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Background to BEAM-ARMM
Background of BEAM-ARMM program

> Significant education and peace program

> ARMM covers nine DepEd divisions across five provinces of Mindanao

> BEAM–ARMM comprised four distinct but integral components

> Components were implemented by a Managing Contractor (Cardno) and through grant agreements with UNICEF, GIZ and BRAC

> Initial phase of program (Sept 2012 - June 2015)

> Independent Mid-Term Review in 2014

> DFAT approved extension phase (July 2015-June 2017)

> Extension phase emphasis on the end of program outcomes
In light of the strategic shift to a programmatic approach the following indicators were agreed:

- Improve access by increasing completion rates
- Improve quality of education and learning environment
- Improve employability of OSY completers
- Improve education governance to support ECE, basic education and OSY
Evaluation Approach
Evaluation Approach

- Mixed methods
- Quasi-Independent approach
- Engagement of partner representatives

Three key questions:

- To what extent has the program achieved stated end of program outcomes?
- How appropriate were BEAM-ARMM’s institutional and governance approaches with DepEd-ARMM and other partners?
- To what extent has the program demonstrated relevance, efficiency and effectiveness through a unified approach to implementation and management? What lessons can be learned?
Limitations and Challenges

> Large number of different interventions
> Time and available resources
> Attribution
> Access to data
> Availability of data
Contextual Environment
Contextual Environment

> ARMM region is a post-conflict (current conflict) fragile environment
> Tension due to prospective transition to a new government
> DepEd-ARMM – characterised by high enthusiasm and motivation but reduced capacity in terms of resources
> Access, enrolments and learning outcomes tend to lag national averages
> Limited private sector investment and job opportunities in the formal sector.
Key Findings: End of Program Outcome 1 – Access and Participation
Increase in School Enrolment

The BEAM–ARMM target for increasing elementary school completion rate was 13%. Elementary completion rate increased throughout ARMM by 15.3% from 24.6% in School Year (SY) 2012–2013 to 39.9% in SY 2015–2016. Completion rates remain very low with eight of nine divisions being below 55%.
### Increase in School Enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BRAC ADM</th>
<th>Tahderiyah</th>
<th>Madaris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>11,865</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>31,522</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>38,192</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>25,438</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>21,640</td>
<td>5,841</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing enrolment growth](image-url)
Increase in School Enrolment

Overall Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) increased from 66.8% in SY 2012–2013 to 88.9% in SY 2015–2016 and Net Enrolment Rate (NER) increased from 55.5% to 69.6% during the same period. This indicates an increase in NER of 14.1% which is above the anticipated target of 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>NER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilan</td>
<td>31.86%</td>
<td>19.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamitan</td>
<td>37.69%</td>
<td>27.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawi-Tawi</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag 1</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag 2</td>
<td>37.75%</td>
<td>27.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS 1</td>
<td>25.16%</td>
<td>16.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS 2</td>
<td>23.18%</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marawi</td>
<td>-41.45%</td>
<td>-41.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: End of Program Outcome 2 - Learning
Teacher Development: Context

> HR / personnel functions are centralised in a political office resulting in:
  - Slow promotions, slow hiring processes
  - Mismatch of teacher qualifications vs. school needs
  - Authority and accountability of Division leaders not established
  - Teachers are not able to practice what they learn from training due to reassignments
  - Posts for school heads are also politically influenced
  - No complete and comprehensive database of teachers

- No regular standardized assessment of teacher competencies
- Teachers are moved horizontally and vertically across the system with little effort to match qualifications against needs
Teacher Development: Context

- Lack of teaching and learning materials in classrooms
- Student performance in the national tests - the lowest among 18 regions in the country
- Funds for operating expenses are not downloaded in 95% of elementary schools
- K to 12 rollout started in 2011
  - Need for teacher retooling and skills upgrading
BEAM-ARMM Teacher Professional Development

> **Intermediate Outcome:** Improved Teacher Competencies

> **End-of-Program Outcome:** Improved Student Performance
BEAM-ARMM Teacher Professional Development
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Cohort Training of Teachers: By grade and by learning area

- Cascade Training
- 12,250 teachers in three years
- Building internal capacity for training
- Two-step:
  - Selection and Training of Trainers
  - Rollout in clusters
- Teaching and Learning Materials provided
- Opportunity to identify school-based mentors learning facilitators
BEAM-ARMM Teacher Professional Development

**COHORT TRAINING**

All teachers by cohort: grade and learning area 2013-2015

- Selection of school-based Trainers
  - Pre- and post- tests
  - Active participation during the training

**SCHOOL – BASED TEACHER DEVELOPMENT**

- LPP: Learning Partnership Program in schools 2015-2017
- READ ALLL: Reading Across Languages, Levels, and Learning Areas (2015-2017)
BEAM-ARMM Teacher Professional Development

PROGRAM EVALUATION OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES:

**Baseline:**  Assessments at the start of training; 2013-2015

**As Input to the Identification of School-based Mentors:**  End of training; 2013-2015

**Input to end of program evaluation:**  August 2016.
BEAM-ARMM Teacher Professional Development

PROGRAM EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE:

Baseline: National Achievement Test SY 2011-2012

As Input to the Identification of Teacher Training Content: National Achievement Test SY 2011-2012

Input to end of program evaluation: National Achievement Test in August 2016
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

Pedagogical Content Knowledge Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Posttest</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

