



QUEEN RANIA TEACHER ACADEMY
أكاديمية الملكة رانيا لتدريب المعلمين

Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment Program (CISLE) Summative Evaluation

Prepared by

CONSULTUS for Development Consulting



The Study Team

Dr. Hassan Al Omari

Haddel Abu Shama

Maysoon Al A'alem

Rania Al Sweity

22nd of July, 2015

Contents

Abbreviations:.....	4
Executive Summary:	5
About the Program	7
Evaluation Purpose	8
Evaluation Audience	8
Evaluation Questions:.....	9
Evaluation Limitations:	9
Evaluation Methodology	9
Evaluation Results	11
First question: “To what extent did the program’s activities help teachers deliver inclusive education?”	11
Second Question: To what extent did the program’s activities help MCS develop dynamic community partnerships in the targeted areas and how did the level of partnerships change due to the program’s interventions?	19
Third Question: To what extent were the beneficiaries able to implement the new practices?.....	22
Recommendations	29
Appendixes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 1: Training Program Evaluation Questionnaire (Pedagogy - Psychosocial Education)	31
Appendix 2: Questions given to focus groups on the pedagogy and psychosocial program	35
Appendix 3: Training Program Questionnaire (Reading Clubs).....	37
Appendix 4: Questions to Focus Group discussions (Reading Clubs)	41
Appendix 5: Training Program Evaluation Questionnaire (Arabic Literacy Training)	43
Appendix 6: Questions to Focus Groups (Arabic Literacy Training)	47
Appendix 7: QRTA (CISLE) -Teacher’s Questionnaire	49
Appendix 8: QRTA (CISLE) - Feedback Form.....	53
Appendix 9: QRTA (CISLE) - Syrian students’ satisfaction with school environment questionnaire	56

Abbreviations:

QRTA :Queen Rania Teacher Academy

MOE: Ministry of Education

CISLE: Cultivating Inclusive & Supportive Learning Environments

USAID :United States Agency for International Development

MCS: Model Community Schools

CPSC: Community Parents Schools Collations

CoP: Communities of Practice

CBO: Community Based Organization

Executive Summary:

Queen Rania Teacher Academy (QRTA) implemented a twenty two months program “Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment” (CISLE) in cooperation with the Ministry of Education (MoE) to support MoE’s efforts in ensuring that all children– local residents and Syrian refugees – are afforded an equal opportunity to acquire a purposeful and meaningful education in a safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment. The program, supported by United States Agency for International Development (USAID), targets public schools which host Syrian refugees in the northern and central governorates and has four (4) objectives: enhancing the capacity of teachers to integrate and increase the participation of displaced refugee student’s in Jordan’s public schools, increasing local community awareness, responsibility, advocacy and participation in the target schools, promoting supportive and inclusive learning environments in Model Community Schools (MCS), strengthening Community-School Support Connections (CPSCs) through Lifelong Learning and Extra-Curricular Projects.

To accomplish these objectives, the program was divided into four phases: establishment, professional development, building MCS.s, gradual exit, and sustainability. The program was implemented in 348 public schools, including 20 that were selected as Community Schools and 60 neighboring schools to enable experience transfer, community of practice and reach out more beneficiaries. The program was implemented in two tracks: **First Track:** To build teachers capacities to promote safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment for displaced refugee students in Jordan’s public schools through psycho-social support and interactive pedagogy. **Second Track:** To create supportive and inclusive learning environments in Model Community Schools (MCS) by implementing: reading clubs, Arabic Literacy Training, and Community Parent School Coalition (CPSC), that aims to strengthen the partnership and mutual responsibility between the school and the community to enhance the inclusion of refugees in different activities.

This evaluation, conducted by the external evaluation team of CONSULTUS Company, is a summative evaluation of the program that used a mixed method approach in evaluation using both quantitative and qualitative data and a variety of evaluation tools (questionnaires, focus group discussions, open-ended questions and reports) to highlight the achieved results, to showcase the role of the activities under the program in building meaningful education in an inclusive and supportive environment and to apply the results of the program to other similar emergency environments. QRTA, USAID, and MoE will be provided with the results to be used if the program will be extended or to improve the implementation of any other future programs.

The quantitative and qualitative results clearly show that the program has been highly effective in building a safe, supportive, and inclusive learning environment. Mean results were good for all sub-activities within the two tracks of CISLE in public schools. The objectives of the **First Track** (Building teachers’ capacities to

promote safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment for displaced refugee students in Jordan's public schools through psycho-social support and interactive pedagogy) were 83% accomplished. Teachers' skills and application of the principles of this track has increased from 68% to 88%. The Majority of participants said that they greatly benefited from the program especially in the psychosocial side, where they confirmed that it helped them better engage the Syrian students and motivate group work. The satisfaction level of Syrian students with the school environment has increased from 71% to 80% and their satisfaction with teachers' support from 74% to 82%, while satisfaction with peers and colleagues from 71% to 76%. The pre survey results showed that 37% of teachers face problems dealing with psychological, behavioral and academic issues of Syrian refugees, while the percentage went down to 28% after the program interventions.

The objectives of the **Second Track**, Model Community schools, were also largely accomplished: reading clubs 89% and Arabic Literacy Training 74%. Teachers' skills increased from 67% to 87% in the Reading Club and from 59% to 82% in the Arabic Literacy Training. Most teachers stressed the importance of these two components in providing attractive learning environment and in establishing and maintaining an effective reading society, where students discuss and indulge in activities related to their readings. Reading clubs has increased the quality and quantity of students' extracurricular readings. Most participants said that the workshop helped them in motivating Jordanian and Syrian students to read more and to develop their handicraft skills. The results of the Community- Parent School Coalition (CPSC) component indicated that the local community, parents, teachers, and students are actually aware of the objectives of CPSC. This element helped in building positive relations: based on the values of cooperation, respect, and mutual responsibility; between the school and the community. The diverse activities helped to interactively engage different community groups and develop skill-sets in areas of project management, strategic planning and handicrafts. As for the sustainability of the (CPSC) activities, beneficiaries indicated that they mastered the skills they were trained on, yet the chance to sustain them needs QRTA continued support.

Recommendations marked that the activities of the program should start at the beginning of the school year in order to give ample time to implement the program's activities during the academic semester and to allow proper evaluation of the program success. Training workshops should consider teachers' experience as new teachers need a different training content comparing to the experienced teachers especially in pedagogy. Training hours should be increased, time for practical implementation should be provided during training and time between one training workshop and another should be extended to allow practical implementation in the field. Certain elements should be added to the workshops also such as conversation skills and dealing with learning difficulties. It is also advisable for QRTA trainers to provide demo implementation in the field to better understand the application challenges and to organize some supportive sessions that showcase some education problems through videos.

The establishment phase should also include a comprehensive vision of all the forms of coordination and cooperation needed between the Ministry and QRTA at all levels (administrative coordination, follow-ups, incentive schemes, and certificates of

recognition) and to be sorted out early enough before implementation. School cotillions on the other hand should be institutionally formed through MoE and within its legislations, systems and instructions, in a way that gives more to the members of the community committees. In addition, a good incentive scheme that motivates the targeted teachers and administrators should be devised. A Needs' Assessment Survey should be prepared to identify the infrastructure and the education environment the program needs before starting any activity and the establishment phase should also include a certain budget to solve any logistical problems in the school and to enable the implementation of activates. A comprehensive plan, with a clearly stated performance and evaluation methodology, should also be available, in line with the executive plan and linked to implementation tools and objectives.

About the Program

In response to the political crisis in Syria, the Government of Jordan and the Ministry of Education (MoE) have put several measures in place to support and accommodate the Syrian refugees, including allowing refugee children to enroll in Jordan's public schools. In relation to this, there is a pressing and dire need among Jordan's public schools to develop safe and supportive learning environment within the public school system. Therefore, QRTA has adopted the implementation of the CISLE program which is funded by the USAID to tackle such needs.

The program is divided into two main tracks, where the first track of the program utilizes a teacher training package and resource materials for a 30 - hour training program to build the capacity of teachers in delivering quality education to Syrian refugee students and local students. Building on the existing QRTA, UNESCO, MoE partnership, these training materials include elements of how teachers can offer psycho-social (PS) support, and utilize interactive teaching pedagogies, effective classroom management techniques and academic and behavioral assessment strategies to enhance students' engagement and promote safe, supportive, healthy and inclusive learning environments in schools. Teachers have been introduced to basic principles of child rights and protection against abuse and will be trained on how to detect early signs of psychosocial problems which will benefit Syrian and Jordanian students. The premise for the training is to ease the stress and tension which may exist in schools with significant refugee populations and provide skills for teachers to more successfully deliver inclusive education.

