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<th>Full Form</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Community Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Child with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CwD</td>
<td>Child with Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>District Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Disabled People Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEENET</td>
<td>Enabling Education Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Effective Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Handicap International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Inclusive Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individual Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Itinerant Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP (survey)</td>
<td>Knowledge Attitude Practice (survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEYS</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>Provincial Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGC</td>
<td>Royal Government of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEO</td>
<td>Special Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>Transcultural Psychosocial Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM</td>
<td>Technical Transmission Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCRPD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Since January 2010, HI-Fed has been implementing along with its local partners (Provincial and District Education Offices, Self-help groups of persons with disabilities and village health works) an Inclusive Education (IE) pilot Project entitled “Promoting a replicable pilot model of inclusive education for disabled children in Cambodia” in Battambang province, Thmor Kol district, Chrey and Otaki communes. As part of this project, HI produced the present guideline gathering all information and resources developed regarding IT (Itinerant Teachers) system.

The guideline objectives focus on the IT system:

a) To capitalize all the information regarding the IT system and its functioning including several aspects: administrative, financial, operational, IT system internal management, skills development, outputs, local authorities role, role of children and families

b) To propose recommendations for improving the system in terms of financial and administrative aspects, IT system internal management, IT skills development, IT outputs, local authorities involvement and management, inclusion of children with disabilities and their families in design and implementation and inclusion of children with disabilities in class.

The guideline is based on the results of a survey who took place from the 09th to the 20th of July 2012, on a sample of 5 schools in two communes 2 Otaki (Otaki & Pre Dach) and 3 in Chrey (Khum Chrey, Tep Piroun & Kor Ko) out of a total of 15 schools (9 in Otaki commune and 6 in Chrey commune) supported by HI project. The survey included the visit of the schools, class observations and interviews of the School Directors, teachers, children and families of children with disabilities.

Aspects of the information capitalized are varied and include retrospective and current practice as well as element of evaluation.

The guideline is composed of 7 parts describing 1) the IT profile and 2) tasks 3) training 4) stakeholders 5) Management and monitoring 6) Cost and the last part 7) presents a series of 8 categories of recommendations to improve the project. The guideline is completed with a bibliography of the consulted documents and annexes.

NB: All survey documents are available on request to HI office.
I. Who is an IT?

**Background**
WHO estimates that the global disability prevalence worldwide is 15.3%. According to the last Cambodian socio-economic survey (2004), the percentage of people with disabilities in Cambodia is 4.7%. To achieve MDG # 2 “Achieve Universal Primary Education”, it is necessary to offer quality education to the 181000 primary school age children still out of school in Cambodia. The Royal Government of Cambodia MoEYS supports children with disabilities in mainstream classes through the itinerant teacher model in the framework of the implementation of the Policy for the education of children with disabilities (2008).

An Itinerant Teachers is a core element of Inclusive Education. The below definition gives a quick reminder of Inclusive Education principles:

> "Rather than being a marginal theme on how some learners can be integrated in regular education, inclusive education is an approach that looks into how to transform education systems in order to remove the barriers that prevent pupils from participating fully in education. These barriers may be linked to ethnicity, gender, social status, poverty, disability, etc. One group, in particular, most at risk of exclusion is learners with disabilities. However, this is not a homogeneous group. To meet the diverse need of all its students schools and other educational provisions need to be flexible and accommodating, they also need to seek out the children who are not there."

The concept of the itinerant teaching system is a relatively new concept in Cambodia and Battambang Province is a leader of its implementation with this 3 year pilot project. The MOEYS has recruited 4 itinerant teachers, 2 in Chrey and 2 in Otaki communes to work full time in 15 schools, 200 school staff, 860 family members.

**What is the profile of an IT?**

Itinerant teachers are qualified classroom teachers who travel around local mainstream schools and communities to offer advice, resources, and support to children with disabilities, their teachers, and their parents.

Defined at the beginning of the project and approved by the Province Education office (Cf. Annex 3), the Itinerant Teachers roles include:

- directly supporting children with disabilities in the classroom and home
- providing consultations and supports to teachers of children with disabilities
- identifying, assessing and referring children with disabilities

---

2. UNICEF (2006)
4. 6 schools in Chrey & 9 schools in Otaki
5. 185 children in school (data collected in 2010)
• providing teacher and community trainings and awareness events
• working with children of different ages and grades with various impairments

From the reading of the IT profile it appears that the responsibilities of the IT are quite vague and cover a large scope of activities. What kind of consultation and support should they give to the teachers and to which extend should they support each children needed precisions and occasioned confusion in the project implementation.

IT representation by a children with visual impairment in Khum Chrey, July 2012

ITs are mainstream teachers recruited after an interview. There are 4 criteria besides motivation:
1. At least 3 years general teaching experience
2. Willing to travel between several schools
3. Able to attend trainings and continue professional development during school holidays
4. Previous experience teaching or working with children with disabilities desired

Ideally, ITS have had some formal training in the education of children with disabilities. In practice, none of them has a formal training as this training is not available in Cambodia. Nevertheless, the 4 ITs working in Battambang have now received several training (See part III) and have acquired a good knowledge and experience.

To date, ITs profile is approved but not validated yet by the local authorities. ITs have no specific contract or order of mission from their line ministry.
Vuti, Chakriya, Channy and Sovann, the 4 pilot Itinerant Teachers in action at school and at home.
II. What are the ITs activities?

Workload of the ITs
As confirmed by their timetable (Cf. annex 1), ITs have very long working hours. They work in average 45 to 48 hours. Besides, the 2 ITs working in Chrey commune have long hours of transportation respectively 8 hours and a half and 15 hours on average per week. ITs working in Otaki commune, travel on average 2h a week.

ITs attend training during holidays (2 months) maximum of days is unlimited but not compulsory according to DOE. In 2 years, IT received 107 days of training (see part IV on training).

Occasionally, ITs have been observed performing tasks outside of their role such as teaching a class in the absence of the teacher.

Wide range of roles
The IT profile covers a wide range of roles. IT role covers social workers responsibilities (working with families) and Itinerant teachers’ responsibilities (working with teachers and children). This explains partly\(^6\) the developments of the pilot project in phase 1 when IT concentrated on home support. This practice had a positive impact on children and helped them to improve their confidence. It is actually a good measure in phase 1 of a project to prepare the children enrolment in class.

Since the reorientation given by HI Technical Advisor\(^7\), IT’s roles are clearer; “ITs have several different roles to play: data collectors for children with disabilities in school, facilitators for knowledge transmission sessions, support for teachers working with children with disabilities, support for children with disabilities in classroom, key resource person regarding all the questions related to disability and children with disabilities”.

The various roles responsibilities imply that the ITs are adequately trained to all the necessary skills. During the survey on IT system conducted in July 2012, it appeared that ITs did not feel confident to provide resources to teachers, identify children with disabilities or refer children with disabilities to socio-economic or health services.

Evolution of the support from 2010 to 2012: reorientation from home support to school support
ITs did not feel comfortable at the beginning of the project to support children in class. There are several reasons; ITs were insufficiently trained, had no clear understanding of their role in class next to the regular teacher. Teachers were defiant to the idea of having another teacher in their class and the exact role of the IT was unclear for school staff.

---

\(^6\) Another reason might be the negative perception of IT by mainstream teachers.

