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Preface

The Learning Environment: Technical Support Program (LETS) is a three-year, $13.5 million dollar initiative that assists the Ministry of Education to improve the learning environment in a pre-selected number of Jordanian public schools. LETS began on August 8, 2011 and is implemented by Creative Associates International (Creative) and the local subcontractor ASK.

As the Government of Jordan advances through the second phase of the Education Reform for the Knowledge Economy (ERfKE) program, the Ministry of Education has identified a critical need for improvement in the quality of learning environments. Physical factors in the school, health conditions and practices, and social and emotional concerns directly influence schools’ learning environments. Current conditions in many Jordanian schools are often unpleasant and sometimes dangerous. LETS GSA findings (2012) point to the presence of pervasive risk in up to 45% of schools’ physical surroundings. The data suggest the incidence of protective factors such as parental engagement and positive school atmosphere are low. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) reports (2007) that more than 50% of Jordanian students surveyed said their teachers or school administrators have abused them verbally or physically. An atmosphere of social distrust and low expectations in particular chronically characterizes boys’ schools. To compound the problem, students with a wide range of intellectual, emotional and physical disabilities often go undiagnosed, and education programs and services for them are often unavailable or not well delivered.

LETS’ range of interventions concentrates on 120 K-12 schools across the Kingdom and focuses exclusively on capacity building. LETS introduces best practice approaches to Learning Environment Improvement initiatives at the school level, expands the Ministry of Education’s operational ability to support their schools in the overall LE improvement process as well as that of its sole local subcontractor and partner, ASK.

This report covers FY 13 from October 01, 2012 through September 30, 2013. The current project approach has increased school exposure to interventions and integrated the new design based on best practices in School Learning Environment Improvement initiatives. LETS has moved towards supporting implementation of School Community Projects. LETS key learning environment domains of Safety, Health, Caring, and Engaging have nurtured immediate improvement of project schools’ learning environment.

Improvement of schools’ learning environment is grounded in international standards of educational best practice. It also lends itself particularly well to progress assessment through benchmarking, as it allows in-school teams to develop the necessary skills and techniques best suited to local conditions and challenges. LETS’ new implementation model now explicitly replicates this approach.
Executive Summary

This marks the fourth quarterly report for 2012/2013 - LETS second year, and includes a quarterly report for the July-September, 2013 period, as well as an annual summary for each component for the period October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013. Following a succinct description of the LETS project, this report addresses each component as implemented through Year 2, and more specifically over the fourth quarter.

LETS began its first quarter of FY13 enveloped in strategy re-assessment sessions initiated by a need to review the project design and postpone implementation in schools by a couple of weeks. An ambitious material production schedule coupled with conflicting project management priorities in Year 1 led to delays across content development, training and assessment activities in Year 2. In spite of delays, LETS swiftly adjusted its approach in schools to focus on building all-important relationships with school communities by increasing the time coaches would have in schools\(^1\), taking the much needed time to introduce LE teams to the concept of LEI while helping school communities to articulate their ideal learning environment, and procuring school-project materials to support LE improvement activities. While LETS was tardy in getting its core activities into the schools, the approach led by ASK to take the time to build relationships with school LE teams laid the foundation for the success we see today in LETS schools.

LETS launched into its second quarter with renewed vigor. In close collaboration with USAID, the team revised and streamlined its SOW into two components (Component 1: Building Capacities within Schools to Support Enabling Environments and, Component 2: Capacity Building), dropped the quasi experimental design (QED), and the quality assurance system activities (QAS) in favor of a school-based approach to LEI best practices as measured through Results Based Benchmarking (RBB), and finalized the new onsite support format led by local subcontractor ASK, adding yet more coaches (ASK) to reduce the school to coach ratio. The third quarter witnessed the team adjusting to a variety of changes including: a new COP, the addition of the local subcontractor capacity building subcomponent in alignment with USAID Forward, and new management structures organized by Project Work Streams (PWS) that included ASK leading school training efforts under the LETS Field Implementation Unit (FIU).

Today, results of LETS first and second semester school interventions led by LETS coaches resulted in a slight (5\%), but nonetheless notable drop in reported negative behavior referrals in all project schools. During the fourth quarter LETS achieved better internal alignment around both its field support strategy and school-based LEI, guided by the project’s ten LEI benchmarks. The project has been largely on target with its activities across its two components, in spite of unanticipated, supplementary training needs and school material delivery delays. Between April and June 2013, the COP provided up to 30 hours of additional RBB coach training to address resistance and lack of technical comfort in implementing the RBB in target schools. The LETS procurement team also addressed second semester delays in delivering school project materials

\(^1\) During the first quarter of FY13, LETS increased the time coaches could spend in school by reducing the school to coach ratio from 5:1 to 3:1. This was deemed necessary if the project was to affect any notable change in schools’ LEs during a 3 semester period.
by streamlining required procurement processes and forms, thus providing for a smoother procurement process for the third semester.

This fourth quarter focused on three initiatives: internal capacity building, alignment, and third semester planning. LETS carefully articulated each of these three priorities to attain maximum impact and sustained efficiency towards project implementation over LETS’ third and final year. LETS’ shift from the QAS/QED construct under the previous SOW to the current approach of LEI best practices through the RBB system, enabled project management to identify capacity building needs as limited familiarity with the research and approach threatened to challenge timely project implementation. To keep on schedule, LETS involved its 40 coaches and 3 coordinators in an intensive 33 hour RBB training program that successfully guided the LETS team through the new project framework, enabling them to train LETS team’s in targeted schools during the third semester. LETS then condensed this same training for the MoE task force during a professional retreat which resulted in winning their full approval and buy-in of LEI benchmarking. LETS presented the RBB as a simple, school-based reform initiative that can be easily grafted on to larger Ministry initiatives. LETS then repeated LEI RBB training with Field Directorates (FD) and Principals through its Professional Sharing and Reflection Sessions (PSRS) approach. On September 5, LETS had its FIRM4 meeting focus on third semester activity planning and the process demonstrated that LETS units were well integrated, which bodes well for LETS third and final semester of activities.

LETS’ most noteworthy achievements this quarter are highlighted by the downward trend in negative behaviors (as noted, by 5%) across the 120 schools; 11 out of 13 types of incidents appear to have declined for the first time since project inception, thus confirming a trend observed much over the project’s third quarter. In the coming quarter, LETS will observe to see if such a trend continues. Other project achievements across LETS’ two components include the following activities: a) the anchoring of the LETS RBB as the guiding LEI assessment tool in preparation for next quarter’s two rounds of schools’ benchmarking against international LEI best practices and standards; b) the production of essential support guides for RBB processes and post-RBB LEI planning; c) the standardization of the three-phased, onsite support strategy by driven by LETS coaches; d) the procurement of school activity materials ($312,909.00 in value) to support 120 school projects, all matched closely to specific, self-identified school needs; e) successfully securing formal support from the MoE task force and FD for the extension of the RBB pilot into next the quarter (the MoE is now hoping to benefit directly from the school-based LEI benchmarking pilot to inform its larger reform agenda and thus directly engaged in project sites monitoring); and f) agreement on drafted capacity building plans for the MoE and LETS local subcontractor, ASK, envisaged for the first quarter of FY 14.

