donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>STEM's team assess the project’s VIM positively (&quot;STEM's approach is oriented to provide good VFM&quot;). This is described in terms of capacity building and sustainable results; the volume of outputs (eg workshops) and degree of MoE prioritisation; and low levels of participant attrition</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>57% of funds (or $1.38M) to date have been spent in relation to Outcomes 1-4 (as opposed to on cross-cutting Programme Management, M&amp;E, equipment or ‘other expenses’).</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Of funds spent on Outcomes ($1.38M), 74% has been spent on Outcome 2</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Of funds spent on Outcomes ($1.38M), 11% has been spent on Outcome 1</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Of funds spent on Outcomes ($1.38M), 6% has been spent on Outcome 3</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Of funds spent on Outcomes ($1.38M), 10% has been spent on Outcome 4</td>
<td>Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Contracted services comprise 52% of the overall budget.* Most of the spend on this category to date relates to the contract for curriculum development</td>
<td>Australia &amp; UK budget reports. *NB extrapolating on the basis of these as Finland budget does not present these categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>UNESCO international and national personal comprise 22% of the budget.*</td>
<td>Australia &amp; UK budget reports. *NB extrapolating on the basis of these as Finland budget does not present these categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Expenses that are not attributed directly to project outcomes (‘equipment and maintenance’, ‘indirect costs’ and ‘other expenses’) represent 16-17% of the budget*</td>
<td>Australia &amp; UK budget reports. *NB extrapolating on the basis of these as Finland budget does not present these categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>As at end 2018 (55% of currently funded project lifetime), STEM had utilised 37.8% of funds which have currently been committed (noting that Australian and particularly UK funds were committed during the project).</td>
<td>STEM budget data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Average expenditure rate has been $101,234 per month. Utilisation of all committed funds by August 2020 will require an average monthly expenditure rate between Jan 2019-August 2020 of $199,613.</td>
<td>STEM budget data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Cost inefficiencies arose from poor quality translation of curriculum draft, which rendered parts of it unintelligible</td>
<td>CCT members, DHE, DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Numerous iterations have been required of EC curriculum - some stakeholders attribute this to insufficient prior consultation. This may have created unnecessary inefficiencies</td>
<td>CCT members, CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The consultative TCSF process has gone through a high volume of iterations which some stakeholders view as excessive. It may be that this has increased costs unnecessarily</td>
<td>DHE, UNICEF, CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>STEM encourages the formal participation of a wide range of stakeholders in its workshops</td>
<td>MoE, DPs, STEM, Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>STEM's donors participate actively in sector and sub-sector working groups</td>
<td>Development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>STEM's team coordinate informally with other DPs, e.g through coffee shop catch-ups</td>
<td>Development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>STEM's efforts to facilitate the participation of a wide-range of stakeholders is widely recognised and appreciated</td>
<td>All DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>STEM's guidance to the contracted curriculum development supplier has been inconsistent as regards the use of CREATE teacher education materials, causing inefficiencies in the need to redraft.</td>
<td>CREATE, Montrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Some misalignment between CREATE’s TE work and STEM occurred and was identified. Roles and responsibilities were then clarified through a dedicated meeting on the issue.</td>
<td>CREATE, Montrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>STEM and DFAT’s My-EQIP project have harmonised well, eg in using My-EQIP to conduct the TCSF validation study, and soon on communications</td>
<td>My-EQIP, STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Capacity development an appropriate modality with CCTs as curriculum developers</td>
<td>Unesco ints, EC Principals; Montrose. CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Going forward, create tighter linkages between primary curriculum development and preparation of EC curriculum for Years 2 – 4</td>
<td>CREATE, JICA, textbook publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>In the next round of development, set up initial consultations between national (CCT) and international developers</td>
<td>CCT interviews, on-line survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Limited progress in addressing the status of primary teaching/teachers</td>
<td>NEPC ints; DHE ints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Incentives for TEs to deliver new course (motivation) including performance monitoring; no action to date</td>
<td>Draft policies; CAQAC interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>CCTs currently motivated for on-going curriculum development engagement</td>
<td>Interviews with CCTs, Montrose, UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Significant risk/anxiety over EC/TE readiness for start date</td>
<td>EC case studies; on-line survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>“Recognise that there will be necessary changes to teaching and learning – it should be a continual process, with TEs properly supported”</td>
<td>EC case studies; on-line survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Strengthening of EC leadership and change management capacity</td>
<td>EC case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STEM project entirely oriented at building capacity to improve teacher education</td>
<td>UNESCO and donor documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Need to generate capacity within MoE to design, produce, implement and monitor relevant outputs</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>CCT cadre strong engagement in curriculum development process</td>
<td>CCT ints; ADB ints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3/3.2</td>
<td>ECs have barely begun to prepare for 12/19 start – changes in practice for some TEs very challenging “Recognise that there will be necessary changes to teaching and learning – it should be a continual process, with TEs properly supported.”</td>
<td>EC case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Upgrading plan not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Potential CCT cadre to have wider role in EC preparations for 12/19 start</td>
<td>CCT ints; UNESCO ints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Outcome/Output</td>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Source/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1/1.1</td>
<td>STEM work to support MoE in policy reform is work in progress. Institutional reform not yet achieved</td>
<td>NEPC, NCC, TCSF, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>CCT cadre good example of capacity development, and is now adding to it through extension to work in some ECs</td>
<td>EC case studies, CCT interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Nevertheless, CCT institutional collaboration is variable and can be extended by adjusting their conditions (Recommendation)</td>
<td>EC case studies, CCT ints, Montrose ints, UNESCO ints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Role changes for TEs causing some tension, with potential implications for progress of the reform</td>
<td>TE interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regular reporting and updates to STEM Steering Committee (donors, MoE)</td>
<td>Steering Committee agendas and minutes; STEM quarterly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beware workload “there are no weekends this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Weak communication with the key stakeholders – the ECs. Appears to fall between STEM and MoE responsibility. Potentially very important gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCT cadre have strong information base, but sharing within their ECs very variable, resulting in missed opportunities (recommendation)</td>
<td>“There are very few cases where they did evaluations. Even where they ask for our feedback at workshops, we’re not sure how much they consider it… If there is a disagreement in the CCT group, the feedback doesn’t go anywhere.” (CCT member)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all by 2030, increasing the number of qualified teachers