In addition to the psychosocial and interactive pedagogy training, the second track of the program incorporates, a two pronged approach to further enhance the capacity of teachers by cultivating Model Community Schools (MCSs) in 20 of the 200 schools from track one. The first strategy will integrate QRTA's Arabic Reading and Writing program by developing teachers' literacy training and language arts instruction to encourage Syrian students' engagement and participation in classroom activities. Reading clubs and literary activities centering on students' ability to express themselves freely will address the challenging behaviors of post trauma. The Arabic Reading and Writing program aim to build the capacity of generalist (Grades 1-3)

and Arabic Language teachers by introducing teachers to the most effective methodologies of teaching reading and writing skills to students. To promote the Arabic training program, the libraries in the MCSs will be enhanced with reading materials and resources that focus on Arab culture and identity as inclusive and supportive elements uniting Jordanian and Syrian students in the schools. Furthermore, Reading Clubs will be established in all the MCSs as essential components to promote authentic reading and expressive writing to enhance student engagement in the classroom as well as confront persistent challenging behavioral problems. Reading and writing activities are recognized as effective interventions involving children in learning tasks that help them to internalize basic concepts, values and skills necessary for their intellectual, emotional and social growth.

The second strategy incorporates QRTA's partnership with 20 Community-Parent School Coalitions (CPSCs) in the 20 MCS over the course of the project. In order to create an improved learning environment, integrate Syrians into the Jordanian school system, and to support dialogue and peaceful coexistence between the host and Syrian refugee communities, QRTA will implement Community Mobilization for Participation in Schools (CMP) program in the 20 MCS. The program will establish Community-Parent School Coalitions in order to mobilize communities and to create a sense of ownership and responsibility for community education, and serve as new models of community engagement. The program focuses on building dynamic community-school partnerships to support participatory approaches to education; create a sense of ownership and responsibility among all stakeholders within the schools hosting a large number of Syrian refugee students; and promote innovative and sustainable use of school space by staff, students, parents and community.

To extend the professional development activities to a larger community of schools, each MCS will be expected to carry out communities of practice (CoP) and outreach activities with three neighboring schools. The application of CoP will involve structured exchange of new experiences and classroom activities. Never the less, Students from neighboring schools will also be invited to use the MCS library and to participate in the Reading Club activities.

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the results achieved by the project, and assess the extent to which the program's activities contributed to ensure that all children – local residents and Syrian refugees – are afforded an equal opportunity to acquire a purposeful and meaningful education in a safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment.

Evaluation Audience

The results of this evaluation will be used QRTA to enhance future implementation of Education in Emergency interventions as well as providing USAID and MoE with the results achieved.

Evaluation Questions:

This study was conducted to answer the following questions (set by donors and implementers):

1. To what extent did the program's activities help teachers to deliver inclusive education?
2. To what extent did the project's activities help MCS develop dynamic community partnerships in the targeted areas and how did the level of partnerships change due to the program's interventions?
3. To what extent were the beneficiaries able to implement the new practices?

Evaluation Limitations:

Results of the evaluation are limited to:

- Timing of the summative evaluation: the implementation of the program started in June during school summer holiday and as a result the program activities were not seen in practice.
- Existing evaluation tools developed and used by QRTA: although the existing tools were not designed to help answer the questions of the summative evaluation, the external evaluation team used some of the developed tools in some aspects to serve this evaluation study.
- Consistency and reliability of the tools built and used by QRTA: this summative evaluation relied on some available data and some notes were made on these tools regarding their structure and type of questions included.

Evaluation Methodology

a. Evaluation design: a combination of qualitative and quantitative research within Mixed Method Research Design was applied to this study. Creswell & Plano Clark model was used, in which all data (quantitative and qualitative) is used in explaining the results of the study, utilizing all data collected before, during or after the implementation of the program.

However, since this Summative Evaluation and the Outcomes-Based Evaluation were prepared after the full implementation of the program, raw quantitative and qualitative data in two categories were used:

First category: raw quantitative and qualitative data collected by QRTA during the implementation phase (workshop feedback questionnaires, pre and post teachers' surveys, pre and post Syrian students' satisfaction survey). In addition to quantitative and qualitative data\results from reports of external evaluators who were hired by QRTA to evaluate some components of the program after their implementation and during the period of the program; such as the pre and post Syrian students satisfaction baseline report and CPSC post assessment reports.

Second category: quantitative and qualitative data collected by the external evaluation team of CONSULTUS company who conducted this study. The team held focus group discussions to cross validate the data collected by QRTA team, in addition to collecting data in other areas that were not covered by QTRA including data related to the Arabic Literacy Training and reading clubs.

b. Evaluation Data and Tools: the evaluation results are based and categorized based on the above mentioned two categories:

- Data collected by the implementer QRTA:
 1. Data from the Teacher's Survey which was implemented before and after the implementation of the program. A random sample representing all targeted governorates was selected. The sample consisted of 9% of teachers targeted by the program (4164 teacher). The pre-survey sample consisted of 438 teachers: 351 female and 87 male. The post survey covered 400 teachers: 323 female and 77 male.
 2. Data resulting from implementing the Teacher's feedback form on the training program. A random sample representing all targeted governorates was selected. The sample consisted of 10% of the teachers targeted by the program (4164 teacher). The sample consisted of 423 teachers: 352 female and 71 male.
 3. Data resulting from the Syrian students' satisfaction survey which was implemented before and after the program. All surveys were used as a sample representing all targeted governorates. The pre surveys were 819 and the post surveys were 810.
 4. The data and results of QRTA reports and studies provided through external evaluators aimed to evaluate some components such as CPSC and to baseline some performance indicators such as the satisfaction level of Syrian students.
- Data collected by the external evaluation team of CONSULTUS:
 1. Data collected through a Multi-Dimensional Survey Tool (Appendix 1), which covered a sample of 90 teachers (69 female and 21 male), randomly selected from trained teachers. This tool is related to the accomplishment of the program's expected results, training workshops, the ability of teachers to apply the program before and after the training, the changes needed to enhance the program, the main challenges the program faced, and recommendations.
 2. Data collected through a tool (Appendix 3) covering a sample of 40% of librarians (total of 8: 6 female, 2 males) regarding their opinion on the reading clubs training and the extent of achieving its objectives.

3. Data collected through a tool (Appendix 5) covering a sample of 50% of Arabic teachers (total of 32: 21 female and 11 male) regarding their opinion on Arabic literacy training and the extent of achieving its objectives.
4. Data collected through Focus Groups of teachers, librarians, and Arabic Literacy training teachers; regarding their opinion on the training workshops, the ability of CISLE to create inclusive and supportive learning environment, understanding the psychosocial needs of Syrian students and ability to engage them, marking opportunities and challenges of the program, highlighting accomplishments, and any suggested recommendations. Tools are mentioned in Appendixes 2, 4, and 6. The sample sizes were the same as in items 1, 2, and 3 above (respectively).

Evaluation Results

Results will be listed according to the sequence of the evaluation questions. Each evaluation question will be answered according to the type and source of information used. Analysis and conclusions will be directly related to the designated information for easier reading and to simplify structure as much as possible.

First question: “To what extent did the program’s activities help teachers deliver inclusive education?”

The results of this question indicate the effectiveness of the first track of CISLE, Teachers professional development. Answering the question will be presented through the quantitative and qualitative sources data and information collected by the external evaluation team, CONSULTUS, through focus groups; and the data collected through the pre and post surveys conducted by QRTA throughout the program.

a. Quantitative and qualitative data and information collected by the external evaluation team, CONSULTUS, through focus groups

As a primary source of information on the program’s ability to build supportive and inclusive (environment (Psychosocial and Interactive Pedagogies), different samples (trained teachers) were randomly selected to be interviewed within focus groups. These samples covered all directorates to guarantee a good representation of all trained teachers. At the beginning of each focus-group session, a questionnaire was distributed to collect quantitative data on the goals of the training program, the training workshop, and the ability of participants to implement the program before and after the training. After that, one hour and a half focus group discussion took place, where CONSULTUS team asked certain pre-set questions. At the beginning of the focus group, members of the evaluation team introduced themselves clarified the discussion points and objectives were identified, and emphasized on the confidentiality and the importance of notes and opinions.

The external evaluation team of CONSULTUS conducted 6 focus group discussions with trained teachers from different directorates of MoE in the governorates of

Amman, Irbid, Mafraq, Jarash, Zarqa, Ajloun, Madaba, and Balqa. The sample consisted of 93 teachers representing the program and responding to the study tool of Appendix 1. Three dimensions were covered in the questionnaire: the extent to which the objectives of the program were accomplished, their opinion on the program and the trainers, and the change in their ability to implement the content of the program before and after training.

This was followed by a focus group that lasted for an hour and a half in which questions of Appendix 2 were asked. These questions relate to how the program developed the participants' ability to understand the psychosocial needs of the students and their ability to implement the activities and skills of learning and teaching. Question also helped in showing the effect the program had in the inclusion of Syrian students, the main challenges and recommendations.