\(^7\) The information contain in this part is extracted from the work document on IT system by HI Technical Advisor, Sandrine Bouille. This paper is a tentative of definition of the IT system and how it should be organized, implemented and monitored for the new school year 2011-2012.
“In school year 2010-2011, the IT system became more and more a private special teaching at home for children with severe impairment. At the end of school year 2010-2011 only 9 children with disabilities were supported by ITs among a total of 185 children with disabilities”. The new orientations are presented below:

New orientations:

- Increase the presence of the IT in the school and in the classroom
- Reinforce the support to mainstream teachers
- Significantly decrease the individual support at home of children with disabilities
- No provision of special education support to children with severe impairment but general support for the inclusion of the majority of children with disabilities

Objectives:

- Follow up of ALL children with disabilities at school
- Facilitate training knowledge transmission session
- Support teachers during formal meeting
- Develop IEP with mainstream teachers
- Support children with disabilities in the classroom (no home support apart for specific cases discussed between HI + IT + mainstream teacher + school cluster director)

Follow up of children with disabilities at school

- Based on the list of children with disabilities in school provided by school directors, IT do a monthly follow up of children participation using the tool developed by HI
- School directors complete the follow up tool
- IT provide the results of the follow up to HI
- For drop out and irregular children, community partners (+ IT if necessary) visit the family to understand why and what could be done to help the children to go back to school.
- The follow up will be divided per school between the 4 IT
- School cluster directors will inform the school directors about the follow up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chrey</th>
<th>Otaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT no 1</td>
<td>IT no 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khum Chrey</td>
<td>Prey Dach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kor Ko</td>
<td>Trang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phum Chrey</td>
<td>Otaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veal Trea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 This information and the following part is extracted from the work document on IT system by HI Technical Advisor, Sandrine Bouille. This paper is a tentative of definition of the IT system and how it should be organized, implemented and monitored for the new school year 2011-2012.
Knowledge transmission sessions (TTM)

- 9 sessions in total one Thursday afternoon per month (generally after TTM):
  - 4 sessions on child development (Nov – Dec – Jan – Feb)
  - 5 sessions on inclusive education (March – April – May – June – July)
- No session on Effective Teaching & Learning (ETL) as this thematic is already part of the child friendly school program and discussed during TTM
- If more sessions are requested to cover a thematic, organize extra sessions (with logistic constraints regarding the availability of the teachers)
- Facilitators: 4 IT + 4 more people in order to have two teams of two facilitators per cluster.
  - Facilitators will facilitate sessions only on one thematic: 1 team per cluster per thematic

Direct support to mainstream teachers

Role of the ITs

- identified teachers who need individual support with the help of the school directors
- Identified children with disabilities who need specific intervention (regarding learning and/or social aspects) with the help of the mainstream teachers.
- identified thematic of interest for the teachers
- School cluster directors/school directors are actively involved in the set up and follow up of the meeting

Some children with disabilities could have no learning difficulties but could face social difficulties (teasing, exclusion, self-exclusion), it is also our role to provide support to them and work on attitudinal barriers

Support children with disabilities in school

- IT shall go into the classroom!
  - To implement the IEP in consultation with the mainstream teacher
  - To observe the child and provide punctual support
  - To assist the teacher when requested

We have to build the confidence between teachers and IT. IT are not in the classroom to evaluate teachers’ results or skills but to support the mainstream teachers

Support in the classroom:

- Shall start as soon as possible
- School directors shall explain clearly to mainstream teachers the objectives of IT’s presence in the classroom
- The support (frequency, duration, etc.) in the classroom shall be discussed between the IT and the mainstream teachers and not to be imposed to mainstream teachers
Present situation
The drift has been implemented for the last 6 months and positive impacts are observed. ITs are presents in schools. During the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of the IT system survey, Knowledge transmission sessions have been mentioned by all teachers and acclaimed as a great source of knowledge and teaching material. Teacher uses the material created but few create by themselves new material. ITs declare spending less than 1 hour a week to create and prepare material. Every absence of children with disabilities is immediately checked by the ITs. Mainstream teachers acknowledge that the ITs are there to support them improving their teaching practices in order to benefit all children.

Nevertheless, it is to be noticed that most of the teachers still consider that IT should support the children with disabilities (one to one support) and IEP (Individual Education Plan) are not in place. From the IT diary analysis it appears that IT did not differentiate the time they supported kids in one to one and support in school which is an indication in itself. ITs have understood that role shifting from support to the children to support the teacher but the implementation is still at the first steps. In the diary summary, ITs declare spending 8 hours and ½ to support the children and more than 4 hours to support the teachers. This tendency was confirmed by observation; most of ITs were sitting next to a child and supporting him. Eventually, some issues with the initial identification of children with disabilities in 2010 have been observed by HI IEP team and during the IT system survey. HI Technical Advisor indicated that “Enfants sourds du Cambodge” tested 8 children identified with hearing impairments and discovered that 6 out of 8 had no hearing deficiencies.
III. What does a class supported by an IT look like?

The schools visited were partly accessible with ramps, guiding blocks or painting and accessible toilets (except for Pre Dach) as well as hand washing procedure, water source in toilets and soap. Potable water is available in schools. Neverthless, some doors were not wide enough for the smooth passage of a wheelchair and some motorbikes were parked on the guiding blocks and some classroom could be cleaner.

**Profile of the classroom observed**

Besides classroom are not well lit and dark. Several black boards painting is old and hinders the reading. To one exception, classroom are clean, decorated and there is awareness posters on health and disability on the walls. Inclusive school & classrooms supported by ITs have an average of 28 students among which 3 have a disability\(^9\). No more than 3 children with disabilities were sitting in a class (3 exceptions observed). Most of the children with disabilities were sitting in front of the class. The setting of the class remains in theatre shape”.

![Theatre shaped setting](image)

![U shaped setting](image)

**Teaching practices**

Teachers have a positive attitude and give extra attention to children with disabilities but no remedial class (a few exceptions were mentioned by teachers). Teachers have introduced in their practices new methods and games but the teaching remains very traditional. During the Khmer language class, children were mainly asked to read on the board and to repeat. Mathematics class mainly involve calculation exercises. Based on survey interviews of teachers and observation, ETL meeting are considered by teachers as the main source of learning new teaching methods. The teachers have learned (or remember) 4 types of game:

1) matching games (word & picture)
2) Puzzles
3) Dominos (braille accessible)

\(^9\) Based on the survey on IT system during which 5 classroom were observed, July 2012. Maximum student per class observed was 40.

Only few grouping activities in class were observed. Some pairing of a student with disabilities and a student without disabilities for daily support was organized.

Except for Otaki school, 4 headmasters interviewed declare having special programs to encourage children to stay in school including children with disabilities; school opening, remedial class, breakfast, uniform and learning material.

**Best practices observed**

Several best practices of mainstream teachers were observed: some teachers gave encouragements and congratulations to children. They also encouraged children’s production (Cf. annex 4).
Encouragements and (adapted) school recommendations documents have a positive impact on children’s motivation. ITs have introduced the use of adapted manual in class for children with intellectual disabilities. These books are available in regular bookstores in order for children who cannot read and write to train on letters & numbers drawing. Many children with and without disabilities have huge difficulties to read and write and could make the most of these books. IT could also look for more adapted material with specialized education stakeholders.

**Discrimination and positive discipline**
No discrimination was observed from mainstream teachers and schoolmates. 3 children reported being mocked and one having observed physical punishment (bitten with a stick). The training on positive discipline has been understood by mainstream teachers. Some reports indicate that some teachers still ask children to run around the school, carry water, filling the toilets or stand in the sun as a punishment. One teacher observed had difficulties with a child refusing to go to the board and do any activities. She told she needed support on children with difficult behavior and conflict resolution.

**Lessons learnt**
The class repetition statistics of children with disabilities are worrying. Out of 16 families interviewed, 5 children never repeated a class, 3 children repeated one class and 8 repeated several classes. The maximum classes repeated for a single child was 7. This child is actually in a great difficulty. His mother indicated that he was depressed (biting himself) and other children regularly mocked him.

During observation in one school, a 13 years old boy was present in grade 1. He apparently was downgraded from grade 3 because he could not read. These practices are extremely discouraging for children and encourage discrimination.

Mainstream teachers had not lesson plan and IEP for children with disabilities. ITs mainly keep supporting children with disabilities in one to one support.