UNESCO Myanmar Country Program Outcome 1: All people in Myanmar benefit from an equitable and effective education system with improved teaching and learning promoting peace, cultural diversity, and freedom of information

STEM Overall Objective: Primary and middle school teachers provide inclusive quality education according to the Myanmar Teacher Competency Standards Framework (TCSF), enabling students to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI1. Number of primary and middle school teachers in Myanmar being trained in competency-based curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2. % student teachers following new curriculum demonstrate TCSF competencies, including inclusive education approach, in peer teaching sessions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 1: Comprehensive teacher policies informed by international standards are adopted, enabling implementation of the updated competency-based Education College (EC) degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI1.1. Comprehensive teacher policy developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is anticipated that the STEM Project Results Matrix will be updated following the findings of the STEM project mid-term evaluation. The current results matrix is being used for progress updates for Quarter 1 of 2019.

According to the current timeline for roll-out of the new Education College (EC) curriculum, two ECs will start as pilots from December 2018. It is anticipated that all ECs will roll out the Year 1 curriculum beginning in December 2019. However, this has not received final confirmation and how many ECs can be upgraded per year will depend on the need and available budget for increase in additional infrastructure and staff salaries. On average 300 student teachers are expected to enroll per year in each college. Estimated targets may change as needed to align with the NESP M&E Plan, currently being developed.

As above, % of student teachers following the new curriculum will follow the timeline for roll-out of the new EC curriculum. It is estimated that two ECs can be upgraded each year, and on average 300 student teachers are expected to enroll per year in each college. Estimated targets may change as needed to align with the NESP M&E Plan, currently being developed.