Over the coming two quarters before project closeout in May 2014, LETS will address the following: a) the continued refinement of implementation in the field to respond to the needs and challenges of selected schools; b) continuous project monitoring through PWS leads including through field visits, c) continued openness of communications both internally (among all LEI RBB practitioners) and externally (with key Ministry and FD partners and Principals) through extension of PSRS and a roll out of capacity building seminars.
LETS successes this year (particularly those achieved since the SOW’s modification during the project’s second semester in February 2013) are noteworthy, yet much remains to be done within the remaining few months: evidence-based practice suggests that measurable behavior change typically requires a concerted effort on school sites for a minimum of three to five years. LETS can only hope that its narrow but intense focus on LEI best practices (as implemented through LETs change coaches over a 3 semester period and supported by school-based RBB assessments of LE changes) will leave enough objective data for the MoE to inform its future LEI policy initiatives.
# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>ASK for capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAII (CA)</td>
<td>Creative Associates International Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Contract Officer Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERfKE</td>
<td>Education Reform for the Knowledge Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Field Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDLET</td>
<td>Field Directorate Learning Environment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>Field Implementation Report Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIU</td>
<td>Field Implementation unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>General School Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCE</td>
<td>Health, Safety, Caring, Engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Individual School Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>John Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>Learning Environment Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET</td>
<td>Learning Environment Team <em>(School-based)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Learning Environment Technical Support <em>(Program)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCBU</td>
<td>Ministry Capacity Building Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education <em>(Central)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE TF</td>
<td>Ministry of Education task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHRA</td>
<td>Operations, Human Resources and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHRAU</td>
<td>Operations, Human Resources &amp; Administration unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Project Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRS</td>
<td>Professional Sharing &amp; Reflecting Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS</td>
<td>Project Work Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QED</td>
<td>Quasi Experimental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB</td>
<td>Results-Based Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASU</td>
<td>School Assessment &amp; Support Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>School Community Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDIP</td>
<td>School &amp; Directorate Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR</td>
<td>Sub-Intermediate Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSU</td>
<td>School Procurement &amp; Supplies Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Senior Technical Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Work Stream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program Description and Goal

Overview of the Program

As the Government of Jordan advances through the second phase of the Education Reform for the Knowledge Economy (ERfKE) program, the Ministry of Education has identified a critical need for improvement in the quality of learning environments. Learning environments are influenced by 1) physical factors in the school, 2) health conditions and practices, and 3) social and emotional concerns. Current conditions in many Jordanian schools are unpleasant and sometimes dangerous; LETS General Survey Assessment findings (2012) point to the presence of pervasive risk in up to 45% of schools’ physical surroundings. Of note, a sizable proportion of students and teachers reported feeling unsafe when traveling to school or walking within the school grounds. Baseline data collected in 2012 data also suggest an inverse relationship between practicing positive behaviors and grade level, with a decrease in practicing positive behavior as students’ transition to higher grades. Finally, an earlier study (Jordan Global School-based Student Health Survey, 2007) documented that both students and teachers demonstrate negative health behaviors in a large proportion of schools. This report describes important health risk factors such as high prevalence of smoking and bullying, poor nutrition and limited exercise, poor hygiene and unmet mental health needs. The data suggest the incidence of protective factors such as parental engagement and positive school atmosphere are low.

To promote a positive learning environment in Jordanian public schools for 5-18 year olds LETS anchors itself in the best practices of School Improvement (SI) initiatives, informed by fundamental approaches to Management Change in Education (MCE). It revives USAID’s and Creative’s on-going efforts to streamline school-level learning environment improvement activities for the selected 120 schools while meeting USAID’s prioritized local capacity building objectives for the Ministry of Education and its local Jordanian partner, ASK. Creative’s approach provides for continuity in implementation. It greatly simplifies data collection processes and increases the effectiveness and quality of its coaching efforts. It also leverages only those tools, approaches or learning from LETS that effectively facilitate school-level positive change. Project implementation includes two distinct components.

Program Component Areas

Component 1: Building Capacities within Schools to Support Enabling Environments

Component 1 provides direct and on-going support to LETS schools and school communities as they engage in a variety of activities aimed at improving their LE to make it Safe, Healthy, Caring and Engaging for all. It includes a focus on educational administrative issues with an emphasis on school management and how best to implement measurable changes in schools. LEI results monitoring through joint use of Individual School Profiles (ISPs) and RBBs will periodically inform adjustments to interventions and help identify possible LEI competent schools.
LETS meets Component I goals by building basic capacity in change management (at both the school and MoE levels) and through field-based school improvement activities. Creative's subcontractor, ASK, is deploying 40 coaches (and 3 field coordinators) to support a range of CB school-based activities organized under three phases (1. Re-igniting the Change; 2. Executing the Change; and 3. Reflecting on Change and Planning for Sustainability) and designed to empower schools to improve their LE. Coaches meet regularly with school principals to inform them of the LETS coaching plan (including the activities and sessions to be implemented each semester) and to ensure principal commitment. They also meet with the LE Team motivating it to practice their roles in leading change to create a better learning environment. Component I implementation includes three essential and inter-related activities:

**Individual School Profiles (ISP).** While school-based development ISP is the essential activity, the final result is the actual capacity of LETS schools to first use the document to inform all school LE improvement activities within the school and school community, then to develop their own document as needed per the specifics of their situation.

**Results-Based Benchmarking (RBB).** Objective assessment of LEI progress at the school level is facilitated by the use of a simple, user-friendly data collection tool focusing on ten key elements of LE improvement as per current best practice. It includes five detailed descriptive rubrics documenting progress achieved in each domain observed and focusing on the 4 domains of LE improvement captured by LETS (i.e., the safety, health, caring and engaging characteristics of the school’s LE).

**School Community Projects (LEI Training and Support Activities).** All LETS schools directly support a series of two school community projects (within strict criteria) designed to illustrate LE improvement gains and speed up the school LE improvement process. LETS FIU coaches help schools identify school projects according to priorities informed by the RBB/ISP, embedding all school project activities within on-going school LE improvement initiatives. LETS supports School Community Projects (SCP) through equitable, balanced and fair allocation of project seed money. Schools use funds to procure those specific items that will allow them to implement their SCP successfully.

**Component 2: Capacity Building – Ministry and Local Subcontractor**

The purpose of Component 2 is to: a) build the Ministry of Education’s capacity to sustain and institutionalize improved learning in schools, and b) better enable ASK to compete for donor funds by strengthening and raising their organizational capacity to international levels. LETS training for the MoE includes recommended topics associated with sustaining LEI and change management. LETS grounds its approach in building a collaborative partnership with the MoE and with members of the MoE task force identifying their own capacity building needs. Similarly, LETS approach to its local subcontractor capacity building efforts is to work in close partnership with its management to help them better meet organizational needs.

Component Two implementation includes the following activities

a) **MoE Capacity Building**

**Develop MoE Capacity Building Plan**
Using a Performance Gap Identification Tool adapted to LE Improvement initiatives, MoE LE Improvement Task Force members identify specific capacity building domains that objectively meet their needs.

**MoE Capacity Building Workshops and Seminars**

Based on results of activity 1, LETS offers central MoE and the 10 MoE Field Directorates (FD) where LETS 120 schools are located a series of three workshops with an intense focus on LEI.

**b) Local Subcontractor Capacity Building**

**Build Capacity of Local Subcontract**

Provide shadowing opportunities to the local subcontractor, ASK, by integrating its team into the fabric of LETS project management and providing direct capacity building training opportunities to ASK.

**Organizational Capacity Assessment**

Implement a rapid organizational capacity assessment geared towards identifying capacity building needs of ASK, and developing and implementing a capacity building plan based on assessment results.

**LETS Project Results Framework**

The Performance Management Plan (PMP) was originally designed and approved by USAID earlier in 2012. Project management reviewed and edited the plan based on changes that were brought to the design of the program in August – September 2012, and before LETS’ scope of work was amended. The LETS PMP now reflects the project’s new scope of work. It was initiated in February 2013, submitted to USAID in April and formally approved by USAID in June 2013.

*Figure 1. below shows LETS new Project Results Framework.*
**Program Goal:** Improved Quality of Learning Environment

**Indicator:** % change in student chronic non-attendance; % of students who practice positive behavior; % of schools that report a reduction in negative behavior prevalent at their schools.