The quantitative analysis of this data (table 1), showed that the mean results related to the objectives (ability to apply the main psychosocial aspects, ability to apply the 5E's of Constructive Approach to Learning, and ability to apply the principles of evaluation), reached to 4.18 or 83% (without gender differences), which are very good results. As for the satisfaction level of teachers with the training workshop, results show that it reached to 4.38 or 88% (without gender differences), as shown in the table below, which is also high. Table demonstrates that there are differences in the mean of all abilities targeted by the program before and after the training. It was higher after the training, which clearly proves the effectiveness of the program in enabling teachers better understand the academic and psychosocial needs of Jordanian and Syrian students, better include the Syrian students in the schools, support interactive learning in classroom, apply the enquiry teaching approach, contribute to building a safe and supportive school environment, and ability to resolve classroom conflicts and evaluate students' performance.

Table 1: Means of questionnaire items implemented during the focus group discussion related to psychosocial education (Total=90, M=21, F=69)

Domain		Domain		
Program Objectives	Mean (out of 5)	Ability to apply the content of the training	Mean before training (out of 5)	Mean after training (out of 5)
Ability to apply main aspects of psychosocial education	4.04	Ability to understand the academic needs of Syrian students	3.10	4.26
Knowledge of child's rights and protection	4.42	Ability to understand the psycho social needs of Syrian and Jordanian students	3.36	4.34
Ability to manage the classroom	4.55	Ability to Include Syrian students with Jordanians	3.10	4.27
Ability to use the	3.91	Ability to support	3.46	4.46

5E's		interactive learning in the classroom and to implement teaching by enquiry		
Ability to apply principles of Formative Assessment	3.96	Ability to contribute to building a safe and supportive learning environment	3.55	4.48
Total Mean	4.18	Ability to resolve conflicts	3.61	4.46
Total Females	4.19			
Total Males	4.17			
Training workshop		Ability to evaluate students	3.65	4.55
Clarity of workshop objectives	4.48	Mean of total domain	3.40	4.40
		Females Mean	3.41	4.46
		Males Mean	3.40	4.39
Achievement of workshop versus expectations	4.06			
Skills and expertise of trainers	4.47			
Trainers' communication and motivational skills	4.50			
* Mean of total domain	4.38			
Females Mean	4.20			
Males Mean	4.43			

* There are no statistical differences between the means of males and females in the three domains ($\alpha=0.05$)

Most participants in the focus groups said that the workshop helped them in understanding students' psychosocial needs, which in turn improved students' inclusion and reduced dropout. One participant said "*this training is one of the best supportive activities on the personal and educational level. It focused on the psychological side that we miss.*" However, some said that it was good for new teachers only and added nothing to the experienced ones, and that it was very idealistic and lacked realistic envisioning of what is really happening in the field.

On the psychosocial level, most participants said that the program helped them develop some important skills including communication skills, student empowerment, and ability to distinguish between right and wrong practices, conflict resolution, organizational skills, role distribution, tolerance and dealing with specific psychological issues among students.

On the teaching and learning level, most participants said that the program enabled them to deal with some teaching situations, though it was hard to apply the 5E's. It also helped in putting strategies into action, as one said: "*we knew the strategies, but now we know how to apply them.*" While another said: "*when the psychosocial*

pressure is decreased, the teacher can function and manage the classroom more effectively. The psychosocial improvements positively affected the teaching process.”. Some pointed out that the 5E’s raised students’ participation, increased role distribution and generally motivated distinguished Syrian students. It also helped students express themselves, showcased democracy, helped in dealing with individual differences and in discovering students’ creativity.

Some of the challenges participants faced included the timing of the training workshops which is after school’s hours , on another side, participants pointed out the difficulties of applying new strategies due to the large number of students, short classes’ duration, intensity of the curriculum and age group of the first 3 grades’ students the unsuitability of some strategies for application for grades 1-3), in addition to some administrative issues such as delays in receiving formal letters (MoE’s circulations) to the field.

Participants said that they had the opportunity to exchange experiences and initiate dialogues between each other’s. Transferring their best practices to colleagues in the same and neighboring schools, reducing dropout, dealing with conflicts, managing time, increasing inclusion, helping Syrian students to take part in school activities and discovering talents and creative sides were some of the main accomplishments teachers said the program helped them in reaching.

Most participants agreed on these recommendations: training should start with the beginning of the academic school year, implementation should take place right after the theoretical training, , consider training needs for newly hired and experienced teachers training period should be extended, more practice is needed, topics related to learning disabilities and students’ academic achievement should be added, better coordination between the ministry and the academy is needed (administrative cooperation, follow-up, incentive schemes, and certificates), and that trainers should provide applied lesson to assess real challenges on the ground. They said that the training process should also include substitute teachers and those who are concerned with Syrian students.

b- Results of QTRA Pre and Post Survey on Teachers

Pre and post surveys’ that were implemented by QRTA- results indicate that there is an increase in teachers’ ability to create a supportive and inclusive environment (psychosocial & interactive pedagogies training). Mean before the program was 3.46; while after the program 3.68. Table 2 shows the total mean and the different means before and after the training intervention for the entire sample disaggregated per gender.

Table 2: Total means and the items’ means before and after the program implementation implemented by QRTA

No.	Item	Pre-program mean N=400	Post program mean N=438

1	Understanding the refugee community	3.22	3.33
2	Realizing the benefits of supportive communication to Syrian students	3.11	3.38
3	Ability to manage behavior in the classroom	4.07	4.41
4	Knowledge of child rights and protection from violence and abuse	4.23	4.37
5	Ability to support an interactive classroom environment	4.07	4.24
6	Use of the 5E.s	2.52	3.18
7	Ability to indicate primary symptoms of psychosocial issues with the refugee students	3.43	3.68
8	Ability to enquire for primary symptoms of psychosocial issues	3.46	3.59
9	Ability to use alternatives to punishment	4.21	4.21
10	Ability to apply Formative Evaluation for students performance	3.67	4.03
11	Arabic writing skills among Syrian students	3.34	3.46
12	Your school participation in local community activities	4.03	4.03
13	Local community participation in school activities	3.76	3.88
14	Amount of extracurricular activities implemented by your school in cooperation with the local community	3.54	3.80
	*Means for males	3.41	3.58
	Means for females	3.49	3.73
	Total Means	3.46	3.68

* The sample size is 9% of the targeted group for the pre and post evaluation. The sample was randomly selected.

* There are no statistical differences between the means of males and females in the three items ($\alpha=0.05$)

The table shows that all items apparently increased after implementing the program and teachers improved their ability to create inclusive and supportive learning environment. Results show that the female sample achieved higher means than the male sample. However, we could not show if those differences are statically significant or not as we couldn't run T-Test for two compatible samples because the implementation of the pre and post surveys by QRTA was not applied to pairs.

As for the academic, behavioral, and psychological issues of the Syrian students, pre-survey results state that 37% of teachers face trouble dealing with these issues, while only 28% do after the program according to the post survey. The nature and type of these issues are detailed in Table 3 below, with the percentage of teachers facing them before and after the implementation of the program.

Table 3: Percentage of teachers facing challenges and issues resulting from Syrian asylum that limit the education process (before and after the program) (N=423)*.

No.	Item	Pre-	Post
-----	------	------	------

		program mean N=400	program mean N=438
1	Increase of the number of students in the classroom due to Syrian asylum	%36	%29
2	Student behavioral issues	%32	%24
3	Student emotional problems	%26	%19
4	Student academic problems	%27	%12
5	Teacher lack of understanding for the methods of supportive interactive learning environment	%20	%14
6	Teacher is not aware of the importance of the psychosocial culture and supportive communication for the refugee student	%19	%12
7	Teacher lacks understanding of Syrian refugee community in Jordan	16%	%7

* The sample size is 9% of the targeted group for the pre and post evaluation. The sample was randomly selected.

In answer to a question in the survey about the efforts teachers make to include Syrian students, 55% think they make these efforts before the program, while the percentage went down to 52 after the program. This indicates that the program, with its activities, follow-ups and interventions, helped teachers overcome obstacles and challenges, which in turn decreased the amount of efforts needed.

The participation level of students, whether Syrians or Jordanians, did not change before and after the program (Syrians: 2.87 before and 2.8 after, Jordanians: 2.0 before and 2.1 after). The means of Syrian students' participation is higher than that of Jordanian students because Syrian students are new and try to show more activity to prove themselves and to attract their teachers' attention.

The results pointed out a slight decrease in the percentage of teachers who make efforts to increase the classroom participation level (from 85% before the program to 82% after). This decrease means that the program helped in motivating students to participate without the extra push from teachers.

The training aimed to promote the psychosocial culture, support the inclusion of Syrian-refugee students, direct behavior and help understand refugee community, manage diversity, cultivate a supportive and safe environment, raise awareness on conflict management and define violence and abuse.

The program was evaluated using a tool designed by QRTA (Appendix 8). The results indicate that the total mean of teacher knowledge has increased (3.39 out of 4- 84.75%), as table 4 below shows.

Table 4: Total mean and means of different items for feedback form on QRTA training (N=423).