The UNESCO Teacher Policy Development Guide is the basis for defining a comprehensive teacher policy – it includes but is not limited to recruitment, deployment, standards, and working conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI1.2. Teacher promotion policy revised to support specialization tracks</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Draft</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>In use</th>
<th>In use</th>
<th>Policy document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher promotion policy has not been revised, but it is planned to be revised as part of the teacher policy to be drafted in 2019. The options paper on career paths for primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary teachers was provided to DHE, and DHE is reviewing the paper before submitting it to the Minister. The options paper will be shared with the Teacher Task Force upon its formation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

57 It is anticipated that the STEM Project Results Matrix will be updated following the findings of the STEM project mid-term evaluation. The current results matrix in being used for progress updates for Quarter 1 of 2019.

58 According to the current timeline for roll-out of the new Education College (EC) curriculum, two ECs will start as pilots from December 2018. It is anticipated that all ECs will roll out the Year 1 curriculum beginning in December 2019. However, this has not received final confirmation and how many ECs can be upgraded per year will depend on the need and available budget for increase in additional infrastructure and staff salaries. On average 300 student teachers are expected to enroll per year in each college. Estimated targets may change as needed to align with the NESP M&E Plan, currently being developed.

59 As above, % of student teachers following the new curriculum will follow the timeline for roll-out of the new EC curriculum. It is estimated that two ECs can be upgraded each year, and on average 300 student teachers are expected to enroll per year in each college. Estimated targets may change as needed to align with the NESP M&E Plan, currently being developed.