Awareness events in class were not implemented. Mainstream teachers do not practice identification of potential disabilities with the tools created by the MOEYS. Mainstream teachers are also not sensitized to the disabilities of the children they have in class. For example, a teacher acknowledged having no idea of the reaction to adopt in case one of her student had convulsions (epilepsy crisis).

Some efforts are still required in terms of school environment.

---

11 One of the children enrolled in school at the age of 11 and integrated directly grade 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School class is not clean</th>
<th>Wheelchair access is difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Integrate pix C. school environment
IV. What is the IT training?

IT received trainings
Since 2010, the ITs have received the following trainings. It is to be noted that 2 ITs were trained to Braille and 2 ITs were trained to Khmer Sign Language, 1 IT on each topic in each commune.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Duration (Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability (HI)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Cwds (HI)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille(^\text{12})</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Sign Language</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding &amp; Communication Skills in CSN (Caritas)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development with basic ToT (TPO)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring Inclusive Education (EENET)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching to children with sensorial impairment (KT)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Teacher Advice Form of SEO (HI)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Monitoring of IT work (2011)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; communication training at Rabbit school</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT capacities
ITs have therefore received a substantial capacity building. These trainings have been efficient since the results of the knowledge test indicate very good results. ITs scored between 14 and 16 out of 22 (maximum score). ITs have a good understanding of the main issues of Inclusive Education and disabilities. They know the legal framework, in particular the Sub-decree in Teacher’s code of conduct (97% of confidence) and the UNCRDP (92.5% of confidence). They are less confident on the Cambodian classification of type of impairment (67.5% of confidence). This result is understandable as the classification has changed recently and differs from the International Classification (ICF)\(^\text{13}\).

\(^{12}\) ITs follow either training on Braille or Sign Language. The total of days of training take in consideration only 1 of both training.

\(^{13}\) [http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/en/](http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/en/)
The importance of adapted curriculum and the IEP (Individual Education Plan) in Inclusive Education is nevertheless not fully understood by all the ITs. One IT answered that the IEP is a document with confidential medical information about a child and another that children with intellectual impairment are able to succeed as other children following the same curriculum if they have IT support.

According to ITs, the main barriers for children with disabilities to access / maintain in school are:

1) Mainstream teachers who do not have enough skills to teach children with disabilities
2) Poor economic situation of the families and family migration
3) Parents not feeling that it is important their child go to school and physical accessibility
4) Lack of motivation from children with disabilities themselves
5) Lack of capacities of children with disabilities themselves
6) Negatives attitudes and behavior of school staff & schoolmates

Distance to school, lack of material, children with disabilities need to earn money for the families are not very important elements

The attitude of ITs is very good and they capacity to analyse major issues in mainstream teachers practice is good. ITs are still focusing a lot on the special education skills.

Specialized training inappropriate focus
A common misunderstanding of Inclusive Education is the focus on the disability and therefore specialized technics. Braille and Sign language for example are of the utmost necessity for children with sensorial impairment but they need to be provided by specialized resources. It definitely would be interesting for teachers with deaf students for example to learn a few sign in order to communicate properly in class. The mastering of Braille can be quite fast (when one can see!) but Sign Language is a language just like Japanese or French and requires a long term learning and practice.

Most regular teachers requested to be trained to Sign Language, Braille or teaching to children with intellectual disabilities. From the observation conducted, most teachers did not have a lesson plan and none used IEP (Individual Education Plan or Teacher Advice form) which is a central element of Inclusive Education. Few used a variety of grouping of the students, peering with another child. No class visited had an appropriate setting in U shape.

Inclusive Education adapts to the learning needs and speed of every children. In the majority of cases, children with disabilities simply need good, clear and accessible teaching.

Needed training in the future
Additional trainings are planned in 2012 in particular on the Teacher Advice Form (Cf. Annex 2) which is not used by teachers. It seems that teachers find it too difficult to use. ITs and regular teachers need in priority a reinforcement of their skills in class management, teaching technics, differentiated instruction and Individual Education Plan. HI technical Advisor is preparing a power point of various activities, games and exercises. ITs should also be trained to simple Teaching plan (Cf. example in annex S) and a greater variety of possible exercises (memory, gaps filling, ...).

14 ITs were asked to react on a video filmed during the survey on IT system.
Additional training on the creation of low cost material available in school environment would be useful as well as a training on psychosocial support for children with disabilities\textsuperscript{15}. This training was suggested by an IT and could benefit the children having difficulties to cope.

\textbf{Remarks on future trainings and continuing education}

The main sources of ITs’ self-learning are the school friendly manuals, HI training documentation, SEO resources and occasional consultation of internet.

Future trainings should be more practical. Trainings should consider an immersion period in classes with a trained teacher.

It is important to reinforce the TTM/ETL session with additional time for best practices and material exchange among the mainstream teachers.

ITs have acquired knowledge and 2 year experience. These capacities increase should be acknowledge by their line Ministry. According to M. Suren, Vice Director of SEO, “\textit{ITs are more trained technically than SEO}”. Whatever orientation the POE is choosing, it is crucial not to lose this expertise and manage to keep ITs as resource person.

\textsuperscript{15} CCAMH/Caritas have this expertise.
V. Who are the IT’s stakeholders?

ITs have many stakeholders. The relations described below take into consideration both the period preceding the project drift and the present time.

**IT and the children**

In 2010-2011, IT supported at home 9 children with the preparation of the lessons, review of the lessons, development of material and use of adapted material. “It was an opportunity for the IT to practice their knowledge, test methods, use and create teaching material and to learn by doing with selected children with disabilities. It was an opportunity for some children with disabilities to develop their learning and learning styles in order to help them to better participate in school and give them confidence”\(^{16}\).

With the project drift, ITs are supporting all the 185 children with disabilities in school (data from 2010) over 15 schools. It can be considered that some children need more support than others but the number of children to follow up remains high. ITs and the Provincial Education Office (POE) consider that 20 children would be a reasonable number of children to follow.

> “ITs cannot control too many children. It is too much time to spend and they cannot do their other duties.” Tep Venti, Primary Education Officer POE

The question of the selection of the children is therefore to be asked. Which children should be selected in priority? De facto, ITs selected the children with the most severe disabilities. On average today, an IT supports between 4 and 12 children per week, according to the severity of the disabilities and the needs of the children. The selection of children is also based on the training received, for example Braille or Sign language. ITs feel therefore more confident to support some type of disability rather than others. The mode of selection needs to be clarified and discussed as the

\(^{16}\) Extract from the work document on IT system by HI Technical Advisor, Sandrine Bouille. This paper is a tentative of definition of the IT system and how it should be organized, implemented and monitored for the new school year 2011-2012.
present selection, established by habits, left aside many children who never or barely see the IT. ITs also indicated they founded difficult to support children from every school level. Integrate pix. A children
Asked about the improvement of the child schooling, 7 families out of 16 had noticed improvements in attitude, confidence, academic results, autonomy or motivation. 3 families did not notice improvements and 6 could not answer the question either because they never saw the IT or could not tell. Only 5 children out of 16 are involved in the meeting with the IT and the mainstream teacher regarding their learning needs.

The responsibilities between ITs and community workers in the follow up of the 35 out of school children were unclear. As a consequence, out of school children were “forgotten” in the drift and not followed up properly.

**The case Lem Srey So**
Lem Srey So is a little girl of 8 year’s old living in the village of Po Pil Kae, identified with a hearing impairment. Her family received the visit of HI in 2010. The team promised a bicycle. Two years later, this little girl’s hearing was never properly assessed; she was never schooled and never received a bicycle. Her family planned to send her to another NGO school where she was refused and could not send her to Khum Chrey which is 2 km away.

**IT and the parents**
Parents interviewed who benefited from home support lauded it. They did not fully understand the project drift.

**Case of Sayana’s parents**
“Before the IT came home to support with lessons and now I am not sure of what happens. Now to get in touch with the IT I should ask because now I never met him and information goes through the CO and self-help group. I do not know anymore about my child learning.”