No.	Item	Mean
-----	------	------

1	Main components of the psychosocial culture and its role in the self-acceptance of the refugee student	3.72
2	Supportive communication and the role it plays in the self-acceptance of the refugee student	3.53
3	Main features of refugee community and how to manage difference with local community	3.46
4	Principles of behavior management	3.45
5	Principles and methods of building a caring, safe, healthy, and supportive environment, and related factors.	3.50
6	Types of violence and abuse child could face at school, and related factors.	3.43
7	Conflict management principles	3.32
8	enquiry teaching, the 5E's, and interactive learning methods	3.37
9	Principles of Formative and Behavioral evaluation.	3.34
	*Total Mean	3.38
	Mean for males	3.32
	Mean for females	3.39

* There are no statistical differences between the means of males and females in the three items ($\alpha=0.05$)

The teacher's ability to better understand the psychosocial needs of the student has increased as the table shows, which in turn led to better student inclusion. Item no. 1 has the highest mean (3.72 or 93%), while the lowest mean was in applying conflict management principles to the classroom and school with mean of (3.32 or %83). In general, the table shows that most items got percentages above 80%, which clearly indicates the effectiveness of the program in enhancing teachers' abilities, skills, and knowledge in dealing with Syrian refugee students in Jordanian public schools.

To examine the satisfaction level of the Syrian refugee student with the school environment, QRTA has commissioned an external evaluator to conduct a baseline study for student satisfaction. Post satisfaction surveys were also implemented by QRTA to the same sample in the baseline study after the implementation of the First Track (teachers' professional development, psychosocial and interactive learning). To compare the results of the pre and post satisfaction level among the Syrian refugee students, CONSULTUS external evaluation team utilized the available data and analyzed it to spot the change in the satisfaction level.

The selected sample covered 200 public schools in seven governorates in the middle and northern parts of the kingdom. 819 Syrian students from grades 2 to 12 were randomly selected from 32 different schools to answer a four-part questionnaire: general information, satisfaction level with school environment, satisfaction level with teachers' support and satisfaction level with peers (Appendix 9). A four point Likert Scale was used (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree). The validity and reliability of the tool was investigated before the tool application. The factor analysis of the results of the initial experimentation on the try out sample showed that 17 items (out of the total 18 items of the tool) are in fact loaded under

one factor, proving that it is a uni-dimensional tool. The reliability of the tool was investigated using Cronbach's (alpha) coefficient which reflects the internal consistency of the tool. The values extracted for the domains were (0.79; 0.82, 0.54), respectively, while the alpha coefficient for the tool was 0.88, which is a good reliability coefficient.

Table 5 shows that the means of students' satisfaction were close in three domains before the program (around 2 out of 5), and they were also close after the program in the three domains (around 3 out of 5).

Moreover, there is an increase in the satisfaction level after the program implementation as follows: satisfaction with teacher's support increased from 74% to 82%, with peers; 71% to 76%, and with school environment; 71% to 80%- highest with a 9% increase.

Table 5: Means of satisfaction level with school environment, teacher's support, and peers before and after the program

Domain	Before the program N=819		After the program N=810	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
School Environment	2.82 (71%)	0.59	3.21 80%	.60
Teacher's Support	2.96 (74%)	0.63	3.28 82%	.59
Relation with Peers	2.83 (71%)	0.58	3.07 76%	.53

The increase in the satisfaction level was not high relatively as it ranged from 5-9% only. This is because the satisfaction level before the program was already high and did not go below 70% in the three domains. QRTA pre study pointed out that this level of satisfaction is already high, and it will be hard to increase the satisfaction level under the tough socioeconomic circumstances that definitely affect the dynamics of the classroom and classmates' relations and behavior. However, the teacher in this case is the biggest change factor and therefore a recommendation is made to continue training the teachers to empower them and provide them with the skills needed to apply the methodologies and activities that help create a supportive and an equal- opportunity learning environment.

The post results show that the increase in satisfaction is below expectations. Reasons include the high pre-study satisfaction level which might be due to intervention of other projects since the beginning of the Syrian crisis, as stated earlier, and the over exaggeration of the teacher's role in satisfying the student as satisfaction factors require financial and logistical support. Therefore; the increase in the satisfaction level was minimal and came from individual efforts made by the teachers themselves without support from other entities. In addition, having to stay away from a war-torn home, a refugee feels bitter and uncomfortable, even if

surrounded with a supportive environment. Thus, it would be almost impossible to achieve higher satisfaction levels than these results with a sad refugee.

We can conclude from the above that the quantitative and qualitative data collected by CONSULTUS and QRTA clearly indicate the effectiveness of the First Track (teacher professional development) in Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment (CISLE). Mean for achieving the objectives of the First Track were high for pedagogy and psychosocial component (83%); at the same time, the level of targeted skills incredibly increased from 68% to 88%, despite many challenges. Results also show that the interventions of the program noticeably helped in decreasing the amount of problems and issues facing teachers due to the program's interventions. The Satisfaction level with the three measured domains (school environment, teacher support, and peers) has also improved with great effort. However, asylum and war in the home country will always hinder the satisfaction of a refugee.

Second Question: To what extent did the program's activities help MCS develop dynamic community partnerships in the targeted areas and how did the level of partnerships change due to the program's interventions?

To achieve an effective partnership between the school and the local community, the program implemented "Community Parents School Coalition" (CPSC) component where high concentration of Syrian Refugees exists. The program component was implemented for one year, 2014-2015 in six governorates in the middle and the northern parts of the kingdom (Amman, Irbid, Zarqa, Jerash, Ajloun, and Mafraq). CPSC component depends on the approach of community participation, whereby all the segments of the community work together to improve the school environment and help in the inclusion of Syrian refugee students in specific and Syrian communities in general. Shared responsibility towards education is also promoted in the targeted community through raising community awareness and capacity building of the local community, teachers, and students at targeted schools. CPSC component aims to build community partnerships that help in institutionalizing work in the targeted communities, in addition to creating a sense of ownership and shared responsibility towards the school; while strengthening the relationship between Syrians and Jordanians.

The program is based on establishing 20 MCSs at the previously mentioned governorates to encourage parents, schools, and local community members surrounding each MCS to strengthen the relationship between the Jordanian and the Syrian community. It also helps develop Communities of Practice to transfer knowledge and promote partnerships between each MCS and three neighboring schools.

Each MCS established a school coalition to reach to all community members surrounding it, through developing awareness programs that target Jordanian and Syrian students and their families; and through creating a sense of ownership and responsibility for all stakeholders inside the school and in the local community in general. The relationship between the MCS and the surrounding community is also

strengthened to implement sustainable learning and execute the extracurricular activities in each MCS, focusing on inclusion mechanisms.

The framework of “Community Parents School Coalitions” was designed in a way that encourages the participation of local communities, and builds the capacities of the local community through the participation of parents, teachers, students, and members of the local community in achieving certain shared goals.

Teachers, students, and community members were trained on each of the following: strategic planning, fundraising, media, homework villages and Income Generating Projects; in addition to training teachers to better understand students’ needs. After that, School coalition members developed a 6-month implementation plan and started to work on activities accordingly.

CONSULTUS evaluated the CPSC component through analyzing the qualitative report prepared by an external party hired by QRTA, to assess this component in accordance with the program’s plan. Evaluation was also carried out depending on the outcomes of the focus group discussions that were implemented by CONSULTUS evaluation team on samples representing trainees, reading clubs, and Arabic literacy training under the MCS track.

The external report of evaluating the CPSC component shows that the evaluation criteria are based on four main categories (effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and effect). Effectiveness refers to the degree to which the program was successful in achieving its desired results and the degree of clarity of vision and objectives that the program adopts with the targeted segments. Efficiency refers to implementing the program in the right manner throughout the phases of planning, organizing, monitoring, and follow-up. Sustainability refers to the ability to continue the program and to continue using the skills which were developed throughout the program. Effect is the program ability to make a change in the opinions and attitudes of the individuals targeted under the program.

The study relied on the Qualitative Approach to examine the program’s ability to achieve the desired goals through knowing participants’ opinions and the effect achieved by after they participated in the activities and the projects of the program. To achieve this, 23 focus group discussions were held that included representatives of the local community members, parents (men and women), teaching staff and administration members of community committees, and a number of students who took part in the program. 6 interviews were held with representatives of related Community Based Organizations (CBO.s) actively worked for the related component of the program, making sure that the study sample covered all related stakeholders who had a key role in the program.

By analyzing the report, we concluded that the objectives of the “Community Parents School Coalition” were clearly understood by the local community/parents and teachers and students. The program helped in building positive relationships between teachers / students and the local community/ parents based on the values of cooperation, respect, and shared responsibility between the school and the local community. In addition, the diverse activities succeeded in involving some local

community segments in different activities in an interactive and meaningful manner. Most participants said that they were able to make small projects through the planning skills they gained for that side. Discussions with participants also revealed that they were able to gain the skills they were trained on through their participation in Community Committees. This was made clear by referring to a number of projects that they applied in addition to strengthening the cognitive skills of some of them in topics related to communication, interaction, fundraising, and small-project management.