60 The UNESCO Teacher Policy Development Guide is the basis for defining a comprehensive teacher policy – it includes but is not limited to recruitment, deployment, standards, and working conditions.
### Output 1.1: Teacher Education Council established to enable teacher representatives to advice and support implementation of NESP Teacher Education and Management (NESP S1C1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI1.1.1. Teacher Education Council established and operational</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TEC ToR</td>
<td>A TOR for the Teacher Education Council has been developed and the formation of a Teacher Education Council has been approved. The Teacher Education Council will be formed following the establishment of the Teacher Task Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI1.1.2. Teacher Education Council leads policy development and standards setting for teacher education</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII interviews with MoE officials</td>
<td>A Teacher Education Council has been approved but not formed. See more information above. Currently, NEPC is filling this role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Task Force membership approved and Teacher Task Force established</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference of Teacher Task Force confirmed</td>
<td>Q1-Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience sharing and exchange with policy makers of other countries on teacher policy development with the Teacher Task Force members organized</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations on the establishment of Teacher Education Council developed</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 1.2: Teacher quality assurance system developed for assessment of teacher quality and measurable improvement in student learning (NESP S1C2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Teacher quality assurance system developed for assessment of teacher quality and measurable improvement in student learning (NESP S1C2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI1.2.1. TCSF developed including ICT specific competencies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft validated</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>TCSF document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TCSF for all four levels of teachers is drafted. In Q1 of 2019, the expert review group for TCSF was established with 48 national experts from teacher education, basic education and policy roles, plus 3 international experts. The group of experts submitted 148 comments to the draft TCSF for Beginning Teachers and then met to discuss and agree on revisions, as well as the next steps in the validation study. There were discussions on how best the ICT specific indicators should be included in the TCSF for the piloting of the validation study in Q2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI1.2.2. The number of states and regions taking part in TCSF validation study with national focus group discussions conducted</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Consultation report, including participation disaggregated by sex and location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The validation study began in Q1 of 2019; involvement at state/region level will occur in Q3. During Q3, a teacher survey will be conducted and respondents will be broadly representative of the diversity of Myanmar teachers and their contexts (including urban/rural, ethnicity, language, school type, etc.). An options paper on sampling for the survey, including the geographical scope, was drafted and discussed with MoE and the TCSF expert group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI1.2.3. MoE-appointed TCSF Working Group leads the development of the TCSF and advice on implementation</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>KII interviews with TCSF Working Group members Report of gender and geographical composition of TCSF Working Group membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (3-F, 2-M) TCSF Working Group members participated in the meeting for expert review of the TCSF to observe and listen to feedback. After receiving comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert review group established to have a final review of the draft TCSF before validation study</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft TCSF reviewed and agreed by the expert review group, ready for validation study</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sessions held about the draft TCSF with stakeholders who participate in the validation study</td>
<td>Q2-Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher surveys on draft TCSF completed, case studies on effective teaching practice conducted on site and data analyzed</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft validation study report reviewed by the expert review group and the TCSF Working Group</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for TCSF assessment tools developed, in preparation for the national roll-out of TCSF</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 1.3: Design and implement an equitable teacher recruitment, promotion, and deployment system to improve management and achieve an appropriate teacher student ratio (NESP S1C3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI1.3.1. Teacher policy on recruitment, promotion and deployment developed and implemented</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Final Draft</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Policy seminar minutes and recommendations Policy documents</td>
<td>In Q1 of 2019, the draft options paper on teacher promotion was translated to Myanmar language, and DHE is reviewing the paper before submitting it to the Minister. MoE is exploring salary alignment of teachers of different levels of schooling, one of the recommendations included in the draft options paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI1.3.2. Teacher Task Force leads in the development of teacher policies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII with MoE and Task Force</td>
<td>The Teacher Task Force and its proposed members have been approved in principle in Q1, and is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61 It is assumed that the responsibility of teacher policy development will fall under the Teacher Education Council starting in 2020.
### 2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation with the Teacher Task Force organized and prioritization exercise on teacher issues completed</td>
<td>Q1-Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher promotion policy drafted for consultations</td>
<td>Q2-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on priorities of comprehensive teacher policy development supporting the implementation of the new Education College degree organized</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 2: Education College (EC) two-year diploma upgraded to specialized programs with competency-based teacher education curriculum (NESP S2C2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI2.1. Number of ECs that use the updated competency-based curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curriculum at each EC</td>
<td>Zero ECs use the updated competency-based curriculum; Year 1 curriculum was drafted in 2018. Two ECs piloted the draft Year 1 curriculum in January-February 2019, with full roll-out of Year 1 expected in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2.3. Competency-based teacher educator guides are being used by Teacher Educators in implementation of new reform</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes(^{62})</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interviews with Teacher Educators</td>
<td>Teacher educator guides, as part of the new EC curriculum, are not being used as they are still in draft form. The pilot of the draft Year 1 curriculum at two ECs in January-February 2019 included piloting of the teacher educator guides. Feedback received from teacher educators in the piloting and curriculum core team members is being incorporated in the revised draft teacher educator guides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{62}\) We expect that after piloting of Year 1 teacher educator guides in 2019, the teacher educator guides can be used to support implementation of the new reform in the subsequent years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI2.1.1. Competency-based curriculum framework for 4-year degree is developed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Curriculum framework document</td>
<td>The Education College Curriculum Framework (ECCF) was revised in Q1 2019 based on NEPC comments. Based on the latest updates from MoE, the approving body of the ECCF is the Senate of the Universities of Education. A meeting with the Board of Studies to review the ECCF was held on 15 March 2019. The ECCF will also be shared with NCC, who has the oversight role of the EC curriculum development, for their feedback. Another Board of Studies meeting is scheduled in May 2019 to review further the ECCF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2.1.2 Number of participative curriculum building workshops held with the CCT members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training reports, including participant attendance disaggregated by sex and location</td>
<td>One participative curriculum building workshop was held from 25 February – 1 March 2019 with all CCT members. During the workshop, the CCT reviewed the second draft of all Year 1 student teacher textbooks, teacher educator guides, and handbooks and provided comments to the authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2.1.3. Syllabi, textbooks and teacher educator guides are developed, for year 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the new curriculum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28 (Year 1)</td>
<td>28 (Year 2)</td>
<td>28 (Year 3)</td>
<td>28 (Year 4)</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Syllabi documents</td>
<td>EC curriculum developed thus far includes: 14 draft syllabi, draft 2 of Semester 1 and Semester 2, Year 1 for student teacher textbooks and teacher educator guides of all 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019 Key Milestones

| PI2.1.4. CCT members participate in decision making in the development of the EC materials | n/a | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | KII with trainers and CCT members | CCT members are participating in decision making in the development of the EC materials. During the Year 1 review workshop in February 2019, CCT members’ comments were fully documented and the authors are to demonstrate that comments are integrated in the next draft.