According to the Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) survey conducted with ITs in July 2012, ITs support less than 10 families on average. The analysis of the ITs diary indicate that ITs visit 4 parents a week for a 5 hours duration. The reason of their visits is predominantly the absence of a child at school and occasionally to give advice on hygiene and communication skills. Out of 16 families interviewed, 6 indicated that they had never seen the IT, 3 families had seen the IT one time, 3 families had seen the IT 2 to 3 times in 2 years and 4 families had seen the IT 2 to 4 times a month. 5 families declared that they know about the IT system (one of them confused HI with another NGO Arupe) and 11 declared that they did not know about the IT system. 8 families declare that they could express their needs at the beginning of the project and all the families indicated receiving school kit and/or bicycle.

**Link between school & parents**
Only 5 families declare having meetings with the mainstream teacher and the IT to discuss the learning needs of their child. 5 Families declare that they received an oral report on their child improvement by the IT, 4 did not receive any report on their child improvement and 7 had never seen the IT before.

17 Change names
Integrate B. parents pix
Out of 16 families, survey indicates that 4 families received a written report from the mainstream teacher every month (Teacher Advice form), 2 received the teacher Advice form but not regularly 3 received an oral report from the mainstream teacher and 7 did not receive any form of report from the mainstream teacher. It is also to remember that some parents cannot read.

“I never see the teacher advise book as she does not give it to me and complete it by herself”.  
Mother of Sur Siyao, little girl with speech disability

The communication of information on the child to the parents is not always optimal as the case below demonstrates:

**Case of Rat Seyha**
Rat Seyha is a little girl of 11 years old identified with visual impairment and it was indicated that she needed glasses. Asked why Rat Seyha had no glasses, the CO and the person from the self-help group had no clue. After checking with the office, it appeared that Rat Seyha vision was assessed by a specialist who diagnosed Rat Seyha had a nutrition issue and needed vitamin A to recover her full vision and did not need glasses. The family was not aware of this information and was still waiting for glasses. As a consequence, Rat Seyha regime remained unchanged and her vision was affected. The person responsible to inform the family is unclear for the CO and they did not consider it was theirs.

Interviewed on their satisfaction with the IT support, 3 families declared being very satisfied, 4 a little satisfied, 1 not very satisfied, 0 were not satisfied at all 8 did not answer as they did not see IT or had no opinion.

All these figures indicate that the parents are not informed and involved properly in the system. We shall remember that unfortunately very little information actually reaches the beneficiaries of aid programs.

**Mainstream teachers**

In 2010-2011, out of 132 teachers, 9 were supported with material development (letter cards, learning games, number cards, etc.) and informal exchange of experience.

From the KAP survey, ITs declare today supporting 4 to 10 teachers on average. ITs declare supporting automatically the teacher of a class which welcomes a child with disabilities they support, other criteria for selection are the number of children with disabilities in his/her class and the ITs’ skills (Braille / Sign language). IT visits the teachers they support every 2 weeks.

100% of mainstream teachers asked declared that they feel supported by ITs. The support provided include advise, capacity building and material. From the mainstream teachers’ declaration in FGD, the support is mainly taking news of the children and supporting directly the children in class. At break time, the IT the IT and teacher discuss the difficulties of children with disabilities. The ITs also contact directly the family when a child is not coming to school. Liaison book are filled. The content of the liaison book of teachers is not always filled with information on the child progression, in some cases, it serves only as presence book.
96.15% of mainstream teachers asked declare that they received capacity building from the ITs. ITs give advice and support with comments and ideas. Examples given by teachers often refer to special skills such as “How to teach to children with low vision with big letters” and described the games mentioned earlier, in general matching games. During the FGD, teachers also acknowledged the support of IT for material creation, especially via the TTM/ETL meeting. Nevertheless, their full understanding of disabilities and learning capacities of children with disabilities is still dubious.

Table 1. Quick survey of 27 mainstream teachers on their opinion on children learning capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Categories of disabilities</th>
<th>can learn everything</th>
<th>can learn a little</th>
<th>cannot learn</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>non disabled children</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>children with hearing impairment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>children with visual impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>children with physical impairment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>children with intellectual impairment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>slow learners</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>other (HIV)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>hyperactive children</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some answers are surprising as 55.56% of them think that children with visual impairment can learn a little, 44.44% think that children with physical impairment can learn a little and 48.15% that children with HIV can learn a little and 44.44% that children with hyperactive behavior can only learn a little. The message that children with visual, hearing and physical impairment, HIV and hyperactive behavior have no learning incapacities is not clear yet.

Strangely enough 66.67%\(^\text{18}\) of the teachers think that slow learners student can learn everything.

\(^{18}\) For this question, only respondents from Kor Ko and Pre Dach gave this answer.
Besides, many mainstream teachers still do not take responsibility for the teaching of children with disabilities. They consider it is the IT responsibility. Mainly teachers do not feel confident as they do not have a specific methodology. They feel some confidence to motivate the children. This is reinforced by the activity of the IT, sitting in one to one with children during the class.

**Teachers quotes**

“I do not feel confident to teach children with severe disabilities”. A teacher in Pre Dach Primary school

“I do not create material because there are less children with disabilities in my class and they are not severe”. A teacher in Pre Dach primary school

“The IT comes to visit the class 3 times per month and support the child “. A teacher in Kor Ko primary school

“The IT’s role is to support directly the children with disabilities”. A teacher in Otaki primary school

**a) School clusters**

Few information were collected on the role of the cluster school in the IT system. Cluster schools welcome the TTM/ETL meeting. IT do give their reports to cluster school (Cf. annex 11). And Cluster schools are responsible for controlling IT presence.

The school cluster directors can participate to the decision of home support in specific cases in coordination with HI, the IT and the mainstream teacher. The school cluster directors are in charge of informing the school director of the follow up of children with disabilities at school. School cluster directors/school directors are actively involved in the set up and follow up of the meeting organized to support mainstream teachers.

**b) Community Officers & self-help group**

In general, the collaboration between ITs and COs occurs at the monthly meeting. Occasionally, ITs call directly the CO 2 or 3 times a month for general health issue or disability issues. Last example was for a problem with a prosthesis creating pain and injury. Informed by an IT, the CO contacted ICRC. If the situation is serious, the ITs will refer the children by themselves.

The organization and geographical sharing of responsibilities between the CO and Self-help group is apparently linked to the availability of one or the other. This might affect the quality of the service, self-help groups seeming less informed and sometimes less confident than CO to talk to families. Besides, the sharing of information on the child needs to be improved (see the case of Rat Seyha).

One of CO indicated not feeling confident to give advice to parents. The reason might be the knowledge that costs will be implied that are not covered by HI and fear to make a mistake or being considered as “responsible”. Besides, it seems that CO noticing an issue do not necessarily take an initiative. Here is an example:
Case of Vit Viet in Tep Piroun

Vit Viet is a 14 year old boy in grade 6 identified with a heart condition. Vit Viet missed school a lot because of his condition, he is too tired to go to school or work home. He go medicine from Siem Reap hospital 2 years ago and go better. But the project stops and there is no more medication for the last 2 years. The mother indicated that the cost of transportation to health center is too expensive (13,000 KHR with a motodop). The mother said she asked for medicine 3 month ago but there was no follow up.

Some parents told they thought the visits were “useless” as the CO “just ask about the child health each time”.

“From the social worker, we got information we already have” […] “The IT supports by encouraging. It would be good to get material to help Vanna, to find something new to help him to learn, not just advice.” Quote from parents of Vanna, Tep Piroun

In April 2012, HI published and distributed to community partners (CP) a directory of linkages to main resources available for health, social and disability. Community Officers and members of the Self-Help group did not have their directory of linkages during family visits organized in July. On two occasions, it was observed that the CO and / or Self Help Group representative did not know the answer to the family question. In one case the CO did not have the directory with him and therefore could not inform the family. In the other case, the CO gave false information about the existence of speech therapy at the Jesuits. A workshop on the content and the usage of the directory of linkage for referral could be useful.