**IR 1:** Improved school capacity to support enabling environments

**Indicator:** # of School with Improvement Plans that include an LE component

**Activities:**
- a. Schools trained on developing Individual School Profiles
- b. Schools Implement LE RBBs

**Indicators:**
- a. # of schools that develop ISPs
- b. # of schools that integrate RBB use to improve LE

**SIR 1.2:** Strengthened school capacity and support.

**Activities:**
- a. School Leadership Training
- b. Classroom Mgt Training
- c. Learning Environment Team activities

**Indicators:**
- a. # of school staff successfully completing positive behavioral change trainings
- b. % of Teachers attending CM Training
- c. # of LE Teams formed

**SIR 1.3:** School and Community Based projects implemented

**Activities:**
- a. Training on School project planning & Implementation

**Indicator:**
- a. % of school that have reached set project LE Improvement goals

**SIR 2.1:** Improved MoE capacity to sustain and institutionalize improved learning environments.

**Activities:**
- a. Develop MoE Capacity Building Plan
- b. Implement MoE capacity building workshops
- c. Select and Train LE teams
- d. Select and Train Field Directorates Teams

**Indicators:**
- a. Capacity building plan developed from NA & approved
- b. # of MOE workshops conducted
- c. # of LE & FD team members completing training

**SIR 2.2:** Improved capacity of local subcontractor to conduct business with USAID.

**Activities:**
- a. Conduct organizational assessment
- b. Develop/Implement capacity development plan

**Indicators:**
- a. Assessment completed
- b. Capacity development plan approved
Summary for the Quarter

During the fourth quarter of FY 2013, LETS activities focused on preparing for third semester training in the schools and intensive capacity building of its chief stakeholder, the Ministry of education and its ten affiliated Field Directorates and school principals. Much of the training focal point was the LEI benchmarking approach now being implemented in the field through LETS coaches. In parallel, LETS proceeded with internal capacity building of all 40 coaches and 3 coordinators so that they would be fully equipped to support the project’s LEI benchmarking initiative in out 120 target schools. Towards both ends, (MoE and LETS coaches), LETS successfully implemented a highly focused RBB/LEI best practice training strategy to capture MoE buy-in and markedly boosted LETS capacity to support RBB integration in school interventions. Any previous reservations about LETS new approach faded and the Ministry is now a strong advocate of the approach. Not only does MoE senior level management in better understand and support the links between LETS and other current major Ministry reform initiatives, but they welcome the RBB tool as one that offers schools LEI strategies and independence of action, while on current LEI international best practices.

Results of LETS’ coaching and data-driven, management support to the schools are encouraging. The fourth quarter highlights evidence of a downward trend in reported negative behaviors with 11 out of 13 types of incidents appearing to have declined for the first time since project inception, thus confirming a trend observed much over the project’s third quarter (see M&E section). Major project activities across LETS’ two components included: a) the anchoring of RBB as the guiding LEI assessment tool for all schools in preparation for next quarter’s two rounds of benchmarking against international standards of LEI best practices; b) the production of essential support guides for RBB processes and post-RBB LEI planning; c) the standardization of the three-phased onsite support strategy by LETS coaches; d) procuring materials ($312,909.00 value) to support 120 school projects, matched closely to specific, self-identified school needs; e) securing formal support from the MoE task force and FD for the extension of the RBB pilot into next the quarter (the MoE is now hoping to benefit directly from the school-based LEI benchmarking pilot to inform its larger reform agenda and thus directly engaged in project sites monitoring); and f) the drafting of capacity building plans for the MoE and LETS local subcontractor, ASK, envisaged for the first quarter of FY 14.

In close collaboration with ASK, LETS and Creative home office team members finalized the CB plan by 15 August. However, when the project close out date changed from 7 August 2014 to 1 May 2014, it generated the need for a budget re-alignment that postponed immediate implementation of the CB plan originally scheduled for 24 September. It is now planned for a series of days between December 2013 and January 2014 before ASK’s scheduled close out in February 2014.

Looking ahead, LETS will ensure that for its last and third semester in target schools, its planning will focus on sustainability, including strengthening the structures and skills of its school-based LE team members while deepening the integration of the RBB and school activities. Simultaneously, LETS will strengthen MoE understanding of the RBB and build their capacity according to assessment activities scheduled for October 2013. Towards both ends, LETS will continue organizing its project units into an organized, efficient whole, fully capable
of supporting the next two essential LEI benchmarking events anticipated for early October and early December 2013 across all project schools.

**Summary for Year 2**

The first quarter of FY13 saw the LETS team re-assessing its trajectory of project goals/targets in light of the team’s Year 1 delays in producing the full spectrum of training content needed, as well as delays in obtaining data associated with the QED and the school specific assessment. The delay necessitated changes during the first quarter of FY 13 (and our first semester in schools), including reducing the school to coach ratio in order to give schools more face time with coaches thus preparing a more solid foundation for LETS interventions in schools.

In January 2013 Creative installed its new COP and supported his efforts to overhaul project operational (drafting of new project proposal, work plan, and management plan) and functional (Work Streams tasked with project deliverables) frameworks. These changes required the renegotiation of a new agreement with the Central Ministry of Education. The MoE Secretary General confirmed composition and appointment of senior management to the new LETS MoE Task Force on March 6, 2013.

With the change in SOW came the dissolution of key features of LETS’ original SOW and the dismissal of a quarter of the LETS team. Those adjustments included: ending the work of one of two subcontractors (JHU) in charge of content development and the positive behavior change campaign; the elimination of the quasi-experimental design and the accreditation components under component 3; and in the interest of USAID Forward, the elevation of local subcontractor ASK to a level of partner with the expressed goal to support capacity building (through operational and technical shadowing and training) that would enable ASK to be a direct recipient of USAID funding. Now with two components instead of three, the LETS activity includes under Component 1 ASK managing coach content development implemented according to its signature 3-phased approach and a higher coach to school ratio (1:3) than used during the first semester under the use of ISP (Individual School Profiles) and RBB (Results Based Benchmarking) and under Component 2 capacity building of the MoE and of ASK.

As ASK expanded its field deployment capacity to reach a greatly improved ratio of coaches to schools, LETS fully integrated ASK into program implementation as its Field Implementation Unit (FIU). Rapid-results initiatives driven at once by FIU in a Three-Phase approach, supported by management by Project Technical Work Streams (PWS), has allowed for periodic system prototyping helping to ensure that all capacity building components operated sequentially or in parallel as dictated by targeted results and that time-taxing challenges are managed and avoided wherever possible. LETS Units are now geared entirely towards cascading Learning Environment Improvement (LEI) capacity-building, which takes place when required from LETS Technical leads to coaches, then from coaches to School Teams, and finally to individual professional staffs in the 120 project schools.

All FIU-led school-based interventions kicked off on schedule on February 10, 2013. As the expansion of the coaching team reached 40 members on March 10 in addition to three field coordinators, Phase One activities set the stage for a smooth commencement of Phase Two field activities. Phase One successes highlighted the formation of an average of five Learning Environment Improvement (LEI) School Teams per school (600 in total), including 480 Student Teams. In all,
LE Teams engaged in 480 school-based initiatives that involved students, teachers, parents and community members working together to update schools’ Vision & Mission, better maintain school buildings, open up lines of communication between different community partners, and promote local concern for students’ health and safety in more caring and engaging learning environments. Phase Two activities successfully dealt with improvement of classroom discipline and engaged all 600 schools LE Teams and sub-teams in planning their school community projects, now financially supported through project seed moneys.

Moving from the original QED and associated QAS that framed LETS from the outset to an approach that emphasizes practical, field-based best practices in LEI has required patience, expertise, optimism and an understanding of and empathy for colleague-educators carrying the project torch. By the end of Year 2, LETS is confident that both the three-phase coaching format and the LEI field-based benchmarking strategy are producing results. For the first time in the life of the project, LETS registers a decreasing trend in incidence of negative behaviors reported by the end of year 2.

Component 1 has seen all 120 schools engaged in the drafting and revision of their ISPs and the LETS team carried out an RBB trial session that prepares them well for the ultimate benchmarking sessions of Year 3. All 120 schools also engaged in the first of a series of activities as part of a planned SCP along strict project criteria, and procured the necessary support material through special project seed money funding.

Component 2 activities for the MoE link RBB capacity building to LEI in project schools while strengthening the operational functions of LETS’ local partner, ASK in order to build its capacity to one day receive direct USAID funding. Documented senior level MoE support for the LETS RBB and the project overall refocuses attention on the importance of anchoring reform initiatives in the school (as the education system’s essential base unit) and is a testimony to revised LETS’ SOW. Similarly, an organizational capacity assessment of ASK conducted by the Creative Home Office in April 2013 provides the basis for a tailored capacity building plan of ASK staff which will include training on: management and administrative systems, internal controls, financial management, and audit and NICRA preparation. The consultant group Allegro, which includes well-known subject matter specialists associated with USAID contracts training, will provide training to ASK staff (and Creative LETS staff) during the first quarter of LETS final year (December 2013).