Standards-based Classroom Observation Protocol

- **Effective use of instructional resources and strategies**: Pre-test (2014) - 2.3, Post-test (2016) - 3.4
- **Fostering collaboration among learners**: Pre-test (2014) - 1.7, Post-test (2016) - 2.7
- **Learner-centered learning activities**: Pre-test (2014) - 1.7, Post-test (2016) - 2.9
- **Fostering learning environment**: Pre-test (2014) - 1.5, Post-test (2016) - 2.4
- **Promoting HOTs**: Pre-test (2014) - 1.3, Post-test (2016) - 2.4
### End-of-Program Evaluation Results

#### Teachers Reading Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter Sound</td>
<td>65.10%</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic Awareness</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Reading and Stress</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

Results of Teachers Oral Fluency Assessment

LEVELS of ORAL READING PROFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Reader</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Proficient Reader</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient Reader</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Reader</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

- **TARGET:** At least 5% improvement in NAT Grade 3

- **ACHIEVEMENT:** Based on the scores of 75,104 test takers in August 2016 against scores of 91,303 test takers in February 2012:
  - 22.83% increase in the MPS of Grade 3 students in science
  - 6.85% increase in the MPS of Grade 3 students in mathematics
  - 3.8% increase in the MPS of Grade 3 in English Reading
  - **OVERALL:** 10.5% increase in the MPS of Grade 3 students
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

Result of National Achievement Test, Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>57.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>64.62</td>
<td>61.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall and by Learning Area
End-of-Program Evaluation Results

Highlights from statistical analysis of scores of paired teachers and students:

> The longer students were taught by trained teachers the better they performed

> Students in the lowest 25% in the SY 2015-2016 NAT did not respond to the number of years of exposure to teachers trained by BEAM-ARMM

> More teacher training resulted in greater performance of girls. The percentage of girls in the bottom quartile decreased and above the median increased with increased teacher training.
Read ALLL: School-based Teacher Development Model

School-based Professional Development: Dangkalan Elementary School

Read ALLL (Reading Across Languages, Levels, and Learning Areas)

![Graph showing oral reading proficiency levels of teachers](image)

**Graph Title:** Reading Skills of Teachers

- Letter Sound: Pre-test: 63.88%, Post-test: 83.96%
- Phoneme Segmentation: Pre-test: 53.88%, Post-test: 75.41%
- Word Reading and Stress: Pre-test: 54.17%, Post-test: 66.99%
- Comprehension: Pre-test: 53.72%, Post-test: 60.43%

**Oral Reading Proficiency Levels of Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Levels</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Proficient</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Read ALLL: School-based Teacher Development Model

School-based Professional Development: Dangkalan Elementary School

National Achievement Scores of Grade 3 Students in Dangkalan ES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53.93</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>66.13</td>
<td>58.58</td>
<td>57.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59.17</td>
<td>57.47</td>
<td>66.41</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>68.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>67.88</td>
<td>62.32</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>71.93</td>
<td>69.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>73.82</td>
<td>71.93</td>
<td>69.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percentage Score
LPP: School-based Teacher Development Model

Schools implementing LPP are reporting increased student learning outcomes in NAT by an average of 15.49 mean percentage points between 2014 and 2016.

![Wao 1 District LPP Schools NAT Results - 2014-2016](chart)
Lessons Learned and Recommendations
Teacher Professional Development

• Large target (12,250 teachers) in a very limited time does not allow opportunities for changes to manifest and be evaluated

• Systemic approach to teacher development especially in areas with very weak governance systems requires simultaneous efforts on many fronts - some of which may be out of the program focus / scope and attribution and contributions hard to determine

• Theory of Change and Results Framework should include Government commitment to their counterpart and obligations
Key Findings: End of Program Outcome 3 - Employability
## Employability

Target – 11,000 Out of School Youth (OSY) and senior high-school graduates trained and 50% in employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Employment Rate %</th>
<th>Total OSY Trained</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Total No. Completers who Took TESDA NA</th>
<th>Total Pass Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5,223</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>3,661 (70%)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>1,108 (24%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>737 (87%)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>OSY: 244 (100%)</td>
<td>OSY: 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHS: 18 (35%)</td>
<td>SHS: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11,044</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>5,177 or 47%</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employability

Contributing factors:

> Shift away from supply-side provision of courses to a demand-driven approach – market responsive.

> Use of information and data from tracer studies to inform change

> More on the job training and mentoring

> Technical Vocational centres have been equipped.

Outcome – employability and increased income for both men and women.
Key Findings:
End of Program Outcome 4
- Governance
Governance

> Considerable challenges

> Key focus:

- School Based Management
- School construction and planning
- WASH in Schools (WinS) monitoring and accreditation
- ADM learners included on national Learner Information System (LIS).
Key Findings: Evaluation Question 2 – Institutional Arrangements
Evaluation Question 2 – Institutional Arrangements

> Institutional arrangements
> Primarily a service delivery program
> Strong focus at school and district levels
> Struggled to realise change at the regional level within DepEd-ARMM
> Governance and institutional arrangements
> Case studies and discussion papers
Key Findings: Evaluation Question 3 – Unified Approach
Evaluation Question 3 – Unified Approach

> Implementation and management
> The Unified approach
> Process was challenging – some key challenges
> Unified M&E approach - a M&E perspective
> Governance structure
Lessons Learned

> Key lessons grouped into Strategic, Technical and Operational.

> Strategic – technical focal person, more time for development models, stronger convergence between components.

> Technical – community participation, culturally specific learning, simple templates.

> Operational - Coordination, local government units
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