## Timeframe

| Curriculum framework for 4-year degree approved by Board of Studies | Q1
| Pilot testing of EC Year 1 selected lessons completed in 2 ECs | Q1
| Draft syllabi (particularly EC Year 1) of 14 EC subjects/learning areas approved by Board of Studies | Q1-Q3
| EC Year 1 student teacher textbooks and teacher educator guides final draft completed | Q2-Q3
| EC Year 1 student teacher textbooks and teacher educator guides approved by Board of Studies | Q3-Q4
| Selection of a contractor for EC Years 2-4 textbook development | Q2
| Participative curriculum building workshops with the CCT members organized | Q1-Q4
| EC Year 2 student teacher textbooks and teacher educator guides drafted | Q3-Q4

## Output 2.2: Teacher Educators supported in delivery of competency-based curriculum and required pedagogies for implementation of the new EC degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI2.2.1. % of Teacher Educators trained in competency-based curriculum, including ICT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Training reports, including disaggregation by sex and location for those trained</td>
<td>4% of teacher educators are trained in competency-based curriculum, including ICT (79 CCT members among 1915 total teacher educators). CCT members applied their knowledge during the review of Year 1 materials at the 25 February-1 March workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the E-portal will occur in three phases: Phase I is the development of the E-library for sharing online resources, Phase II is the development of E-learning to facilitate portfolio creation and practicum records; and Phase III is E-learning with continuing professional development modules.

PI2.2.2. Number of training workshops held on ICT with ICT teacher educators from all ECs

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Training reports, including disaggregation by sex and location for those trained | No ICT workshop was held in Quarter 1 of 2019. |

PI2.2.3 Number of orientations in ECs completed about the upgrade

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mission reports</td>
<td>Orientation trainings for the piloting of Year 1 curriculum materials were held in Mandalay EC from 24-26 January and in Yankin EC from 31 January - 2 February 2019. This follows the orientations to the pre-service teacher education reform held in the same two ECs (Yankin and Mandalay ECs) which occurred in Q3-Q4 of 2018. Feedback from MoE was received on a concept note regarding the communication and outreach strategy to inform stakeholders about the upgrade; based on the feedback the strategy will be further developed. In addition, discussions were held with MoE for the project to train a selected group of student teachers to develop photo documentaries showcasing the importance of teachers and teacher education reforms in Q2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PI2.2.4. E-portal is developed with access to course modules and other

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>Phase I complete</td>
<td>Phase II complete</td>
<td>Phase III complete</td>
<td>E-portal in use</td>
<td>E-portal Course modules and materials</td>
<td>Draft 2 of the web version of the e-library was tested with teacher educators during the piloting in late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

63 Development of the E-portal will occur in three phases: Phase I is the development of the E-library for sharing online resources, Phase II is the development of E-learning to facilitate portfolio creation and practicum records; and Phase III is E-learning with continuing professional development modules.
### 2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A communication and outreach strategy for the implementation of the new EC degree programme developed</td>
<td>Q1-Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A draft CPD framework for EC Teacher Educators developed with support of a selected expert</td>
<td>Q2-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 selected training modules for EC Teacher Educators developed</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Teacher Educators trained in delivery of competency-based curriculum for EC Year 1 programme</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientations about the new EC degree programme in ECs completed</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2019 and the CCT members during the curriculum development workshop in late February 2019. The e-library is being further developed incorporating feedback received and is to include both a web and a mobile version.**

---

**PI2.2.5. Framework for Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for Teacher Educators developed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CPD framework document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A framework for CPD for teacher educators has not been drafted. The development of the CPD framework for teacher educators will begin in Q2.

**PI2.2.6. Training modules for Teacher Educators developed for selected modules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training modules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CPD framework has not been drafted and therefore CPD training modules have not been developed; they are to be developed based on the CPD Framework. The project will look into short-term CPD need in the meantime and have training modules on short-term CPD developed in Q3-4 of 2019.