On the level of efficiency and action mechanisms, results showed that the preparation phase well-fitted the program's objectives, and that the training program helped develop teachers' skills in areas related to project management, strategic planning, and handicraft.

As for the sustainability of the CISLE program and the extent to which the community can continue to carry the components of CISLE, it has been found that the beneficiaries gained the needed skills through training, however, there is a weak chance for sustainability, since many confirmed that in order to keep performing the activities of the program, the Academy's support is needed.

On the effect side, teachers declared that the program made positive changes, especially on the level of their relationship with one another. It also increased the awareness regarding the importance of community members' participation in school activities, through the different types of support that community members give to improve the whole community.

As for the most significant recommendations, the report included a number of recommendations including the need to activate the role of the local community/parents and students, in cooperation with the teaching staff and administration members, through community committees overseen by QRTA and continuing to implement CPSC component. However, the positive results still in fact need support and development to guarantee their sustainability. In addition, CPSCs should be implemented within MoE's institutional and legal framework. MoE should issue legislations and systems that give wider authorities to the members of the community committees. An incentive scheme that motivates the teaching staff and administration members, and takes their interests into consideration, should also be designed. Programs to build self-confidence and other life-skills should be developed to make larger positive effects on change in the community. The program should better stress and clearly encourage knowledge and experience transfer among all public and private schools through designating specially designed activities.

Focus group discussions held by the evaluation team of this study marked a noticeable change in the relationship between the school and the local community. The activities and events of the program helped develop this relationship and improve the partnership with the local community. More parents were visiting the school where more events were taking place (open days, sports events, and art, food and agriculture activities). Some schools received huge financial and moral support from community individuals through community committees formed for this

program; while some schools reported that the program didn't largely improve their partnership between the school and the local community.

Accordingly, we can conclude that the "CPSC" component helped in achieving a good level of partnership between schools and local community including Syrian community. There also were some good practices that really deserve recognition and could create a small beginning for future experiences, taking into consideration that the fruits and returns of this program could be better seen on the long run. The relatively short period of implementation in addition to the existing legal and legislative challenges that need solutions limit the work of community committees, especially that these committees function outside official-working hours, and require legal coverage to collect in-kind and cash donations.

Third Question: To what extent were the beneficiaries able to implement the new practices?

1. Reading Clubs Component

The external evaluation team from CONSULTUS conducted a focus group discussion with a group of librarians (8 librarians comprising 40%) who were trained on Reading Clubs representing the governorates of Amman, Irbid, Mafraq, Jerash, Zarqa, and Ajloun. Participants answered a questionnaire specially designed for this study (Appendix 3), that had three dimensions (the first on the extent to which the objectives of the program that they were trained on were achieved, and the second on their opinion regarding the training program and the trainers, and the third on the change in their ability to apply and put into practice the domains before and after the program). Following this, a one hour-and-a half session was conducted and questions (in Appendix 4) were asked. Questions were related to how the program developed their ability to increase Jordanian and Syrian students' motivation to read and increased students' love for books, how did the program help librarians build and sustain effective reading communities that run discussions and hold activities related to the books they read, and how did the program help break the psychosocial barriers between the Jordanian and Syrian students to reach to better tolerance and acceptance, in addition to some of the challenges that limited the implementation of the program and the main recommendations they propose.

The quantitative data related to the questionnaire (table 6) implemented by the external evaluation team of CONSULTUS on Librarians (Reading Clubs), indicated that the training program achieved its objectives for students (the first three items in the table), which were represented in the program's ability to (encourage reading and the love for books, ability to encourage team and cooperative work and ability to break psychosocial barriers between students) which achieved a mean of 4.45 (89%). They also highlighted the fact that the training program was effective since it accomplished a mean of 4.21 (84%) in the items of (the clarity of the workshop objectives, the degree to which the workshop objectives were achieved, the degree to which the trainers possessed the needed training skills and the cognitive experience related to the topics of the workshop, and the degree to which trainers were able to communicate and motivate participants). Results also show that there are

differences in the means before and after the training in the items related to the ability to execute the content of the training program, since all means were higher after the training. The results of the T-Test conducted to examine the differences between the total means before and after the training (3.36 and 4.43 respectively), also pointed out a significant statistical difference between the two means in favor of the post training, which proves that the program was able to make a positive change in the role of librarians.

Table 6: Means for the questionnaire items answered by the librarians during the focus group session, related to the objectives and role of Reading Clubs. (Total=8, M=2, F=6)

Domain		No.	Domain		
Program Objective	Mean		Ability to apply the content of the program	Mean before training (out of 5)	Mean after training (out of 5)
Encourages reading and the love for books	4.50	1	Ability to motivate students to read	2.88	4.50
Encourages team and cooperative work	4.50	2	Ability to encourage students choose the right book	3.75	4.50
Breaks psychosocial barriers	4.38	3	Ability to help students understand the elements of the story	3.25	4.75
Mean of total domain	4.45	4	Ability to help students imagine the events and characters of the story	3.50	4.62
Males mean	4.50				
Females mean	4.44				
The training workshop		5	Ability to help students identify the main events and characters of the story	3.50	4.38
The clarity of the workshop objectives	4.25	6	Ability to help students imagine main characters	3.50	4.25
Achieving workshop objectives compared to expectations	3.88	7	Ability to help students re-order information in the story	3.13	4.00
Trainer possesses the needed training skills and the cognitive knowledge related to the topics of the workshop	4.37	8	Ability to help students understand what they read	3.38	4.38
Trainers' ability to	4.37	9	Ability to help	3.38	4.50

communicate and motivate participants			students re-tell the story		
Mean of total domain	4.21	10	Ability to create an atmosphere that encourages discussion and knowledge exchange	4.62	3.50
Males mean Females mean	2.77 4.29	11	Ability to distinguish between truth and opinion	4.25	3.25
			Mean of total domain	4.43	4.43
			Males mean	4.45	4.45
			Females mean	4.42	4.42

* There are statistical differences in the training workshop field in favor of females ($\alpha=0.05$), which means that females are more satisfied with the program than males.

As for the focus group discussion with the librarians, most participants said that the workshop was useful since it developed teachers' ability to improve the reading and writing level of students through training on story writing and reading, analyzing (breaking down) the story elements through drawings, character role playing (acting), and doing some activities like making masks and puppets. The workshop also contributed to breaking the ice between students and to motivating students to read and gain more knowledge through books.

Most participants pointed out that the workshop enhanced their abilities to motivate the Jordanian and Syrian students to read and to love books. It was also useful to their ability to direct students to do activities, read, gain handicraft skills, and run dialogue and discussions. Someone said: *"I started to make dialogues with the students the same way Arabic teachers do, and I started to make use of other workshops; such as linking the Arabic Literacy Training to the reading club"*.

Regarding the way the component contributed to helping Librarians establish and sustain an effective reading community that runs dialogues and performs activities related to the books students read; most participants said that the component encouraged them to read the books provided by the Academy and to bring books from outside. Students started to come to the library to study and discuss the content of their textbooks. In addition, a number of curriculum activities were applied on the students of the reading club during the "Independence Day". "Library classes, where teachers give classes in the library, were also organized to utilize the sources available at the library and to break the classroom routine." "Starting a puppet theatre boosted teaching through acting and role-playing".

Most participants stressed the importance of the program in developing their ability in breaking the psychosocial barriers between Jordanian and Syrian students; towards achieving tolerance and acceptance, through dialogue, communication, encouragement of group work, and discovering some talented students after having dialogues with them.

As for the contribution of the component in increasing the partnership between the school and the community, the program did not largely help in increasing the level of partnership between the school and the local community. However, there was a limited participation from some mothers who attended the reading club with their daughters, some humble prize-donations to encourage female students, and some fans for the library at one school only.

Main challenges that faced participants while implementing the program were mostly due to female students attending reading clubs at male schools or vice versa. Some female participants said: “*some male students need to behave and they caused troubles*”. In addition, the activities of the reading club were conducted after school hours and that the distance between homes and schools in some areas is long. Lack of legal coverage for the teacher and the student to do activities after school hours posed a real challenge as well. The high turnover in school principals, and having to deal with some cooperative and other uncooperative principals did also affect the program. Some participants pointed out that the duration of the training was insufficient and that “one day” was not enough to work on the activities that would need more time communicate and cover the courses. Infrastructure challenges included the limited sources, the small space and the poor equipment of libraries.

As for the achievements made by the participants in the Reading Clubs, most participants indicated the establishing the reading clubs is a major achievement in addition to enhancing students’ desire to visit the library, attend the puppet theater and increasing the chances of cooperation between different schools.

In recommendations, most participants agreed that a larger number of schools should be included in the program, the program should be sustainable and supported by QRTA, the reading club should be within the official school hours, MoE should give better attention to the libraries and their sources in a way that supports reading clubs, incentives, motivation and Certificates of Appreciation should be granted to students who participate in the reading clubs, reading clubs should not be limited to MCS.s, reading clubs at female schools should be for females only, and those at male schools should be for males only.