LETS has experienced project adjustments within a short period of time and has been ever-mindful of the need for timely and effective implementation towards reaching LETS targets within its allotted three semester period. As change heralds both opportunity and challenge, LETS has managed to address its challenges and turn some into a force of strong opportunity.

**Key Challenges**

- Challenges experienced during Year 1 of the project related to content development processes and low coach to school ratio delayed some parts of LETS’ implementation in LETS schools.
- FIU and MoE initial concerns and/or lack of familiarity with RBB efforts using ISP and RBB instruments. Concerns at the MoE led to a delayed approval of the RBB process. Moving forward and given training needs, our challenge will include ways to efficiently
transition practice over to LETS three key partners, the central MoE, the ten FDs, and project schools.

- Earlier, limited alignment hindered LETS’ ability to make significant progress in the field as partners found it a challenge to reconcile sometimes dissonant project messages. The change in project partnership in February and the elimination of some features of the project have helped to address the issue. LETS partners are still learning about LEI international best practices and it must remain the LEI guiding light.
- Boys’ schools continue to show results that lag behind results of girls and mixed schools as noted in the M&E section.

**Key Successes**

- LETS ability to rapidly hire, train and deploy more coaches during the first and second semesters while maintaining an active presence in target schools in the midst of significant SOW and project staff changes was a notable success for LETS. This included turning delay into an advantage, where coaches during the first semester spent what was considered important time in building relationships of trust with schools, and preparing them conceptually to take on the work of change management in the schools.
- The second semester in schools had been well underway by the time LETS and USAID finalized its new SOW in February 2013. In spite of the transition in team composition and leadership, LETS coaches returned to the school in January focused on keeping LEI momentum moving forward, implementing training based on content developed during the first semester. Between LETS and Creative HO, ASK was able to hire and deploy a total of additional coaches in historically record time, thereby demonstrating that Creative and ASK had streamlined and improved a heretofore tedious coach and ASK staff approval processes.
- While FIU coaches received 33 additional hours of training between July and August 2013 to strengthen their foundation of RBB, the MoE Task Force, Field Directorate officers and principals also received training and hands on experience using the RBB. Both efforts made a significant impact at the school and at the policy level with more robust and realistic RBB data generated out of target schools, and the MOE endorsing the RBB theoretical framework and approving LETS effort to continue piloting the RBB through the third semester.
- Efforts to more fully integrate are sole partner and all components along Project Work Streams (PWS) as documented in previous reports has done much to improve alignment and messaging. The process is continuous and the team continues to refine its approach to project integration, emphasizing finer levels of integration based on task, and quality assurance monitoring.
- While boys’ schools lag behind girls and mixed schools in their LEI results, feedback from the majority of LETS schools began to show positive results in LEI improvement during the second semester. A number of previously documented school visits by USAID and MoE officials, along with LETS quality assurance team visits have shown a general receptivity and readiness for LETS interventions.
Key Next Steps
LETS was notified during its fourth quarter that it is ending its activities on May 1, 2014 rather than as August 7, 2014. During the remaining months, to support a smooth hand-over between LETS and its partners, LETS will focus on the following:

- Continued and sustained participation of MoE TF members in all LETS activities, in particular project school visits and regular PSRS that have proved a fertile ground for alignment of professional views;
- Continued and sustained effort on the part of all LETS units to remain focused on LEI benchmarking. Towards that effort, FIU must continue to align its proposed activities along LEI best practices, minimizing mundane activities in favor of other pursuits more prone to bringing lasting support to LE improvement;
- LETS continued support of FIU as it attempts to differentiate both approach and onsite support modes when working with boys or secondary schools; and
- LETS will continue to document and verify schools progress through quality assurance efforts, noting schools’ ability to use RBB to inform their LEI planning. Such documentation will inform MoE future policy decisions as it works towards integrating LETS gains into its larger reform initiatives.

Program Component Activities and Progress
The following represents a review of LETS fourth quarter activities for each component followed by a review of this quarters successes, challenges, and actions to be taken. Each component quarterly review is followed by a summary of year 2 activities under each component.

Program Component 1: Building Capacities within School to Support Enabling Environments
Two subsets of activities support LETS efforts in building capacities at the school level. The first under Sub-IR 1.1 Improved school community access to and use of learning environment data focuses on gathering and understanding school-level data through the use of ISPs and RBBs to support school efforts in understanding their current environment (ISP) and then objectively assessing their progress towards improving their learning environment (RBB). The second under Sub IR 1.1 Strengthened school capacity and support is through on-site support and training of school LE teams through the use of LETS coaches, coupled with resources to support school community projects, the implementation of which is also supported by the coaches. The framework upon which coach field activities are designed includes the four domains of a Healthy, Safe, Caring and Engaging learning environment. LETS derived these categories based on its General Survey Assessment conducted during the project’s first phase in collaboration with the with the Ministry of Education. The five categories of the RBB complement these four domains.

The last quarter of FY2013 saw an intensity of activity as the team prepared for the commencement of a new school year and the refinement of RBB tools and related training.
Provided in the sections below is the presentation of LETS fourth quarter in FY2013 activities, successes, general challenges and actions relevant to this quarter. Following is an annual summary of this year’s activities.

All LETS management activities concentrated on three very distinct yet closely related domains: a) internal capacity building, b) field alignment, and c) planning for and launching into school-based activities for the project’s last semester. Although the overwhelming majority of project management and implementation interventions dealt with LETS’ component one, component two activities that involved our key partners, ASK and the Ministry of Education were also central to our preoccupations.

Sub IR 1.1: Improved school community access to use of learning environment data

*Internal capacity building*

By way of background, assessment of the initial benchmarking session carried out in May 2013 showed a number of trends indicative of a general lack of clarity among coaches and the MoE of LETS benchmarks. In short, LETS training support efforts needed further refinement given that at that time, LETS coaches and most schools’ LE team members had not made the link of the benchmarking effort with a basic LEI gap assessment exercise. As a result, only in very few schools was LEI international Best Practice taken in as the ultimate goal against which all LEI efforts must be assessed to arrive at a reasonable placement of the school on the LETS LE improvement continuum. In the wake of MoE’s tardiness in approving proposed LEI benchmarking approach (RBB), LETS coaches could only benefit from cursory training prior to conducting their first benchmarking exercise with all 120 project schools. In retrospect and given the very short period of time they had to familiarize themselves with both the tool and process, coaches did a very commendable job. However, the first (May 2013) benchmarking resulted in an uncharacteristically generous rating of individual schools LE improvement effort, generally, one that was not borne out by reality in many project schools.

At the same time, the exercise generated numerous and probing discussions around the benchmarks themselves. Questions on the RBB tool and the benchmarking process such as: “Is it a “valid and reliable” tool? Are they workable in Jordanian schools? Why do they offer a five-step progressive development scale? Do they really and effectively relate to school-based activities as offered through LETS?; Should LETS coaches lead it or leave schools’ LET members carry it out on their own? How long should be spent on it? How do we bring school members to be accurate in their rating of their own progress?” were revealing. These thoughtful questions clearly pointed to the need for a more clear review and explanation of and extensive internal training on LETS RBB. It also gave team members, especially LETS coaches, the chance to experience benchmarks first-hand and begin appreciating the tool’s complexity in spite of its surface simplicity.

The summer hiatus from schools offered ideal conditions to address this issue head-on. Project management with SASU put together an ambitious and extensive internal training plan. RBB training for coaches was led by SASU and RBB PWS members so that sessions could be carried out in both Arabic and English at all times (Annex B offers a full schedule of RBB training sessions and their content). The process was not without its own drawbacks as many found the new benchmarks challenging as evidenced by the questions noted above. Training first
concentrated on an extensive review of LEI International Best Practices to offer coaches real context to LETS benchmarks. Then, the second phase of training focused on appreciating the successive (and incremental) LEI development stages normally experienced in 21st century schools. The essential training message highlighted the importance that coaching school LE team members means helping them assess their effort objectively; benchmarking must never be seen as an evaluative task, rather it should allow entire schools to understand where they stand objectively on a simple LEI progressive scale. Professional objectivity and integrity must underpin the whole benchmarking process at all times.