**PI2.2.7. Teacher Educators use the ICT equipment, e-Portal and other digital resources to improve their teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-Portal usage stats KII with Teacher Educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher educators are using ICT equipment in their teaching and in administrative tasks; this is being led by the ICT Tutors at each EC. ECs were provided with Internet, laptops and tablets for teaching and learning.
The e-library (Phase I of the online learning portal development) developed and rolled out Q1-Q2
The draft e-learning platform (Phase II of the online learning portal development) developed for consultation with potential users Q3-Q4
EC ICT Teacher Educators upskilled in ICT-pedagogy integration through annual training Q4

<p>| Outcome 3: Strengthened management and administration of Education Colleges (NESP S2C4) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI3.1. New management structures to support upgrade of 4-year degree implemented</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>MoE records on roll-out reform</td>
<td>The proposal submitted by MoE regarding new management structures of ECs is still pending with the Union Civil Service Board. The project provided technical advice to the initial proposals about the new management structures in 2018. Continued support is planned for MoE to make decisions on the management structure in 2019 as part of development of a master plan for the upgrade of ECs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3.2. % of EC management staff trained in management skills</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Training reports, including disaggregation by sex and location for those trained</td>
<td>It is planned that a CPD framework for EC management staff and then a module for training will be developed in Q3-4 of 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3.3. Projections of teacher needs used in planning</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII with MoE officials</td>
<td>Projections of teacher needs are being fine-tuned in Q1, ensuring its alignment with the sector-wide simulation model for planning also supported by UNESCO. Capacity development for its use will take place in Q2-4 of 2019, and it is anticipated that the master plan will be developed beginning in Q2, based on projection results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PI3.4. EC managers make use of the ICT equipment to perform management tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII with EC managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECs were provided with ICT equipment (including Internet, laptops and tablets), and interviews have indicated use of this equipment in management tasks by some EC Principals in 2018. Further CPD for management staff to make use of ICT is planned in 2019, and will be based on the CPD framework for management staff.

---

**Output 3.1: Comprehensive plan for upgrade of Education College (ECs) to 4-year degree institutions developed and implemented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI3.1.1. Master Plan developed for implementation of the new EC degree, including enrolment and cost projections</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>The Master Plan has not been developed as of Q1, but its development is anticipated to begin in Q2. The simulation model to project teacher needs was fine-tuned in Q1 and initial findings about teacher needs at the national level and at selected regions/states were presented to DBE and DHE in March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3.1.2. Physical facilities in relation to ICT equipment and internet access improved</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII with EC managers</td>
<td>All 24 ECs (except Katha EC in which the EC building is still under construction) have been equipped with Internet facilities and are connected to the fiber Internet at 8Mbps. MoE successfully arranged with the network operator for their provision of fiber Internet free-of-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A draft simulation model fine-tuned to project teacher needs at national and regional/state level with data collected and entered</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations based on scenarios for the implementation of the new Education College degree, including data projections and costing of teacher need, developed</td>
<td>Q2-Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher policy seminar for consultation and recommendations of the implementation of the new Education College degree organized</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development training on the use of the simulation model to project teacher needs for MoE organized</td>
<td>Q2-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical facilities to support the development of the online learning portal improved and ECs advised on the efficient use of ICT equipment and internet access</td>
<td>Q1-Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.2: Capacity development plans implemented with training of Education College management staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI3.2.1. Framework for Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for EC management staff developed and used</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In Use</td>
<td>CPD framework document</td>
<td>A framework for CPD for EC management staff has not been drafted. Development of the CPD framework for EC management staff will take place in Q3-4 of 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3.2.2. Training modules in management skills developed for selected modules</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training modules</td>
<td>As the CPD framework for management staff has not been drafted, there are no training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019 Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A draft CPD framework for EC management staff developed with support of a selected expert</td>
<td>Q3-Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 selected training module in management skills for EC management staff developed</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Outcome 4: An inclusive education approach mainstreamed through teacher policies, teacher education curriculum, and Education College Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI4.1. Updated curriculum, syllabi and textbooks demonstrate awareness on gender equality, human rights, and peace education</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Curriculum documents</td>
<td>During Q1 of 2019, the International Bureau of Education reviewed and advised integration of inclusive education content and approach across the EC Year 1 draft subject syllabi, student teacher textbooks, and teacher educator guides. Further, the second draft of Year 1 curriculum was reviewed for gender sensitivity from 11-12 March, and a workshop on education for peace and sustainable development (ESD) included training on appreciative enquiry of curriculum for ESD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI4.2. Updated teacher policies demonstrate awareness on gender equality, human rights and peace education</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Policy documents</td>
<td>Teacher policy has not been drafted. However, discussions about gender equality continue to be part of discussions for teacher policy, including encouraging more male participation in the Teacher Task Force to be formed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PI4.3. CPD programme demonstrates awareness on gender equality, human rights and peace education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CPD framework documents</td>
<td>The CPD program has not been initiated. However, the Training Manual for Gender Mainstreaming in Teacher Education was finalized in January 2019 and a training on HIV/AIDS awareness and sexuality education for student teachers was developed as of February 2019. Both will be integrated in training modules on inclusion to be part of CPD; the module on inclusive education is to be developed in Q3-4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PI4.4. Teacher Educators, policy makers and MoE officials promote an inclusive approach in teacher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII with TEs, policy makers and MoE officials, noting sex and location of key informants in reporting</td>
<td>Teacher educators, policy makers and MoE officials have emphasized the importance of inclusive education in KII. They expressed the opinion that all should have access to quality education. Further, MoE officials are working to coordinate with state/region basic education offices to identify teacher needs and to recruit teachers according to local needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Output 4.1: Baseline assessments on inequalities in teacher education in Myanmar informing the teacher education reform process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI4.1.1. Baseline assessments of inequalities in teacher education conducted and informing planning of reform activities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Assessment reports</td>
<td>An assessment of equity and inclusion in teacher education was approved to go forth by MoE in March 2019, and is expected to begin in Q2 of 2019. The gender assessment reports were approved by DHE and are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2019 Key Milestones