Coordination between stakeholders

The only IT responding to the question in the diary declared for the number of hours spent in coordination (teacher with parents, other organizations…) 4 hours and ½. The main coordination is TTM/ETL meeting and the monthly meeting usually called “subcommittee” every month at HI office (one meeting for education and one meeting for community) and the 2 of them together every 6 months.

Referral reinforcement within HI program and with other NGOs

Out of 16 families visited, the only recent referrals done were the checking of 4 children at Krousar Thmey (KT) recommended by HI Technical Advisor. 9 children were never referred and 7 were referred; 4 to KT, 1 to ICRC (wheelchair) and 2 to health center. Several parents indicated that the health center is “not good” and “has no ability”. During the survey, 12 children interviewed needed potential referral (health or social). Besides health referral, some situation needed the attention of IT and initiative to look for solutions within HI program or with other NGOs.

Case of Chou Chan

Chou Chan is a young woman of 18 years old identified with a severe hearing impairment. Chou Chan has never seen the IT and misses school very often as she is in charge of preparing food for her 10 brothers and sisters. Chou Chan says she cannot read. It is unclear why Chou Chan was part of the project as she is more than 15 years old. Anyway, Chou Chan would benefit much surely from a vocational training and is actually willing to. She should have been referred to TIGA program.
Case of Sep Pring Tom

Sep Pring Tom is a young boy of 14 year old in Kor Ko, who is missing school regularly and has already a lucrative activity. Orient this boy towards a vocational training to offer him a chance to get a better qualified job.

Case of Kimsean

Kimsean is a successful 13 year old boy in Grade 3 identified with a visual impairment. Parents are worrying for his future because of the cost of studying in high grade. Kimsean was enrolled at Krousar Thmey (KT) but because of the timetable and the fact he had no friends there, he stopped going. Nevertheless, in the future, if not better option is found, Kimsean can follow higher education with KT. Besides, Kimsean has very little mobility and does not go outside by himself; this is due to the fact that he has not learned enough about mobility. This is a something he could learn with KT.

In several cases during the visits, families were in very difficult situation; grand-parents in charge of their grand-children (parents had died of a disease) or a mother, widow with 4 children and no family support but her own mother who was very old. It would be interesting to link them with other NGOs like Help Age (http://www.helpage.org/resources/) and NGO supporting women.
VI. Who does manage and monitor the IT?

The below flow chart has been established on the declaration collected during the survey on IT system in July 2012.

**Management**

Process of selection of children & teacher supported is unclear. Many respondents of the survey have indicated that the final decision for criteria of selection for children belonged to IT, mainstream teachers, parents, community, school directors, DOE, POE and NGO (Hi). The main criteria seem to be the severity of the disability (severe and medium with a focus on intellectual disabilities) for children and for teachers the fact that these children are in their class and the specific skills of the IT.

It appears that ITs are responsible for their planning in coordination with mainstream teachers. School headmasters are informed of the coming of the IT in advance (by letter or orally). According to headmasters interviews the frequency of the IT visits is different according to schools; answers included; “4 times a month”, “2 or 3 times per week”, “it depends the IT plan”, “irregularly: a lot at the beginning less at midterm and now it is better” and “comes everyday at the cluster school”.

Some criteria like the one for selection of classroom for awareness events are unclear to Headmasters who give various answers (Classes with children with disabilities facing difficulties of integration, Classes with children with disabilities with a particular type of impairment, Classes with children with disabilities irregular at school). In any case, it shall be by a decree from POE.
Management of training is entirely ensured by HI. DOE indicated not having the experience in training on IE/special education and not feeling confident to facilitate training but POE declares having experience in training on IE, ETL, Guideline MOEYS. Headmasters of the 5 schools interviewed declared that the dissemination of training to other mainstream teachers in school was effective. There is no evidence of the follow up of the dissemination.

The main issue for the IT system is that there is no clear definition of responsibilities. The majority of the respondents of the survey tick all the stakeholders at the same time when requested to name the responsible person / institution. According to POE, POE and DOE are responsible for monitoring and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>POE</th>
<th>DOE</th>
<th>HI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v  (salary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both DOE and POE have a good knowledge of the system by now. Many operational activities are currently implemented by HI staff (Eg Agenda of meetings, sending of IT planning…). The habits are well established by now and the transfer of some of these responsibilities could start.

**Monitoring**

As for the management, the definition of responsibilities for monitoring is not precise. There are not apparent differences between DEO / POE in terms of responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT SUPERVISION ACCORDING TO POE and IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct supervision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOE mentioned that there is a direct supervision from Headmasters and Cluster Headmasters\(^\text{20}\) and that an indirect supervision from POE/DOE for the administrative part. HI is responsible for recruitment, finance, operational aspects and skills. All stakeholders “collaborate for the decision making”.

In POE there are 3 focal persons dedicated to monitoring, 2 in DOE and 2 at Cluster level. Each one has its own planning. In POE, 2 days a month are dedicated per month (2 schools visited). POE visit 3 to 6 schools a month and DOE visit schools every 3 months. According to the DOE the frequency of the IT monitoring should be every 3 months but was delayed to 6 months. POE / DOE have all the documentation that was provided to them by HI and schools. IT seem to report more regularly to POE than DOE. The content of the report is essentially the result of CwDs. According to the new orientation of the IT system, the monitoring of the system shall be done with the participation of DOE/POE and time to time SEO.

POE and DOE coordinated 2 to 3 times a month through 1) a technical meeting 2) Knowledge sharing meeting 3) ETL (Effective Teaching Learning) at the Cluster and 4) Evaluation, planning and monthly meeting. The main coordination is through the “sub committee” taking place every month at HI office (1 for education and one meeting for community) the 2 of them meet every 6 months.

The list of monitoring documents include (consulted) include:

Monitoring of Itinerant Teachers’ support to children with disabilities:
1) Questionnaire for caregivers of children with disabilities
2) Questionnaire for children with disabilities in school
3) Questionnaire for school directors
4) Questionnaire for mainstream teachers

Monitoring documents (in Khmer):
1) Monthly report to POE by HI (M. Sophal)
2) Monthly report on data on children with disabilities to POE
3) Monthly report of IT to Cluster school (monthly)

These monitoring tools were produced with HI support and approved by POE/DOE approval.

**Tool to be develop to measure impact of knowledge transmission session**\(^\text{21}\)

**Formal support for mainstream teachers**

- IT will organize formal meeting with the teachers working with children with disabilities.
  - Meeting could be individual meeting (IT + one teacher)
  - Meeting could be thematic meeting (IT + several teachers)
  - Meeting could be the opportunity to invite external professional (IT + several teachers + external service)

\(^{20}\) Headmasters also mention a co-responsibility from the school headmasters and the school cluster director.

\(^{21}\) This information is extracted from the work document on IT system by HI Technical Advisor, Sandrine Bouille. This paper is a tentative of definition of the IT system and how it should be organized, implemented and monitored for the new school year 2011-2012.
a) Individual meeting

- Give the opportunity to mainstream teacher & IT to discuss the situation of a particular child
- Give the opportunity to mainstream teacher & IT to prepare Individual Education Plan
- Give the opportunity to mainstream teacher & IT to prepare inclusive activities

b) Group meeting

- Give the opportunity to several teachers and IT facing similar difficulties with children with disabilities to discuss
- Give the opportunity to several teachers and IT to work together on needs identified: development of material, lessons plan, classroom management, etc.

c) Group meeting with external support

- If needed some external support could be requested to provide information and knowledge on specific topics: children with intellectual, hearing or seeing disabilities, children with social difficulties
- If needed some external support could be requested to facilitate discussion with teachers and IT on specific topics

Some project tools are missing in order to improve the internal monitoring:

- IT weekly planning
- IT individual report per child
- Monitoring tool to supervise the dissemination of trainings to their colleagues by mainstream teachers having follow trainings
- Monitoring tool of the inclusion and participation of children with disabilities in the social and educational school environment
- Monitoring tool of the perceptions and attitudes of children without disabilities who have peers with disabilities in their classes.
- ...