2. Arabic Literacy Component

The external evaluation team from CONSULTUS Company conducted 4 focus group discussions with the concerned Arabic teachers representing the involved educational directorates for the governorates of Amman, Irbid, Mafraq, and Jerash. The sample consisted of 32 teachers (males and females) who responded to the study tool in Appendix 5. The tool covered three dimensions (the first on the extent to which the goals of the program that they were trained on were in fact achieved, the second on their opinion regarding the training program and the trainers, and the third on the change in their ability to apply and put into practice before and after the program). Following this, an interview that lasted for an hour-and-a half was conducted and questions (in Appendix 6) were asked. Questions were related to the way the program developed participants’ ability to motivate Jordanian and Syrian students to reading and writing fiction and non-fiction, and the way the program helped in improving the quality and quantity of students’ extracurricular reading, in

addition program implementation challenges and the main recommendations participants suggest.

The quantitative data related to the questionnaire (Table 7) marked that the program achieved its objectives with the students from the point of view of teachers (the first eight items), scoring a mean of 3.70 (74%). It also showed that the training program was effective and achieved a mean of (4.49), (89%) in the items related to the clarity of the workshop objectives, the degree to which the objectives of the workshop were achieved, the degree to which the trainers possessed the needed training skills and the cognitive experience related to the topics of the workshop, and the degree to which trainers were able to communicate and motivate participants. Results also show that there are differences in the means before and after the training in the items and the whole domain related to the ability to implement the content of the training program, in favor of the post-training means for all items. The results of the T-Test, to examine the differences between the total means before and after the training for two connected samples (2.95 and 4.13 respectively), also pointed out a statistically indicative difference on the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the two total means, in favor of the post-training mean, which proves that the program was able to make a positive change in the role of the Arabic teachers.

Table 7: Means for the items of the questionnaire answered by the Arabic Teachers during the focus group discussion, related to the objectives and the role of Arabic Literacy. (Total=32, M=11, F=21)

Domain		No	Domain		
Program Objective	Mean		Ability to apply the content of the program	Mean before training (out of 5)	Mean after training (out of 5)
Fiction and non-fiction reading	3.84	1	Use of strategies that engage students in reading	2.96	4.28
Fiction and non-fiction reading	3.78	2	Use of strategies that engage students in writing	2.84	4.34
Fiction writing	3.68	3	Planning mini-lessons	2.84	4.37
Non-fiction writing	4.03	4	Satisfying students different learning need and giving appropriate feedback	3.53	4.46
Article writing to express opinion and support it with appropriate evidence	4.12	5	Establishing professional communities of practice at the school level to work as a team in teaching and supporting reading skills	2.78	3.78
Development of students' positive trends towards reading	3.43	6	Supporting the implementation of communities of practices between the students in the class and between teachers.	2.81	3.71
Students practice to extracurricular reading	3.34	7	Supporting and encouraging the quantity and quality of reading inside and outside the class room	2.90	3.96

Students use the needed skills and strategies in reading non-fiction	3.40	8	Building and supporting in- class reading communities to start a group of readers who support one another.	2.84	3.93
Development of the positive trends in creative writing	3.84	9	Ability to teach the reading skills for fiction and non-fiction.	3.06	4.34
Total mean	3.70	10	Total mean for the domain	2.95	4.13
Males mean	3.86				
Females mean	3.62				
Training workshop			Males mean	2.87	4.32
The clarity of the workshop objectives	4.75		Females mean	2.99	4.03
The degree to which objectives of the workshop were achieved compared to expectations	4.12				
Trainer possesses the needed training skills and the cognitive knowledge related to the topics of the workshop	4.53				
Trainers' ability to communicate and motivate participants	4.56				
Mean of total domain	4.49				
Males mean	4.68				
Females mean	4.39				

* There are no significant statistical differences between the means of males and females in the three domains ($\alpha=0.05$)

Most participants in four focus group discussions said that the workshop was positive and helped them acquire new skills *“it is a quality and a practical program”*. They also stressed the fact that it gave students the freedom to write *“a student learns to write without having to abide to one topic and without having one certain type of reading or writing imposed on him/her”*. *“The program enabled the student to write his/her own personal fiction”* and they learnt to interact with the stories and its characters and to express what they have learnt.

Most participants also marked that the program developed their ability to help Syrian and Jordanian students in reading and writing fiction and non-fiction through modeling fiction- reading and writing, and finding introductions to writing *“I am glad that the students became participants”*. The program was effective in developing students' critical and analytical skills and enhancing the cooperative work between the teacher, the librarian and the student in selecting books. It also helped in developing the student ability to communicate and make dialogues and contributed to the inclusion of Syrian students, while giving them the opportunity to express themselves and break the ice with others during Arabic classes.

As for the program's contribution to enhancing the quality and quantity of extracurricular reading; most participants pointed out that the amount of books a student reads has increased, but the quality of reading has slowly developed in general and the quality of reading for the lower grades was not affected, mainly because younger students were mostly attracted to pictures. However, there was an

increase in the number of students participating in the reading and writing competitions “*the student is self-driven to go to the library*” which indicates the increased desire to read due to diversification of readings and giving students the freedom to choose what they want to read.

As for the books that QRTA made available, most participants said that most of the books the Academy provided to libraries were attractive to students and helped them distinguish between fiction and non-fiction. Students also linked what they read with the school radio and confirmed that the program supported the reading club. Everybody confirmed that it helped in improving students’ level of reading and writing; while few said that the books are not suitable for the culture of the society.

Most participants agreed on the main challenges that they faced during the training on the program to be: the inappropriate timing of the workshop, the short duration of the training program relative to its content (most said that the few days of the training were insufficient to cover the rich information of the program). The challenges they faced during the program implementation, as seen by most, were mainly about the applying new practices: the large number of students, some uncooperative school principals, delay in receiving official circulars (letters) regarding attending the training workshops, the number of classes provided do not fit the intensity of the training material “both the curricula and the training material are packed with information”, the absence of linkages between the training material and the school curricula, discouragement from some parents “*a student is used to go to school jut to memorize the curricula*”, and some parents’ disapproval of the whole program. The administrative challenges that most participants highlighted were the absence of the role of the Directorates of Education who should be responsible for the follow-up and evaluation, the poor infrastructure available that is not enough to implement the program, lack of a pre-survey that would help in prioritizing processes, lack of a needs assessments according to which the program should be designed.

Participants identified the achievements of the Arabic Literacy component by: the improvement of the teacher’s performance and the increased ability to control and manage the classroom, which in turn leads to higher self-confidence, and getting the chance to meet new colleagues and share experiences.

As for the program’s contribution to building professional communities of practice at the level of the school and the Arabic literacy training, where teachers would work as a team to teach and support reading skills; some participants said that teachers exchanged classes and shared experience within the same school, while training and sharing experience with the neighboring schools was limited.

Most participants agreed that recommendations included the need to: extend the training duration, motivate teachers and students taking part in the program (through increasing allowances, organizing trips, giving prizes, publishing their work in the newspapers, and reducing the number of classes of targeted teachers); improve the coordination between the Academy and the Directorates of Education, and improve follow-ups and take them more seriously through evaluating students and teachers before and after the program.

Recommendations also included the need to expand the project to cover more schools and teachers in order to be able to continue with the student as he/she moves to higher grades, and to cover conversation skills in the program and add the training material to the Teacher's Guide after reconsidering its order and sequence.

It can be concluded from the above that the quantitative and qualitative data mentioned earlier, either gathered by the external evaluation team from CONSULTUS Company or by QRTA, clearly indicates the effectiveness of the two components (Reading Clubs and Arabic Literacy). The objectives of the reading club were approximately 89% achieved and of the Arabic literacy training 74%. Teachers' skill-sets and their implementation increased from 67% to 87% in the reading club component, and from 59% to 82% in the Arabic literacy component.

Most teachers stressed the importance of these two components in creating a attractive-learning environment and in building and sustaining effective reading communities that perform book-related dialogues and activities. They also said that the two components helped them improve the quantity and quality of students' extracurricular reading. Most participants marked the clear development in their ability to motivate Jordanian and Syrian students to read, to love books and to develop their handicraft skills.

In light of the second and third questions that represent the second track of the program (MCS), results generally indicated that this track was good in achieving its objectives. Most teachers stressed the importance of the three components of the track (CPSC, Reading Clubs, and Arabic Literacy Training). They pointed out that these components succeeded in building positive relationships and partnerships between the community and the school, and that they could be a small beginning for other experiences, to be continued and built-upon in the future.