| Baseline assessment terms of reference approved and a contractor selected to conduct the baseline assessment | Q1 |
| Finalization of results of baseline assessment | Q4 |
| Seminar on inclusion issues following results of baseline assessment | Q4 |
| Workshops to build capacity on gender mainstreaming for policy makers and curriculum developers | Q1-Q4 |

### PI4.1.2. Inclusion issues mainstreamed into policy, curriculum, and training programs across Outcome 1-3 project activities

- Output 4.2: Ministry of Education and Education College staff supported in capacity building and promotion of inclusive approach in teacher education

#### NESP Strategy 2: Pre-Service Teacher Education Quality Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>2019 Q1 progress updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI4.2.1. CCT members are supported during the curriculum development workshops to include gender equality,</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KII with CCT members, noting sex and location of key informants in reporting</td>
<td>CCT members were supported during the February CCT workshop to consider education for peace and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019 Work Plan Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of additional project activities to support training CCT members to include gender equality, human rights, HIV/AIDS and sexuality education and education for peace and sustainable development throughout materials</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Year 1 curriculum materials reviewed to strengthen inclusion of gender equality, human rights, and education for peace and sustainable development</td>
<td>Q1-Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PI4.2.2. Awareness raising and training modules on gender mainstreaming, gender and education, gender sensitive pedagogy teacher hand book, peace education and human rights in CPD program for MoE staff, ECs staff and CCT members to implement inclusive approach in teacher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training modules</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In use</td>
<td>Training modules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gender Mainstreaming Training Manual was developed and used as the basis of a training in Naypyitaw in December 2018. Participants in the Naypyitaw training included policy makers, planners, teacher educators, and management and financial staff from MoE and Ministry of Planning and Finance. Parliamentarians and NEPC members attended as observers for some of the training sessions.
| Training modules for CPD on inclusion (including gender, HIV/AIDS, sexuality education and peace education) for MoE and EC Teacher Educators developed | Q3-Q4 |
| Awareness training of curriculum core team members on inclusion (such as gender equality and education for peace and sustainable development) in curriculum development workshops organized | Q2-Q4 |