**Field Alignment**

Project management conducted an internal intervention around LETS RBB with a parallel approach in the field. It correctly assessed the need for direct interface with all 120 project school principals. In conjunction with SASU and MCBU and FIU, LETS management orchestrated a series of Regional Principals/Field Directorate Seminars dispersed over the three regions in the kingdom (Jerash in the North, Amman in the Center, and Aqaba in the South) through the first two weeks in September 2013 (08, 15, and 18 September 2013). These sessions were aimed at engaging school administrators and Field Directorate employees or personnel at once in a systematic, open and interactive review of all key educational and managerial concepts embedded in the new LETS benchmarks.

Opening with a comprehensive review of what current LEI Best Practice entails and moving on to RBB’s five development stages, the three seminars led colleagues through a simplified, shortened mock benchmarking exercise. All of them also had the opportunity to share their own varied initiatives and rate them objectively against the benchmarking scale. This more than any other previous presentation or debate on the project’s revised approach to LEI afforded all principals the opportunity to appreciate the true validity of LETS RBB and their accuracy in guiding a school’s effort towards developing a safer, healthier, more caring and engaging learning environment.

Principals’ participation in the three RBB seminars was excellent and their direct contribution spoke volumes in terms of their new understanding of LETS RBB and their enthusiasm for the flexibility and adaptability of the tool. Indeed, a clear focus was brought on to the empowering qualities of LETS benchmarks as they are highly suited to the initial assessment purpose LETS has assigned to it in the project. However, the RBB should also be part of the next steps schools must consider once benchmarking has been concluded: LEI will be guided by content/activities explicitly offered in support of moving forward from say the initiating stage to the exploring one, or from performance to competence. Specific, diverse and multiple considerations should be given to the LEI incremental process and RBB offers a unique means of guiding that process. Finally, LETS RBB engages users towards in-depth consideration and analysis of current LEI International Best Practices, thereby helping the local educator in his or her quest for the next best steps to consider within the Jordanian context. Jordanian building administrators who attended LETS three RBB seminars quickly began to realize that LETS RBB’s versatility allows them to remain in full control of their LEI choices.

Although attendance of Field Directorate employees or personnel was not as widespread as that of Principals, it still indicated a reasonable interest in and support for our initiative. According to
their own comments, the sessions brought them closer to the field in the sense that professional language around LETS RBB is now shared uniformly thus generating a professional consensus around project schools’ LE improvement initiative that facilitates their direct LEI monitoring in RBB-relevant language.

Finally, LETS undertook a major alignment effort with colleagues in the LETS MoE Task Force. Members had expressed through last quarter meetings and especially in the course of the May 15, 2013 PSRS the desire to enrich the professional dialogue through an expanded immersion in LEI benchmarking as designed and offered by LETS. The MoE TF Professional Retreat took place from August 17, 2013 through to August 19, 2013 in Aqaba. The theme of the two-day seminar centered on LETS LEI benchmarks and how they relate to current 21st century reality of child-centered education. We also ensured that we demonstrated the clear linkage that now exists between RBB and the current Ministry initiative SDIP. That other Ministry venture seeks to offer better support to schools as they engage in newly mandated school-based strategic planning and school-wide improvement initiatives. To that end, LETS re-design generated through last January’s project re-scoping anchored all LEI initiatives first within the larger parameters of school improvement planning, then within essential wider considerations of the management of change in modern schools. Again, and as noted with principals, the retreat generated and confirmed essential alignment, appreciation and views around the concept of LEI benchmarking. Proceedings also helped clarify which policy options MoE employees could eventually choose to explore. Because LETS designed RBB specifically for field use as a school-based instrument to guide LEI initiatives, their use can easily become part of Ministry guidelines and/or mandates and support Ministry LEI expectations throughout the public school system.

**Third Semester Planning**

Planning activities related to third semester initiatives were initiated in early August with a series of internal technical meetings dedicated to the identification of priorities. These included four key areas of concern: data collection processes and requirements, project interface with FDs, lead-up to and conducting RBB sessions in schools, and sharing project progress through PWS. These were then dealt with deliberately through a one-and-a-half day capacity building professional retreat that was held over 25/26 August 2013 at the Dead Sea. The LETS 2013 professional retreat allowed all LETS Team members and 5 Key subcontractor ASK Management Team members to join in and concentrate on a detailed review of project domains with a view to arrive at alignment about next steps. The decision-making process adopted was based on consensus around a clear emphasis on LETS RBB. This session was in fact LETS Team’s first opportunity to discuss RBB’s guiding role within LETS and to appreciate how they relate to school-based interventions. It also finally helped strengthen FIU’s support. The RBB offers schools an LEI objective assessment that gives a general appreciation of a school’s progress towards international LEI Best Practices. LETS contribution is to offer a simple, progressive, incremental approach to LEI improvement, building on visible, demonstrated success, starting from MoE mandates’ LE baseline. LEI Best Practice is not a LETS contribution, rather it is used as the ultimate LEI goal that each one of the 120 project schools is invited to consider and then work towards.

LETS final third semester planning exercise culminated with preparation and delivery of FIRM4. Initially scheduled for August 29, 2013, it was postponed to September 5, 2013 to accommodate
changes in LETS coaches RBB training and subsequent delivery of the principals regional seminars. FIRMs offer a regular, open forum for all project units to share their progress, successes and challenges as experienced through project implementation with our client. Detailed review and analysis of FIRM3 held in June 2013 lead to the decision to devote this initial meeting in the third semester to an exhaustive consideration of project planning to the end of the calendar year. The salient points brought to light through FIRM4 touched upon the four following domains:

- A closer, tighter integration of project units through a revised capture of all PWS, in terms of membership, function, and role within project implementation as shown in Annex B;
- A determined effort to ensure LETS RBB’s guiding role in terms of supporting all schools LEI mapping effort;
- An expansion of formal internal communication functions through the establishment of weekly technical LEADS meetings (in addition to previous meeting patterns) and the launching of the LETS professional RBB blog where all LETS coaches are invited to share their RBB work and discuss LEI Best Practice as adapted to the Jordanian context; and
- An effort to continue to increase MoE support for and understanding of LEI benchmarks through their direct participation in weekly school visits.

Some of the key activities during this quarter include the following:

- FIU coaches collected the SY 12/13 ISP’s from schools on 24 September 2013 and submitted them to SASU;
- An updated version of the ISP was developed during the first week of September in coordination with the FIU. The modified document was sent on 11 September to FIU coaches to collect school information for the SY 13/14. Changes include removing data that are already collected through other M&E forms (such as referrals logs), in order to avoid duplication, changing some data collection (such as student and teacher absenteeism) from monthly to semester-basis and improving the format to make it clearer;
- Results of the May 2013 Benchmarking Trial were analyzed and discussed in detail with all LETS coaches with a view to set the stage for actual benchmarking sessions in the fall;
- On the 30th of July, MEU, in consultation with FIU, redesigned all data collection forms as now apply to LETS’ revised PMP.
- FIU offered systematic support to LETs to document their second school community project and schools’ extra-curricular activities;
- As part of FIU’s phase one (re-igniting the change) they conducted reflection sessions in each of the 120 schools to review schools’ past achievements in light of their vision & mission; and
- All schools’ LET reviewed last May RBB results and engaged the discussion on LEI best Practices.

Provided in the sections below is the presentation of LETS general challenges and successes, and anticipated next steps in light of this quarter’s activities.
Challenges

- A full understanding and ownership of ISP and RBB in support of LEI remains still to be somewhat of a challenge for most of the school Learning Environment Teams (LET);
- Outstanding questions and/or the lack of a full understanding of the LETS RBB process required extra planning for capacity building, extending the capacity building time beyond what had been originally planned for both the MoE and coaches. However, the dedicated time did not delay project implementation and was necessary to address all questions surrounding the new approach and allay LETS coaches’ concerns about the new project tools;
- Data collection quality can be more robust.
- MoE concerns with the RBB, as it was seen initially as inferior to the quality assurance model provided under the previous SOW.
- The flexibility given to schools to choose their resources resulted in in a longer than necessary procurement process and the inclusion of many vendors and a wide variety of procurement requests. Due to the expansive nature of the requests, items procured by the various vendors precluded close inspection of items before purchase; items procured were often of poor quality and a disappointment to the schools.
- Delayed delivery of school materials to schools due to access to warehouses blocked by MoF in order to verify procurement process.

