

DOCUMENTATION CENTER OF CAMBODIA

Genocide Education Project

The Teaching of "A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979)"

Teacher Training Survey Data

by Christopher Dearing, Esq.

Scope of Surveys

The surveys measured the opinion of teacher trainees and other education officials with respect to the quality of the Genocide Education Project's teacher training workshops. The specific questions evaluated the trainees' impression of training materials, overall training, organization of the training, presentation style, subject matter knowledge of trainers, the ability of trainers to handle questions and generate discussion, and the trainers' use of relevant examples.

Limitations to Surveys

The surveys did not provide sufficient information to accurately respond to such questions as:

- How much information was assimilated by the trainees?
- How many new techniques, approaches, or attitudes were assimilated by the trainees?
- How confident are the trainees in using the new techniques, approaches, or attitudes in future work?
- What is the level of commitment by the trainees to using the new information, approaches, techniques, or attitudes in their future work?
- How will the training impact student learning?

Summary of Survey Data

The surveys suggest that the Genocide Education Project's use of teacher training workshops is well-received, and the majority of comments strongly suggest an eagerness to continue with this model of professional development. With respect to the overall Project's metrics, notable deficiencies are observable in the trainers' use of relevant examples and their perceived subject-matter knowledge. Notable areas for sustainment (or requiring only minor improvement) are in the use of training materials and the presentation style of the trainers. With respect to the provincial breakdown of the survey results, there is a significant disparity between the perceptions of training quality between provinces. Certain provincial teams received high marks in terms of giving excellent training, whereas certain provinces were judged to be only satisfactory. No provinces received a significant number of poor responses, and thus, there is sufficient evidence to state that while certain provincial teams required improvement in their operation/execution of workshops, the training was still viewed as successful and valuable to the trainees. It is also worth mentioning that the trainees' overall assessment of the Genocide Education Project's teacher-training workshops is relatively similar to assessments compiled in the United States.¹

¹ BRUCE JOYCE & EMILY CALHOUN, *MODELS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A CELEBRATION OF EDUCATORS* 98 (2010) ("In NCES [National Center for Education Statistics] surveys (as in NAEP, 2004), about half report that workshops lasting from one to eight hours in all content areas (including curriculum, instruction, teaching diverse students) improved their teaching moderately or "a lot." For longer workshops, 75 percent or more indicated moderate or a lot of improvement, and another 20 percent indicated 'somewhat.'").

Nation-wide Survey Results

Number of Trained: 2725

Number of Trainings: 17

Average Size of Workshop: 160




Figure 1: Survey Results for All Teacher Training Sites (Summer/Fall 2010)




Figure 2: Survey Results by Province




Figure 3: Nation-wide Results by Metric

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples

Province-specific Survey Results

Number of Trainees per Province

Takeo Sessions 1 & 2: 62; 255

Phnom Penh: 106

Svay Rieng 1 & 2: 292; 304

Prey Veng 1 & 2: 62; 368

Kandal: 50

Kampong Cham: 57

Battambang: 261

Preah Sihanouk: 98

Siem Riep: 137

Kampot: 166

Kampong Thom: 159

Kratie: 89

Srung Treng: 79

Pursat: 180




Figure 4: Takeo Training 1: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 5: Phnom Penh Training: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 6: Svay Rieng Training 1: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 7: Prey Veng Training 1: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 8: Kandal Training: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 9: Kampong Cham: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 10: Battambang: Summer 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 11: Takeo Training: May 8-14, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 12: Preah Sihanouk Training: April 5-11, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 13: Siem Riep Training: June 24-30, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 14: Svay Rieng Training 2: June 24-30, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 15: Kampot Training: April 5-11, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 16: Kampong Thom Training: May 8-14, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 17: Kratie Training: April 5-11, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 18: Srung Treng Training: April 5-11, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 19: Prey Veng Training 2: May 8-14, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples




Figure 20: Pursat Training: June 24-30, 2010

1	Training materials
2	Overall impression of training
3	Presentation style of presenters/trainers
4	Subject matter knowledge of trainers
5	Organization of training
6	Trainers' ability to handle questions; lead discussions
7	Trainers' use of relevant examples