SEO monitoring

There are 3 departments in charge of the follow up of IE; SEO is in charge of primary education and collaborates with the Department of School and the pre-School Department (Early Childhood). The 3 departments work together (3 people - up to 5 ; 3 people from SEO can be mobilized) for Inclusive schools monitoring over 3 provinces (6 out of 15 schools in Battambang), others are in Kampot (1 school) and 2 schools in Takeo. In Cambodia, SEO has trained 30% of mainstream teachers at district level on IE (early & primary schools but not yet secondary schools).

Monitoring tools used by SEO are finalized but not validated yet by the MOEYS (Cf. Annex 7 a copy of the analysis). They are based on the Six Indicators of Good Quality Inclusive Education which are: 1. Providing appropriate supports 2. Placing children in age-appropriate settings 3. Having a few
children with disabilities in one classroom 4. Ensuring the participation of children with disabilities in all activities 5. Collaboration between teachers and families 6. Training teachers to work with children with disabilities

SEO monitoring does not cover the IT system elements. A collaboration with SEO on this would be profitable as according to M. Suren, Vice-Director of SEO if the IT system is sustainable, SEO should be responsible for its monitoring.
VII. How much does an IT cost?

ITs are recruited by the MOEYS and their full salary is covered by the Cambodian Government. Under the pilot project, additional costs are covered by Handicap International. The total cost for 4 ITs for one year is 6000 USD. The cost is split between incentives and fuel & fuel allowance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST OF AN IT PER YEAR</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives 22</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monthly fuel and food allowance</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above running costs, should be considered:
- Means of transportation of the Itinerant teachers (Motorbike & helmet)
- Training costs

The activities of the IT also have a cost, even modest:
- Awareness event in class and communities
- Small class material would be helpful like paper, clay, color pens or cell tape for example.

In the poorest school visited, the teacher brought pens, slate & chalk for children having none. Some of the children interviewed had never draw and color before and could hardly hold a color pen and needed a model to reproduce.

---

22 Average of the 4 ITs; promotions are based on seniority.
In order for the position of the ITs to be sustainable, it is necessary to integrate these costs into the POE budget. To this purpose, it might be necessary to involve other relevant department such as the planning and budget section, the Governor and parliament for instance.
VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE ITINERANT TEACHERS SYSTEM IN BATTAMBANG, CAMBODIA
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</tr>
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<td>Inclusion of children with disabilities in class</td>
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</table>

1. **General recommendations**

**Project structural weaknesses**

First the number of IT seems insufficient to ensure a real follow up of 200 children, i.e. more than 40 per IT. To compare, in France at La Malgrange\(^{23}\), a supervisor in charge of following children with disabilities in mainstream schools (close to ITs’ role) follows an average of 20 children. In addition, one person is responsible of a limited number of grades.

⇒ Recommendation # 1: A reasonable maximum of children to follow up should be defined. POE estimates that 5 to 10 children supported by an IT would be a reasonable number, IT consider they could follow 20 children.

The project second weakness is to rely on these 4 people to ensure the large variety of activities described in the IT profile. According to their profile IT are social worker (working with families) and Itinerant teachers (working with teachers and children). This explains partly\(^{24}\) the developments of the pilot project in phase 1 when IT concentrated on home support. ITs are aware of the shift but the mainstream teachers have not yet taken responsibilities for the teaching of children with disabilities and consider it is the IT’s role.

⇒ Recommendation # 2: Precise the profile of IT and reinforce IT capacities to support teachers with more teaching technics and adapted material.

---

\(^{23}\) La Malgrange is a leading institution in France of specialized and inclusive education of children with hearing impairment [http://www.social.nancy.fr/pagint/fiche.php?cid=378](http://www.social.nancy.fr/pagint/fiche.php?cid=378) (Website in French language)

\(^{24}\) Another reason might be the negative perception of IT by mainstream teachers.
† Recommendation # 3: In a future project, have an additional IT in charge of social aspect and referral in each commune.

The shift from Home to school support is a positive reorientation and should be proceeded with. ITs support should be effectively reoriented towards mainstream teachers. There is yet a lesson learned from the positive impact on children confidence and perception by families of the home support.

† Recommendation # 4: Every IE project aiming at the inclusion of children with disabilities (school first access, with drop out history) school should have a phase 1 of home support to prepare them, the family and the school welcoming them. This can include for example training on orientation and mobility for children with visual impairment as well as awareness event on disability in class.

It would be interesting to reinforce the partnership with KT and other relevant NGO of the specialized education. In IE principles, special schools have vocation to become resource centres for regular schools (Partnership agreements). The networking with other relevant organization needs to be reinforced in order to ensure a proper learning process for children with disabilities. For instance children with sensorial disabilities requiring the learning of Braille, mobility & orientation or Khmer Sign Language need to be systematically referred to the schools of Krousar Thmey. Children who cannot / will not integrate / will drop out school should be referred to other organization for life skills, non-formal education or vocational training, such as Opération Enfants du Cambodge25 for example.

† Recommendation # 5: Reinforce networking and partnership with relevant NGOs and organisations.

The financial sustainability of the pilot project is an issue. One of the main obstacles is the cost of ITs (incentive and fuel). The legal formalization of documents (Eg. Mission of order) requires an institutionalized project approach which implies the lobbying and awareness raising to relevant departments in addition to the MOEYS. For the validation of a job profile which induce the provision of incentive, salary increase, etc. and Education department officials are not the final decision maker and need support to defend their propositions in the annual budget.

† Recommendation # 6: Involve other departments such as the Governor secretariat, planning section, budget and parliament to ensure the sustainability of the IT position.

In general, the pilot project has taken a too big a step. The education system quality remains poor and there are little teaching skills available. Some basics are missing and hinder the potential impact of the pilot project.

**Difficulties specific to the context**

During the survey, several absences of teachers were observed and other reported. Some parents indicated that some teachers were absent 2 to 3 times a week. Another parents indicated that the teacher of his child missed every Friday morning. During visits, a school was observed closed before the official day.

“The teacher does not come to school to teach. The children come back home in the morning because the teacher did not come. All year, especially after raining, 2 or 3 times a week, the children stay home.” A father in Tep Piroun

Reasons for absence are varied but many teachers have a second activity to complete their salary. Besides, it was observed that no measures were taken by the Headmaster in the absence of the teacher; children would remain unattended.

⇒ Recommendation # 7: POE/DOE need to ensure a closer monitoring of teachers’ presence. School Headmaster need to be sensitized to the loss for children loosing countless hours of teaching. In case a teacher is not present, a school staff should take the class in charge.

This point will be further developed in the recommendations on training but the quality of teaching in general is low. Teachers have no lesson plan, lack of class management; do not use the Teacher Advise Form, etc.

⇒ Recommendation # 8: General teaching skills are a training priority over any specialized training.

Out of 16 families interviewed about the class repetition history of their child, 5 declared no class repetition, 3 declared that the child repeated 1 class and 8 declared several class repetition (the maximum class repetition being 7 times)

⇒ Recommendation # 9: It is urgent to sensitize teachers & headmasters on the issue of class repetition.

⇒ Recommendation # 10: (Re)sensitize headmaster to accessibility issue and general school environment (Eg. Class setting, simple low cost adaptations like lowering the blackboard, motorbikes in the alley in front of the ramps...).

During the survey it was observed that many children presented signs of malnutrition. It appears that in Cambodia, « more than half of children under 5 years old (especially in rural area) present signs of malnutrition which can significantly affect their growing as well as their cerebral and psychomotor development »26.