Successes

- An improved understanding among LETS school communities of ISPS and use of LE data collected through the 5 revised data collection forms which are aligned with the project PMP due to three successful regional trainings on the practical use of the RBB for all of all 120 school principals across 3 regions. During the training, principals engaged in actual assessment of the different LETS-facilitated activities that have taken place in their schools;
- An improved understanding and support of the RBB tool among FIU coaches, made possible by the 33 hours of RBB training provided by LETS leadership.
- Successful training of FIU coaches in preparation for the start of LETS third and final semester in the schools according to the ASK model.
- Successful and timely procurement of a wide variety of school project materials for schools.
- MoE approval to continue piloting of RBB until December 2013

Next Steps

- Continued capacity building on the use of the ISP for LET members and school administration to support their improved understanding of the link between the two components of the benchmarking tool. FIU school-based activities in support of LEI will continue to be integrated into the RBB-guided LEI processes;
- MEU will continue capacity building on the importance of rigorous data collection and conduct regular QA visits to schools to discuss data collection procedures directly with LET members and encourage them in that task. The MEU will also collaborate with FIU
to address all data collection issues expeditiously, and follow-up regularly with field QA visits;

- SASU to interface with FIU on a regular basis to expand on standard, international LEI Best Practices. Jordan educators must now avail themselves of the best information sources widely available to them electronically and build their LEI Best Practice capacity accordingly;

- Strengthening the support of a learning community in which LET and LETS coaches have been invited to contribute and share their professional experience on the new LETS RBB Blog; and

- LETS has contributed its new, creative approach to LEI benchmarking: all LETS coaches are requested to engage their schools’ LET in a professional discussion of the five LEI development stages and in particular, of the specific constants that support them.

Sub IR 1.2: Strengthened school capacity and support

LETS coaches were busy during the fourth quarter in preparation for new school year. Towards that end, LETS coaches spent the first part of the 4th quarter engaged in 33 hours of capacity building related to the RBB (as noted in the previous section) as FIU at-large focused on developing an activities manual for school use. Coaches also supported procurement efforts related to school project materials and rehearsed training plans to be implemented at the start of the school year. Field implementation activities between mid-August and the end of the quarter included a two week period in which coaches supported school staff in reflection of RBB results. In parallel to the field-based activities, the LETS team jointly supported coaching sessions for principals, counselors and LET teams. LETS coaches also conducted sharing experiences sessions among each other aimed at identifying major challenges facing the coaches during the second school semester, and to brainstorm recommended solutions to overcome these challenges in the coming semester.

Filed Implementation Activities

Phase One: Re-Igniting the Change

Within a two-week period from August to September 2013, LETS focused on enabling school staff to reflect on progress, identify strengths and weaknesses, and plan for next steps in light of the RBB and third semester learning environment activities. Work with school communities also reviewed revising schools’ mission and vision in light of the progress made. In particular, this phase focused on planning for the first week of the school year to provide a positive welcoming environment.

LETS provided coaching sessions for both old and new school principals. Sessions for the experienced LE principals focused on third semester activities and securing principals’ full commitment on continuing the implementation of activities that will enhance their schools’ LE. These coaching sessions also provided the needed support for the principal to reflect on school LE achievements and to what extent they’re achieving the school’s mission and vision. It focused on planning for involving new teachers and students in school life and LE improvement. New principal coaching sessions introduced LETS objectives and the expected values and outcomes needed to enhance the LE in the school, while also emphasizing the principal’s role in facilitating the implementation of these activities towards achieving project objectives.
FIU also conducted coaching sessions for school counselors and LE Teams. The sessions focused on the process and progress of student behavior monitoring in classrooms over the past two semesters while creating an action plan with the school counselor for the third semester.

The coach facilitated session for the school community entitled: “*A Brighter Start for a Better Learning Environment*” was aimed at identifying last semester’s challenges and achievements, and how to leverage achievements for future implementation, especially in light of the RBB. As part of this effort coaches worked with school communities on planning for the opening week of school. The plan included activities such as: inspecting the school premises and ensuring that it is *safe and healthy* for students; *engaging and inviting* parents in the first day of school; *Implementing activities* and *events* to foster a positive and attractive LE for the students; and introductory activities to unify old and new students and teachers. For example, in al Qabesy Secondary School for Boys an activity titled “Name Chain” was implemented, which aimed to welcome new students in the school. A similar example in Wadi Al Rayyan Basic School for Boys, an introductory activity was implemented in which the new students were introduced to their colleagues. In the Abu Habeel Mixed Basic School coaches supported LE efforts with students, helping them to design cards with their names and their school ambitions which were displayed in classrooms.

For RBB improvement, coaches provided support to LE teams in several ways. For example, in Khuzma Secondary School for Boys, LE teams identified their work areas to focus on the benchmark (school provides safe and support classes) and the benchmark (high expectations). Also in Ekremah Secondary School for Boys the focus next semester will be on the health facilities in the school. As al Hamidiyah Basic School will focus on providing opportunities for the students to enhance their leadership skills.

**Phase Two: Executing the Change**

This ten week phase started in September and is focused on enhancing the LE through providing the needed support to the school community in planning and implementing the 2nd school project while empowering teachers with the needed capacity to better employ classroom management techniques. Coaches will also focus on: counselor skills in reinforcing positive behavior; students’ leadership skills through involving them in the different school activities; and engaging parents and the local community in LE planning.
In order to achieve the above objectives LETS implemented the School Project workshop which focused on identifying school teams different roles in implementing the second school project, and in identifying the activities and events that are going to be executed in this phase. This workshop targeted the school staff, parents and the local community and resulted in each team identifying their activities. Each team initiated their Action Plan, and now they are in the executing stage of these activities.

FIU conducted two workshops to build teachers’ Capacity in “Modern Teaching Pedagogies”. The first workshop entitled “Using Drama in Education” enables teachers to be more interactive in lesson delivery by using activities that include role play, debate, and the expert guests. For example, in Wadi Al Salt Mixed Basic School teachers implemented the “Open and Close” activity in which the teacher organized the content of the Arabic Language curriculum through storytelling, asked the students to act out the in front of their classmates, then open the discussion on the main ideas and themes of the scene. By the end of this session the teachers planned to deliver their lessons by using drama techniques and including the strategies learned in the workshop.

LETS teams conducted a training session targeting students which focused on building on what had been achieved during the past school semester -- their leadership skills and encouraging positive behaviors. This training session also emphasized the importance of participating in the LE team in order to coordinate for implementing new student-led initiatives that focuses on their leadership roles, which will reflect positively on their self-esteem.

Finally, the FIU team members supported data collection, including:
- Ensuring that the ISP and E1 forms are properly filled.
- Supporting the counselor in filling the E3 Form.
- Supporting the school teams to document the second school project by using the E4 Template.
- Supporting the teachers to document the extra-curricular activities by using the E5 Forms.

A summary of activities are noted below;

- 120 ‘First Week of School’ plans, were implemented and developed by the schools, which included activities such as:
  - Investigating the school premises and ensuring that it is safe and healthy for students.
  - Engaging and inviting parents in the first day of school activities
  - Implementing activities and events to foster a positive and attractive LE for the students.
  - Implementing introductory activities to unify old and new students and teachers.
- 120 “Second School Project” workshops were conducted in the schools.
- 120 “Modern teaching Pedagogies” workshops were conducted in the schools.
- 120 school activities were implemented to create a welcoming and attractive school environment.
- 120 “For a Brighter Start” activities developed and implemented by the schools that positively engaged students to contribute to a positive LE.
- Finalized the Second School Project that focused on achieving the level of improvement on the different levels of the benchmarks.
- Schools integrated the new school staff (teachers) into the school teams.