Recommendations

In light of the results of the Summative evaluation as a whole, with its two tracks: the professional development of teachers and the MCSs, recommendations could be provided as follows:

- The need to start the program at the beginning of the academic school year, and to implement it right after the training in order to allow ample time to judge its success.
- The need to direct the training programs according to the experience of the teacher. New teachers need different content from experienced ones, especially in areas related to learning and teaching.
- Increasing the number of training hours and expanding the practical side, while making space between hours to enable immediate application. New dimensions should be added to the workshops such as conversation skills, learning difficulties, and academic achievement. The trainer has to apply

- practical lesson to assess the real challenges. He/she also needs to hold supportive classes for each educational situation -videos.
- Program's establishment phase should include a comprehensive overview of all the needed coordination between the Ministry and QRTA at all levels (administrative, follow-up, incentives, certificates of recognition).
 - Implementing CPSC through an institutional framework set by MoE. Work should be carried out under the legislative frameworks and the instructions of MoE. Through this, more authority is given to the members of community committees. In addition, an incentive scheme that motivates faculty members and administrators should be developed.
 - A needs-assessment survey should be prepared to identify the educational environment and the infrastructure needed to implement the program before starting to execute any activity. The establishment phase should include a clearly defined budget that would be used to overcome any logistical problems that could arise while implementing the activities of the program in schools.
 - Providing transportation to participants in future projects, to make the participation of the students and teachers in the activities outside official working hours easier.
 - Motivating teachers and students taking part in the program through “organizing educational\Entertainment trips, prizes, and publishing work in newspapers...” and decreasing the number of classes of targeted teachers.
 - The need to include a comprehensive plan to evaluate the phases of the program and the summative evaluation right from the very beginning of the program, as a plan parallel to the implementation plan, and in a way that guarantees that the tools are well directed to measuring the desired results.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Training Program Evaluation Questionnaire (Pedagogy - Psychosocial Education)

Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire is designed to know your opinion regarding the opportunities and the challenges related to Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment (CISLE) program in public schools/pedagogy- psychosocial education, implemented by Queen Rania Teacher Academy. This questionnaire has five parts:

Part one: general information

Part Two: Items related to the objectives of the program (5 items)

Part Three: Items related to the training workshops (4 items)

Part Four: Items related to your ability to implement the content of the training program (7 items)

Part Five: Open ended questions (3 items)

Please answer these items and we thank you for your cooperation in developing the program. Your answers will be treated with strictest confidentiality.

Part One: General Information

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Number of years of experience:

- Less than Five Years
- More than five years

Name of MoE directorate:.....

Part Two: Items related to the objectives of the program (5 items)

After your participation in “CISLE” program, to what degree each of the following objectives was achieved?

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	Ability to implement					

	the main dimensions of the psychosocial culture					
2	Knowledge of child rights and protection ways					
3	Ability to manage classroom					
4	Ability to apply the 5Es					
5	Ability to apply the principals of the Formative and Behavioral evaluation					

Part Three: Items related to the training workshop (4 items)

After your participation in the workshop related to the CISLE program, to what degree do you agree on the following:

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	Clarity of workshop objectives					
2	Workshop objectives achieved compared to your expectations					
3	Trainers acquire the cognitive experience related to the topics of the workshop					
4	Trainers acquire the training skills and able to communicate and motivate participants					

Part Four: items related to your ability to implement the content of the training program (7 items)

Through your application of the content of the training program that you took, what is the degree of achieving each of the below before and after the training:

Before Training					No	Item	After Training				
Very	hig	mediu	low	Very			Very	hig	mediu	low	Very
					.						

high	h	m		low			high	h	m		low
					1	Ability to understand the academic needs of Syrian students					
					2	Ability to understand the psychological needs of Jordanian and Syrian students					
					3	Ability to include Syrian with Jordanian students					
					4	Ability to support interactive learning in the classroom and apply enquiry teaching					
					5	Ability to contribute to building a safe and supportive school environment					
					6	Ability to manage and resolve classroom conflicts					
					7	Ability to evaluate students' learning progress					

Part Five: Open ended questions (3 items)

1. What are the main challenges that you have faced during your participation in the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. What are the improvements/amendments that should be made to the program in your opinion?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Write one sentence to express your opinion regarding your participation in the program.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 2: Questions given to focus groups on the pedagogy and psychosocial program

These questions are given to the participants in CISLE program at the public schools/ pedagogy -psychosocial education implemented by QRTA:

1. What is your opinion on the pedagogy and psychosocial strategies training that you took? Justify.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How did the program develop your ability to understand the psychosocial needs of the students? How did that help in the inclusion of Syrian students?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. How did the program develop your ability in pedagogy? How did that help in the inclusion of Syrian students?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. What opportunities and challenges did you face in implementing the objectives of the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. What are the main accomplishments you think you have achieved through your participation in the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6. What recommendations do you propose to develop and improve the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 3: Training Program Questionnaire (Reading Clubs)

Dear Librarians

This questionnaire is designed to know your opinion on **CISLE program**, implemented by QRTA to train **librarians**. This questionnaire is divided into five parts as follows:

Part One: General information

Part Two: items related to the objectives of the program (3 items)

Part three: items related to the training workshops (4 items)

Part Four: items related to your ability to apply the content of the training program (11 items)

Part Five: open-ended questions (4 items)

Please answer these items and we thank you for your cooperation in developing the program. Your answers will be treated with strictest confidentiality.

Part One: General Information

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Number of years of experience:

- Less than Five Years
- More than five years

Name of MoE directorate:.....

Part Two: items related to the objectives of the program (3 items)

After your participation in the program related to Reading Clubs, to what degree did the students **achieve** each of the below **objectives**:

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	motivated to read and loves books					
2	Encouraged to work in a team and to be cooperative					
3	Breaking psychosocial barriers					

Part Three: items related to training workshops (4 items).

After your participation in the **training workshops** related to Reading Clubs program, to what degree **do you agree** on the following?

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	Clarity of workshop objectives					
2	Workshop objectives achieved compared to your expectations					
3	Trainers acquire the cognitive experience related to the topics of the workshop					
4	Trainers acquire the training skills and able to communicate and motivate participants					

Part Four: items related to your ability to apply the content of the training program (11 items).

Through your implementation to the content of the training program that you took, what is the degree of achieving each of the below before and after the training:

Before Training					No.	Item	After Training				
Very high	high	medium	low	Very low			Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
					1	Ability to motivate students to read					
					2	Ability to help students select the right book					
					3	Ability to help students understand the elements of a story					
					4	Ability to help students imagine the events and the characters of a story					
					5	Ability to help students identify the main events and					

						characters					
					6	Ability to help students analyze characters					
					7	Ability to help students reorder information in a given story					
					8	Ability to help students understand what they read					
					9	Ability to help students re-tell a given story					
					10	Ability to create an atmosphere that encourages discussion and knowledge sharing					
					11	Ability to distinguish between reality and opinion					

Part Five: Open-ended questions (4 items)

1. What are the main challenges that you have faced during your participation in the program?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. What are the improvements/amendments that should be made to the program in your opinion?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. Write one sentence to express your opinion regarding your participation in the program.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....
.....

4. Did the program help you build and sustain effective reading communities that perform dialogues and activities related to the books read? And how?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 4: Questions to Focus Group discussions (Reading Clubs)

These questions are directed to the participants in “CISLE/ Reading Clubs” implemented by QRTA:

1. What is your opinion regarding the Reading Clubs training workshops that you were trained in? Justify.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How did the program develop your abilities to motivate Syrian and Jordanian students to read and to love books?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. How did the program help librarians in building and sustaining effective reading clubs that perform dialogues and activities related to books read?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. How did the program develop your ability to break psychological and social barriers between Jordanian and Syrian students and help them accept one-another?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. What opportunities and challenges did you face in implementing the objectives of the program?

.....
.....
.....

.....
.....

6. What are the main achievements you accomplished through your participation in the reading club component?

.....
.....
.....
.....

7. What recommendations do you propose to develop and improve the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 5: Training Program Evaluation Questionnaire (Arabic Literacy Training)

Dear Teacher

This questionnaire is designed to know your opinion on the **opportunities and challenges** related to “CISLE/ Arabic Literacy Training” implemented by QRTA. This questionnaire is divided into four parts as follows:

Part One: General Information

Part Two: items related to the objectives of the program (8 items)

Part Three: items related to the training workshops (4 items)

Part Four: items related to your ability to implement the content of the training program (9 items)

Part Five: open-ended questions (3 items)

Please answer these items and we thank you for your cooperation in developing the program. Your answers will be treated with strictest confidentiality.

Part One: general information

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Number of years of experience:

- Less than Five Years
- More than five years

Name of MoE directorate:.....

Part two: items related to the objectives of the program (8 items)

After your participation in “CISLE/ Arabic Literacy Training”, to what degree did the students achieve each of the below objectives:

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	Fiction and non-fiction reading					
2	Writing personal stories					
3	Non-fiction writing					

4	Article writing and supporting it with suitable justifications					
5	Students developed positive tendencies to read					
6	Students perform extracurricular reading					
7	Students practice non-fiction reading skills and strategies					
8	Students developed positive tendencies to creative writing					

Part Three: items related to the training workshops (4 items)

After your participation in the training workshops related to “CISLE/ Arabic Literacy Training”, to what degree **do you agree** on the following?

No.	Item	Degree				
		Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
1	Clarity of workshop objectives					
2	Workshop objectives achieved compared to your expectations					
3	Trainers possess the cognitive experience related to the topics of the workshop					
4	Trainers possess the training skills and able to communicate and motivate participants					

Part Four: items related to your ability to apply the content of the training program (9 items).