⇒ Recommendation # 11: In a future project, it would be necessary to come back to the basics of Inclusive Education and Disability prevention and include a nutrition component in the project.

The replicability of the project at this stage cannot be considered. Nevertheless some positive impacts can be seen. The great majority of the children visited had benefited from this project and were happy at school. Education programming cannot be limited to 5 or 10 years. M. Suren, SEO Vice Director appreciated the study visit to Vietnam which enabled him to foresee what IE can be when IE is governmentally leaded and embedded. He said he is not pessimistic. He believed as he was told in

Vietnam that “the situation in Cambodia is the same than 15 years ago in Vietnam”. Competences were build and government approval obtained, it is important to build on these efforts.

Recommendation # 12: As the sustainability is not acquired. It is necessary to save the gain of the project and plan several scenarii for future according to funds.

2. Administration and financial recommendations

a) Short term recommendations

The Terms of Reference (ToR) of IT are too vague and cover too many “professions” requiring a scope of skills too large for a single person. IT are required to act as school assistant (AVS in French) for children, teachers trainers, Inclusive Education focal point for schools, social workers, coordinator of the various stakeholders, etc.

Recommendation # 13: The ToR of IT need to be reviewed and expectation reduced and split in either support academic, either social. It does not mean that IT should not have contacts with the family but simply that they cannot ensure a social follow up.

There was a request from the IT to obtain the same per diem than other participants when they are requested to go outside of the usual work place.

b) Longer term recommendations

ITs have a heavy workload; they work 6 days a week, morning & afternoon. No maximum travel / training days per year are defined.

Recommendation # 14: In a future project, these administrative and financial elements should be clearly defined. Ideally an incentive / promotion reflecting the additional competencies of IT should be budgeted.

Recommendation # 15: IT indicated that covering all 6 grades was difficult. In a future project, the repartition of the grades among the ITs could reduce the difficulty.

Identification is not an activity covered by IT at the moment and no awareness with community is done but informal information given by some ITs. Besides, when asked, teachers said they “did not need to identify children in their class (with the Identification tool from the MOEYS) as their children had no problem obviously”.

Recommendation # 16: Organize awareness activities and use this opportunity to try to identify new out of school children in order to promote and increase access to education for children with disabilities.

---

27 The consultant is not in position to judge the fairness of this request but mention it.
Recommendation # 17: Insist with mainstream teachers on the importance of early identification and their central role in it as they are in a unique position to observe children hardly seeing the board or not answering to their name for example.

Recommendation # 18: All children should be properly assessed before the end of the project. Dubious cases should be verified.

Some assumptions on children capacities are also dubious. On little girl, Nary, did a lotto and had to match animals and objects cards together with name cards. At the same time, the consultant was told she could not read and write. If the child can identify the words and recognize the words, she probably is able to read as well.

The main issue for the sustainability of the IT position is the financial sustainability. In order to ensure the activities of the IT the source of financing of the fuel and incentive at the end of the project should be anticipated.

Recommendation # 19: IT profile should be validated by the MOEYS with the support of POE / DOE. It is necessary to identify precisely the relevant departments to involve in order to obtain a formal agreement. At National level, the support from M. Suren could help supporting the request.

3. Internal management recommendations

The Flow chart established in part VI, based on the survey responses, is very imprecise. When responsibilities are shared among everyone, they are unclear. Consultations are possible with other stakeholders but some responsibilities cannot be shared.

a) Short term recommendations

Recommendation # 20: A clear definition of responsibilities needs to be established, indicating who the final decision maker is (and what the proper criteria are) for:

- Child support selection
- Teacher support selection
- Support provided to mainstream teacher
- Support provided to families
- Awareness raising event in class

Recommendation # 21: Have a flexible but coherent minima and maxima of children to follow every month. For example: IT should supervise at least 1 time every child in every school every month.

Recommendation # 22: IT should have weekly planning of their visits to school and inform schools in advance of their visit. The modality of planning distribution should be discussed. This would also allow Headmaster to inform the authorities of an IT absence and ensure a proper supervision.
Recommendation # 23: IT should prepare 1 report per child. Format should be designed and approved) in order to have a coherent and accessible follow up of each child.

Recommendation # 24: Each coordination meeting should have a clear agenda prepared by local authorities.

Recommendation # 25: The objectives of transmission meeting should be clarified. The meeting minute’s format should allow that no important information on children are missed or forgotten. The final section of the meeting minutes should have a section “Actions for follow up” with a name and a date.

Recommendation # 26: Precise the content of the liaison book of teachers. Which information on the children progress should there be.

b) Longer term recommendations

Recommendation # 27: Train IT, CO and self-help group on the proper use of the directory of linkages for referral.

Recommendation # 28: In a future project, establish partnership between mainstream schools and specialized schools acting as a resource center.

Recommendation # 29: Ensure that children have a portfolio they keep home in order to know actions and avoid cases like the one of child, Vit Viet, whose case was not properly followed because he participated to a previous project with HI and wen tot lower secondary school but stopped and came back to primary school and appeared as a “new entrance”.

Recommendation # 30: A real coordination needs to be thought with SEO regarding the monitoring. As their monitoring tool is still at draft stage, it would be interesting to see how the monitoring aspect of ITs work could be integrated into their tool. If it is not possible, work on a tool together with SEO. If not with SEO, the IT monitoring should ideally be integrated in the usual monitoring tools used by the government (mainstream teacher supervision, school supervision). This would ensure the monitoring is actually done. A selection of criteria should be done by IEP Team and presented with the same format that evaluator are used to work with.

Recommendation # 31: POE/DOE and relevant stakeholders should be trained to new monitoring tools.

4. Skills development recommendations

HI has been the main source of identification and provision of the IT learning needs. Trainings were provided by available resources in Cambodia (to the exception of EENET) like CARITAS, TPO, SEO, Rabbit school, etc.

a) Short term recommendations
Recommendation # 32: A list of main skills and trainings necessary to train an IT should be established and kept at POE / DOE and Cluster schools levels. The training material obtain during the project should be kept, organized and re-used for future trainings. A little library (a few shelves) in POE/DOE should contain all training material, a copy of tools created during ETL meetings, Reference documents of the SEO, Child-Friendly school manual. In addition, a copy of new relevant information from Internet or stakeholders should be shared with Cluster schools.

There is a focus among ITs and mainstream teachers on specialized trainings. Initiation to Braille and Sign Language is interesting for awareness but as a language to master it requires years of practice. To ensure these services are available to children, partnerships between schools and specialized organizations should be established.

Recommendation # 33: Focus of trainings shall be on lesson plan, class management, individualized pedagogy, Individual Education Plan (Cf. Annex 2 Teacher Advice Form) and creation of teaching and learning material with school environment.

Recommendation # 34: For the time of the project, it is interesting for IT to design a small leaflet with a selection of vocabulary regularly used by teachers translated in SL and train mainstream teachers to it and have a copy of the alphabet in Braille.

Recommendation # 35: Simple training on prevention of disability (hand washing, sore eyes, malnutrition, etc.) could be useful as well as basis on epilepsy and first aid during awareness sessions.

The sources of information (library, Internet connections, etc.) are not numerous in rural areas. ITs themselves refer mainly to their training document, SEO documents and child-Friendly school manuals. ITs look occasionally for additional information on Internet.

Recommendation # 36: In addition to the ETL meeting, IT could organize best practices exchange meetings between teachers of the same school (and neighbor schools) to exchange experience, resources, material created and discuss faced issue every month.

b) Longer term recommendations

Training is a continuous activity.

Recommendation # 37: Plan for 3 to 5 years to ensure a change of practice

The trainings received by IT have several weaknesses. They are short time and not practical enough. Practical training include practices in class with good inclusive teachers for several days on several months duration.

Recommendation # 38: Next trainings should be practical and have immersion sessions in 3 phases i) Trainees observe a new practice ii) Trainees do with the trained teacher iii) Trainees do and are observed by the trained teacher.