**Challenges**

- Lack of consensus/mutual understanding on the implementation of the RBB component in LETS Schools
- Turnover of School Community Members: upon start of the new school year 409 teachers, 17 principals and 19 admin employees in project schools have either transferred to another school or left the school. This situation in turn causes constant change in LE team membership and makes it harder to maintain momentum;
- Significant increase in the number of Syrian students in the classrooms: The addition of many students that are foreign to the Jordanian Public school system simply puts even more strain on an already fledgling system. This makes specific requirements on LETS emphasis on engaging all students;
- Recent Ministry of Education decisions such as reassigning the teaching of specialized curricula (Phys. Ed., art, vocational education) from primary grades teachers over to junior grades staff, or tasking Assistant Principals with up to 10 – 12 teaching periods/week has translated into less availability of primary staffs and Administrators for project support; and
- Principals in some project schools show limited leadership skills and find it difficult or impossible to guide their LET.

**Successes**

In addition to meeting its project activity implementation targets, the LETS team achieved the following successes:

- FIU team members participated in 33 hours of training on the RBB process and are now in a strong position to better integrate RBB into field training activities;
- FIU coaches have increased their onsite support where possible to support new School Community members. As noted in attachment __ school-based LE activities have included opportunities to provide peer support to teachers;
- LETS LE activities have included working with LE Teams on active ways to welcome Syrian students and reduce school-community tension. See attachment _ for example activities;
- FIU coach training over the last quarter included strategies to support teachers’ skills in time management, planning and successfully implementing school project activities.

**Next Steps**

- FIU to help LETS coaches to plan and implement a Mentorship program between returning members and new staffs, also involving supportive community members;
- Wherever feasible, FIU will redistribute coaches’ time to increase onsite support days in schools with large number of newcomers;
- LETS coaches must dwell on engaging activities specifically geared to foreign (Syrian) newcomers and engage parental support in this initiative wherever possible;
• FIU coaches to ensure all students in the school are seen as students first; leadership roles must be open to all and peer-coaching will be re-enforced;
• FIU coaches will ensure they engage LEI professional discussion with their respective FD counterparts and support their regular visit to schools;
• FIU Coaches will enroll support from more junior grade staffs in support of project activities;
• FIU Coaches will focus on leadership skills and on delegation of tasks among different school community members; and
• FIU will allocate SASU up to one hour every other Thursday morning for LETS coaches to address any RBB concern. The first such meeting was held on 19 September: SASU members shared and distributed a one-page document with a few notes for coaches to consider prior to the first RBB session.

SIR 1.3 School and community-based projects implemented
Over the last quarter, the LETS procurement team worked closely with Creative HO procurement office in an attempt to improve and streamline its procurement process ensuring that school supplies would be delivered to the schools on schedule. In an attempt to be more responsive to the needs of the schools and coaches, SPSU developed a new list of 187 items (stationary, office supplies, sports equipment, maintenance equipment, cleaning and hygiene materials, science laboratory supplies, furniture and electronic devices and appliances) that best addressed all school needs in support of their school community projects. SPSU drafted 7 invitations for bids to run over 15-16 July, 2013. Bids closed on 5 August and tenders were awarded for a combined value of $287,489.97. At time of writing, LETS successfully procured materials in support of LETS school community projects had been received into the MoE warehouse in Amman pending delivery to schools.

Challenges
a. In spite of essential lessons learned through previous procurement initiatives, LETS experienced delays in providing schools with their ordered materials in a timely manner due to the Ministry wanting assurances of procurement processes used. The MoE altered its approach to releasing project procured material requesting additional paperwork at the last minute thus unexpectedly pushing back delivery to school by as much as three weeks
b. School Community projects are not always in line with set criteria even though they have been spelled out in great detail.
c. Linkages between school-based projects and LEI benchmarks are not always obvious, as a result schools have tended to engage in a great variety of activities without due concern for systemizing their LEI ventures which usually keeps them at a lower LEI benchmark rating (i.e.; exploring or developing at best).
d. Although materials procured for project schools do contribute to enhancing their overall environment, direct linkage to specific school project remains tenuous.
e. Review and discussion of past semester’s experiences during the “A Brighter Start for a Better Learning Environment” session has shown that individual schools did not pay enough attention to budgeting.
Successes
- Successful and timely procurement of school project materials;
- The procurement team has demonstrated its ability to continuously learn from previous experience and adapt its procurement process within limits of Creative/USAID procurement guidelines in an effort to be more responsive to the field. Had it not been for the unforeseen delay noted above under challenges, materials would have been delivered to the schools on time; 120 “Second School Project” workshops were conducted in the schools.

Next Steps
- The LETS procurement team will meet with relevant MoE offices to document its expectations for the next and final round of procurement, thus planning for possible MoE assurances concerns;
- LETS coaches will review all project criteria thoroughly with LET prior to signing on to project approval.
- FIU coordinators will oversee school spending to ensure no school engages its entire budget on just one single event but rather spreads project benefits over time and the largest possible number of classes in the school.
- SPSU to engage discussion with MoE in order to review new essential MoE procurement requirements and guidelines.
- The usual differential between standard material prices in original order list and prices secured through the bidding process has generated a budget balance that some schools can still access. SPSU will inform all schools of their respective balance so they can use up their budget over the next quarter.
- LETS coaches will monitor each SCP as they unfold so that end-of-project can be objectively documented on appropriate data collection form.

COMPONENT 1 OVERVIEW FOR YEAR 2
LETS successfully initiated the re-orientation of the LETS SOW. The January 2013 re-scoping resulted in immediate gains in terms of project impact at the school level. Coaching model redesign allowed for a sustained project presence in all 120 schools. Immediate benefits included the following:
- Stabilization of project implementation around the three-phase approach launched through second quarter brought about a better understanding of project goals and a wider buy-in from participating schools;
- Successful transition from QED/QAS format over to school-based reform initiative based on LEI benchmarking (RBB) against world LEI Best Practice;
- All 120 Principals have participated in LEI RBB training sessions offered by LETS and have overwhelmingly endorsed this new approach to school-based LEI;
- All 120 Project schools have enjoyed access to SCP support funding through seed money provided. This afforded them the opportunity to plan for a range of school-based activities outside of the normal restrictive local financial parameters (on average, schools can access less than $1000 in operations funding per year). It also allowed schools to
envisage – most for the first time – leveraging additional funding from their local community through direct community involvement engaged by the school’s LET;

- Successful engagement of school leadership in reflective professional practice based on objective assessment of school performance: many Principals underlined the value of LETS as having offered the very road map they felt they needed to frame their LEI ideas and projects. The live model RBB session held in Zaraq school in conclusion to the coaches RBB training vividly demonstrated project impact in the key domain of professional objectivity;

- Visible improvement in educators’ perception of the centrality of the child in modern education as demonstrated by project schools gains in making their LEI safer, healthier, more caring and engaging for more children: more specific impact in this area is shared in Annex D;

- Successful engagement of a wide range of community members in the life of the school: while other MoE initiatives such as SDIP had underlined the necessity for schools to reach out to their larger communities for support and engagement in the overall education process, LETS actually made it possible within project format as community members joined the local LET.

**Major Challenges for Year 2**

Overly generous LEI benchmarking results by schools were a general feature of the May 2013 RBB trial and it required extensive debriefing at the school level as well as internally within FIU. LETS three-phased approach is now in place and fully functional. However, as the integration of onsite training and LEI evidence-based approaches (i.e., including RBB) had been a challenge, the apparent disconnect had led at times to significant differences in views (in particular between FIU and the COP). These differences have been overcome but accounted for an initial degree of disconnect between project units, adding a degree of some strain on project implementation.