Through your application of the content of the training program that you took, what is the degree of achieving each of the below before and after the training:

Before Training					No	Item	After Training				
Very high	high	medium	low	Very low			Very high	high	medium	low	Very low
					.						

					1	Using strategies that help engage students in reading													
					2	Using strategies that help engage students in writing													
					3	Mini-lessons planning													
					4	Satisfying students' different learning needs and giving appropriate feedback													
					5	Establishing professional communities of practice at the school and the network levels to work together in teaching and supporting reading skills.													
					6	Supporting communities of practices between students in the classroom and between teachers.													
					7	Encouraging and supporting the quality and quantity of extracurricular reading inside and outside the classroom													
					8	Building and supporting learning communities to create a community of readers who support the work of one another													
					9	Ability to teach reading skills through fiction and non-fiction methods													

Part Five: Open-ended questions (3 items)

1. What are the main challenges that you have faced during your participation in the program?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. What are the improvements/amendments that should be made to the program in your opinion?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Write one sentence to express your opinion regarding your participation in the program.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 6: Questions to Focus Groups (Arabic Literacy Training)

These questions are directed to the participants in “CISLE/ Arabic Literacy Training” implemented by QRTA:

1. What is your opinion of the Arabic Literacy training workshops that you trained in? Justify.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How did the program develop your abilities to motivate Syrian and Jordanian students to read and write fiction and non-fiction?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. How did the program help increase the quantity and quality of students’ extracurricular reading outside the classroom?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. What did students achieve through implementing the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. What opportunities and challenges did you face in implementing the objectives of the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6. What are the main achievements you made through your participation in the Arabic Literacy Training component?

.....
.....
.....
.....

7. What recommendations do you propose to develop and improve the program?

.....
.....
.....
.....

8. Did the program contribute to building professional communities of practice at the level of the school and the Arabic Literacy Training that work together to teach and support reading skills? And how?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 7: QRTA (CISLE) -Teacher's Questionnaire

Queen Rania Teacher Academy (QRTA)

Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment (CISLE) Program at
Public Schools

Teacher's Questionnaire

Dear Teachers,

This questionnaire is directed to all teachers participating in CISLE program at public schools, organized by QRTA and funded by USAID. The questionnaire items cover three pages and aim to know the learning environment in your classrooms and the main challenges you face.

Thus, we kindly ask you to carefully read each item, and answer it if you want to. Your answers will help us improve and further develop the activities of the program. Your answers will be treated with strictest confidentiality and reservation. None of the teachers or schools will be mentioned in the summaries of the study related to the program.

With our sincere thanks and appreciation for your effort and your cooperation in filling this questionnaire.

a. General Information

Name:

.....

School:

.....

b. Teacher experience

1. Number of years of teaching experience

less than 5 years

6-10 years

11-16 years

more than 16 years

2. Did you previously participate in professional development programs related to the inclusion of refugee-students in Jordanian public schools?

Yes

No

If you answered YES, mention the program below:

.....

3. Did you use the tools you have learnt in the professional development programs related to the inclusion of refugee-students in Jordanian public schools?

Yes

No

If you answered yes, mention the grades you taught/ tools you used:

.....

4. Did you previously participate in Arabic language teaching and remedial support?

Yes

No

If you answered yes, mention these programs:

.....

c. Students Inclusion

1. What is the average number of Syrian-refugee-students in your classes?

less than 5 students

6-10 students

11-20
students

more than
students 20

2. Generally speaking, are there problems caused by the enrollment of Syrian students in school (academic, behavioral, or emotional problems)?

Yes

No

If you answered no, move to questions (6 and 7)

3. What are the problems that you face with students at school (academic, behavioral, emotional...)?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. Which of the following challenges you think limit the teaching process in the classroom (you can choose all if they apply):

- I. The increase in students' number with the Syrian refugees
- II. Behavioral problems of students
- III. Emotional problems of students
- IV. Academic problems of students
- V. Lack of teachers' knowledge in supportive methods to interactive learning environment
- VI. Lack of teachers' knowledge in the effect of the psychosocial culture and supportive communication on the refugee-student.
- VII. Lack of teachers' understanding for the Syrian-refugees community in Jordan.
- VIII. All of the above
- IX. None of the above

5. On a scale of 5, how do you rate each of the following statements, where 1 is the lowest rate, and five is the highest

No.	Item	1	2	3	4	5
1	Your understanding of the Syrian-refugee community					
2	Your knowledge of the effects of supportive communication on Syrian students					
3	Your ability to manage behavior in the classroom					
4	Your knowledge of children's rights and protection from violence and abuse					
5	Your ability to support the interactive environment in the classroom					
6	Your application of the 5Es					
7	Your skills in <u>identifying</u> the primary indicators of refugee-students' psychosocial problems					
8	Your skills in <u>enquiring</u> (investigating) the primary indicators of refugee-students' psychosocial problems					
9	Your ability in using punishment alternatives with students					
10	Your ability to apply formative evaluation to students'					

	performance					
11	Syrian students' Arabic writing skills					
12	Your school's participation in the activities of the local community					
13	The community's participation in school activities					
14	Percentage of extracurricular activities carried out by your school in cooperation with the local community					

6. Are there efforts from your side, as a teacher, to embrace and include the Syrian with the Jordanian students?

Yes No

If you answered no, move to question (8).

7. What are the methods and ways that you apply to embrace and include the Syrian with the Jordanian students?

.....

8. How do you evaluate the participation of:

Jordanian Students?

Very high	High	Fair	Weak	Very weak
-----------	------	------	------	-----------

Syrian Students?

Very high	High	Fair	Weak	Very weak
-----------	------	------	------	-----------

9. As a teacher, were there any efforts from your side to increase the level of participation in the classroom?

Yes No

10. If you answered yes, what are the methods that you use?

.....

Thank you for the time you gave to in answer the questionnaire

Appendix 8: QRTA (CISLE) - Feedback Form

Workshop...../ Feedback Form

Date:/...../.....

1. Please identify the extent to which you agree or disagree on each of the below mentioned statements related to the training workshop:

No.	Item	Agree	Agree to some extent	Disagree to some extent	Disagree
1	The workshop was organized				
2	The workshop included practical activities that suited the content				
3	I was given enough chance to take part in the discussions of the workshop				
4	The topics matched my expectations on the training.				

2. Please identify the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the below statements related to the trainers/ facilitators:

No.	Item	Agree	Agree to some extent	Disagree to some extent	Disagree
1	Trainers/ facilitators showed great ability in communicating with trainees.				
2	Trainers/ facilitators encouraged participants to share experiences and give suggestions.				
3	Trainer effectively managed the workshop time				
4	Trainers/ facilitators effectively managed the discussions and				

	principles in classroom and school								
9	Formative and behavioral evaluation principles.								

4. What did you mainly learn from the workshop?

.....

5. Any other suggestions/notes?

.....

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix 9: QRTA (CISLE) - Syrian students' satisfaction with school environment questionnaire

The questionnaire aims to know the degree of Syrian students' satisfaction with the school environment targeted by "Cultivating Inclusive and Supportive Learning Environment (CISLE)" implemented by Queen Rania Teacher Award (QRTA) and funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

This questionnaire is confidential. Your answers will be added to the answers of other students from your school and other schools. No one from your school will see your individual answer.

Date:
Researcher Name:
School:
Directorate:
National No.:

Date:
School Category:
No. of Students:
No. of Syrian Students:

1. What grade are you in?			
	Second grade	Third grade	Fourth grade
	Fifth grade	Sixth grade	Seventh grade
	Eighth grade	Ninth grade	Tenth grade

2. Regarding your school, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?				
	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
I feel welcomed				
Most of the school staff (principal, teachers, advisors) know my name and who I am				
Teachers and advisors give me attention personally				
The staff (principals, teachers, advisors) help in my inclusion with other students				
I can use all school facilities (playgrounds, library, cafeteria, and restrooms) freely				
I can go to the psychosocial advisor at school to ask for help when I face psychosocial problems				
I can participate in the activities that the school organizes or takes part in (cultural training, sports competitions, or celebrations)				

3. Regarding the support and direction you get from your teachers, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?				
	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
My teacher always encourages me to ask				
My teacher gives me information on my academic level and helps me improve it.				
I can ask the teacher when I need to.				
My teacher treats me equally with all other students (Jordanians and Syrians)				
My teacher helps me overcome any academic/educational difficulties'				
My teacher helps me overcome any psychological/ social difficulties'				

1. Regarding the relation with students, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?				
	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
I can ask my colleagues for help in overcoming some educational/ academic difficulties				
I can build friendships with my Syrian and Jordanian colleagues				
I share practical activities with my colleagues (experiments, research, making learning aids)				
I am subjected to harassment/ verbal and physical abuse by my colleagues				
I get the appreciation and respect of my colleagues when I do a good job				

Thank you for your cooperation