5. IT outputs recommendations
a) Short term recommendations

According to local authorities, the monitoring of the IT is covered by the same supervisors than mainstream teachers. Their activities are monitored on a monthly basis through coordination meeting. The focus during the coordination meeting is the data of children with disabilities. The monitoring of changes in knowledge, skills and attitudes of ITs and mainstream teachers is not covered.

⇒ Recommendation # 39: A specific tool should be developed to monitor ITs as their range of activities and skills differs from mainstream teachers. The KAP survey used during the survey on IT system can be used as a basis. Besides, regular monitoring on field is required.

Class observation indicated also that the understanding of children with disabilities ‘capacities to follow the class, with support, remain unclear for several teachers. Some methods were misused by mainstream teachers. For example, a child with visual impairment would draw in class during the grammar lesson. There is no specific reason why this child should not follow the grammar class too. Her listening capacities should be used and bigger print should support her reading.

⇒ Recommendation # 40: ITs shall monitor the impact in class of trainings given to mainstream teachers. Practices are not changed overnight and new learning needs to be experimented.

⇒ Recommendation # 41: Monitor the training dissemination in schools.

The SEO monitoring of Quality Inclusive Schools (Cf. Annex x) based on the “Six Indicators of Good Quality Inclusive Education” does not cover all outputs. For example, indicator # 4 “Ensuring the participation of children with disabilities in all activities” is partly reflected in the classroom observation (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 6, 10) and school observation tools (Indicators 15, 18). The monitoring indicates that actions have been taken by the teacher but does not fully reflect the inclusion and participation of children with disabilities in the social and educational school environment.

⇒ Recommendation # 42: A specific tool should be developed to monitor the inclusion and participation of children with disabilities in the social and educational school environment

The perception and attitudes of children without disabilities is not monitored by the SEO, beside indicator 1 in classroom observation telling that the teacher is a role model. From the children’s interviews, most children with disabilities indicated being well included at school, having friends and enjoying school. A few suffered mockery and were given names “crazy”.

⇒ Recommendation # 43: A tool should be developed to monitor the perceptions and attitudes of children without disabilities who have peers with disabilities in their classes.

b) Longer term recommendations
One of the SEO role is “Follow up & monitoring of application of policies on the system of IE”\(^{28}\). The monitoring tools mentioned above are finalized but not validated by the Minister yet. IT monitoring should fall under the responsibility of the SEO. M. Suren indicated it could be a problem for SEO to monitor the ITs if ITs are more trained technically than SEO. He recommended a mutual assistance and knowledge sharing.

6. **Participation of local authorities**

   a) **Short term recommendations**

   ⇒ Recommendation # 44: Local authorities should start to take the lead and ensure activities ensured by HI staff at the moment (planning distribution, meeting agenda preparation, reporting ...) with HI support to start with.

   b) **Longer term recommendations**

   ⇒ Recommendation # 45: The PEO/DOE and relevant stakeholders shall be trained to use monitoring tools.

7. **Participation of children with disabilities and their families**

   The participation of the families is one of the weakest points (Cf. part on the IT stakeholders). Among the families interviewed 37.5% had never met the IT, 18.75% had seen the IT only 1 time and another 18.75% had seen the IT 2 or 3 times in 2 years. Most of them declared they were not asked about their needs. The main reason of the visit of the IT is the absence of a child at school.

   ⇒ Recommendation # 46: The involvement of families really needs to be improved at every stage (identification involvement, consultation on support, link with school, monitoring).

   a) **Short term recommendations**

   ⇒ Recommendation # 47: Integrate interviews of parents in evaluation and monitoring tools with more open questions.

   ⇒ Recommendation # 48: Improve information given to parents regarding the project. Beneficiaries are often poorly informed about measures that concern them.

   b) **Longer term recommendations**

   One way to involve parents of children with disabilities in schools is to have them on board of the school committee. 100% of Headmasters interviewed on this point declared being favorable to this measure, 1 out of 5 indicated that one parent of children with disabilities was already member of the school committee.

\(^{28}\) The 5 roles of SEO are 1) Coordination of different projects working on IE 2) Regional visit to promote or improve knowledge on IE 3) Leadership, take initiative for policies establishment for IE 4) Report to National and international level on this work 5) Follow up & monitoring of application of policies on the system of IE.
Recommendation # 49: Negotiate with the schools to have at least one parent of a child with disability.

8. Inclusion of children with disabilities in class

Overall, children feel included at school and school & classroom have made adaptations. Many of the above recommendation can already support the improvement of the children inclusion in class.

a) Short term recommendations

- Recommendation # 50: Train mainstream teacher to IEP (and impose it by decree) and lesson plan.
- Recommendation # 51: Develop additional material and games
- Recommendation # 52: Ensure proper sitting of children with disabilities in classroom
- Recommendation # 53: Limit class repetition
- Recommendation # 54: Start awareness raising event in class shortly

b) Longer term recommendations

- Recommendation # 55: Ensure proper setting in classroom
- Recommendation # 56: Raise awareness of the Headmasters on possible improvements of their schools’ accessibility with no or little costs (Eg.: Blackboard repainting, lighting, floor cleaning, classroom decorating, etc.)
CONCLUSIONS

Structural issue and sustainability
The real issue is the sustainability of IT system in financial terms. Who will take in charge the incentive and fuel costs at the end of the project? M. Suren indicated that SEO tried to create a taskforce and involve the Governor in Battambang, like they observed in Vietnam but did not succeed. Local authorities need support to lobby at Provincial and National level of relevant government authorities in order to obtain the formalization of IT status. Maya Kalyanpur (FTI), recommended to engage also with non-formal department in order to increase IT role to access for out of school children.

Good initiative with reorientations given by Technical Advisor
According to Maya Kalyanpur from the FTI this project is « a very good initiative from HI, new, which was not implemented in Cambodia before ». Besides the project structural issues and some internal management improvement, the project had a positive impact on children’s education. The reorientations, main one being the refocus on school support, given by the Technical Advisor are going in the right direction. Efforts still need to be done on the internal management and monitoring. And the local authorities will be soon in position to take over some responsibilities in management and monitoring.

Relation HI and Cambodian authorities Local and national very good
POE/DOE and HI have good relationship and work efficiently together. M. Suren, Vice Director of the SEO is highly favorable to HI project continuation. He already asked for IT project to continue during the study visit to Vietnam and would love to see HI expanding its activities to other geographical area and to focus on IT and also other issue of IE. Furthermore, M. Suren would like to see a closer relationship between SEO and HI at National level. “Now with the politics of decentralization, HI works directly with POE and SEO is at National level, but it would be good to improve HI relationship with SEO at National level. The study visit in Vietnam is very good capacity building”.

Added value of this IE project
SEO representative has a good knowledge of the project. He appreciated in particular the creation of document for IT teachers. According to him, other organisations willing to work on IE can used HI documentation. M. Suren sees the added value of this project: “HI project is a very good project because it is a new initiative, pilot project. It is important because other initiative from KT are specific (integrated class), HI is less specific. The Government should use HI model to establish a global system including integrated classes”.

IE situation in Cambodia
According to Maya Kalyanpur, the situation of IE in Cambodia is positive. Children with disabilities have now a high profile at National level. Advocacy is needed to encourage the government to recognize that children with disabilities need to go to school and acknowledge the effort on screening, referral and training. “HI has a role to push for inclusion in national agenda.” The information is not confirmed yet but it seems that the SEO already submitted a proposal for GPE and hope for positive answer. Rumor says this is a 14 million USD funds.
Quotes from ITs:

“Inclusive Education is very important therefore we should disseminate very broadly to other districts in Battambang Province in order to reduce discrimination on children with disabilities and persons with disabilities”. Channly

“ITs can support all children with disabilities therefore we should sensitize very broadly in district around Battambang and other Provinces”. Sovann
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