- LETS’ new benchmarking approach seemed to be a challenge to LETS FIU and the MOE. In that sense, the transition over to RBB took longer than anticipated. LETS coaches participated in 33 hrs of SASU-led capacity building in LEI benchmarking and the issue of integration is essentially resolved. SCP funding was in place to facilitate all project schools’ different initiatives. However, the procurement process adopted by SPSU in all three procurement rounds proved cumbersome and more importantly, could not be deployed in synch with activities roll out in schools. Although all schools eventually did receive materials ordered;

- While a critical number of project schools Principals have embarked on and support the LEI benchmarking approach, leadership in secondary and boys schools continue to remain largely on the sidelines;

- In terms of project impact in its four key domains of student safety, health, caring and engaging, it is clear that LETS can do more in boys and secondary schools. Those schools are the ones where more traditional practices prevail and apart from selected schools that had previously outreached to their local community (vocational secondary schools in particular), LETS gains remain minimal;

- Community engagement has developed rapidly in most project schools. However, presence of officials and of prominent community members in the school often remains an occasion for all school administration and staffs to cater to their rank rather than engage them in school affairs. In other words, LET need to develop strategies that will
attract higher-ranking members of the community to the side of modern, child-centered education.

- Boys and secondary schools cultures are markedly different than that of other project schools: LETS approach needs now to be much more differentiated to address that diversity.

Next Steps

- SASU and COP will continue to provide all necessary support to field colleagues as they engage their schools LET in the two upcoming rounds of LEI benchmarking. To that end, SASU is in the process of producing five support documents for LETS coaches to guide their work. Since the RBB pilot phase formally concludes on 31 December 2013, LETS needs thorough feedback on such documents’ usefulness as support for and guide in LEI benchmarking to inform recommendations the project will formulate during year three;
- Project management will review specific challenges LETS is facing in select boys and secondary schools. While the GSA identified those schools as the more challenging among all other project schools, LETS has not had as much time as it would have liked to focus more closely on these issues.
- LETS will consider a clearly differentiated approach in both boys and secondary schools. LEI best practice has long documented the necessity to differentiate educational considerations according to educational milieu – Jordan is no different. LETS COP has scheduled a number of joint discussions on this issue early in the next quarter with a view towards identifying one boys school and one secondary school for school-based action through to the end of the calendar year; and
- In terms of engaging more community members in local LE Improvement effort, LETS needs to close ranks with the SDIP, the other MoE countrywide initiative. SDIP advocates for the creation of a specific school governance model that includes community members and in that sense takes over where LETS ends. Such discussion should be managed at the FD level and will be part of the next quarter component two exercise.

In the wake of FIRM4, all PWS were entirely changed and new leads appointed. Ongoing and open communication between all project units will be maintained. The new weekly leads meeting supports such efforts and will provide a closer analysis of implementation issues and challenges, becoming the forum of choice for resolving difficulties encountered.

**Program Component 2: Capacity Building**

The second component of LETS is dedicated to capacity building with the project’s two key partners; the Central Ministry of Education and ASK the project local subcontractor. Over the past year, Component 2 activities for the MoE linked RBB capacity building to LEI in project schools while strengthening the operational functions of LETS’ local partner, ASK in order to build its capacity to one day receive direct USAID funding. Documented senior level MoE support for the LETS RBB and the project overall refocuses attention on the importance of anchoring reform initiatives in the school (as the education system’s essential base unit) and is a testimony to revised LETS’ SOW.
An April 2013 organizational capacity assessment of ASK conducted by the Creative Home Office provides the basis for a tailored CB SOW of ASK staff which will include training on: management and administrative systems, internal controls, financial management, and audit and NICRA preparation. The consultant group Allegro, which includes well-known subject matter specialists associated with USAID contracts training, will provide training to ASK staff (and Creative LETS staff) during the first quarter of LETS final year (December 2013).

Significant changes in the LETS SOW within a short period of time has required a more vigilant focus on making the best use of project resources to ensure timely and effective implementation towards reaching LETS targets within a three semester period.

Key Component 2 activities are noted below.

**Objective 2.1 MoE Capacity Building**

**Successes**

- The MoE TF and ten FD successfully bought into the new project LEI benchmarking. This required LETS to hold additional joint sessions specifically geared to meeting MoE Task Force’s needs and to redefining FD Learning Environment Support Teams (See Annex E).
- Most challenges that LETS met with in working with MoE TF have been addressed and resolved through this quarter.
- MoE TF was very appreciative of LETS’ Iftar invitation on 29 July: the event was preceded by a formal business meeting during which all participants engaged in a discussion of LETS RBB. Participation was excellent.
- MoE TF attendance at the August retreat in Aqaba was also instrumental in bringing all project stakeholders much closer together and focused on school-based education reform concepts that now undergird LETS implementation.
- PSRS were held during the MoE retreat in August as well as the series of Regional Principals meetings that also included FD participation in September.
- A successful review of MoE TF meetings, moving slowly from a series of somewhat disjointed meetings through the second semester over to a much more organized schedule of meetings which generated consensus around key project issues (i.e.; benchmarking pilot extension, school visits, etc.) through the fourth quarter:
- The Component Two Sub Committee (MoE CB) approved the addition of new members to its ranks on August 4, 2013 and approved Roles and Responsibilities of the Field Directorate LE Support Team through an official letter to the FD.
- On 11 September 2013, the sub-committee supported all plans for the MoE CB NA. It also approved use of the project brief school visit questionnaire (List of Look-Fors) for use by all visitors to better document such field visits.
- Successful planning for upcoming MoE TF needs assessment to be conducted in partnership with all members: MCBU finalized selection of external consultant Dr. Barbara Thornton.

Dr. Thornton will lead the Ministry’s Needs Assessment exercise jointly with MCBU STA early next quarter. The initial assessment was carried out off site in both English and Arabic through the use of a bilingual questionnaire completed on 29 September..
Challenges

- Time constraints continue to be an issue for all MoE TF colleagues but since re-alignment over this quarter, they have shown renewed interest in accompanying LETS both with Management and in the Field.

Next Steps

- MCBU will act as co-lead with external consultant Dr. Thornton during the MoE CB Needs Assessment session: this is to facilitate communication between consultant and Ministry colleagues; they are all well acquainted with MCBU STA who is a former MoE member.
- LETS management needs to continue to hold a number of PSRS through next quarter to ensure fluidity and content in all official communication about the project: as the Pilot unfolds, cues to possible Ministry policy must be identified and shared with ministry colleagues. LEI Best Practice is actually adapted to the Jordan educational K-12 context through the RBB Pilot.
- LETS MEU will review collected “Look-For” questionnaires filled in by external school visitors with a view to identify additional information about project LEI implementation. A full-scale analysis will be initiated early in the second quarter since only a limited number of visits will have been completed in time for analysis this quarter (See Annex F).

Objective 2.2 Local Subcontractor Capacity Building

Successes Achieved in Quarter 4

- More complete and more functional integration of all units, including FIU into entire project fabric as reflected in FIRM4
- Alignment of views around LETS RBB achieved by end of RBB training over July/August 2013
- ASK Capacity Building plan developed and agreed upon on 15 August (See Annex C)

Challenges

- Development of ASK CB Plan has required long negotiations between all parties, including COR, to arrive at a proposal acceptable to all.
- Implementation of CB Plan tentatively scheduled near end of first quarter in year three.

Next Steps

- Pursue weekly joint executive meetings between ASK Management and Project management as a privileged forum to address and resolve implementation issues.
- Pursue joint planning wherever warranted in support of project implementation and in particular for upcoming FIRM5 and FIRM6 next quarter
- Support dialogue between CAII HO and ASK Management in terms of finding best time frame for implementation of planned CB for ASK
COMPONENT 2 OVERVIEW FOR YEAR 2

Successes

- LETS successfully overcame MoE’s initial objections to project re-scoping: MoE TF now very supportive of project goals and involved in monitoring project field implementation.
- Project management successfully rallied skeptical subcontractor to validity of new LEI benchmarking approach.
- Project Director successfully oversaw development of a capacity building plan for ASK that its management received and approved.

Challenges

- MoE’s initial reluctance to consider the new project direction as a valid avenue for LEI in Jordan schools.
- Difficulties in locating appropriate external consultant knowledgeable in LEI Best Practices.

Next Steps

- Ensure close monitoring of MoE CB Seminars so that maximum benefit is derived in terms of Ministry understanding of and appreciation for senior management roles in support of LEI in Jordan schools.
- Ensure an immediate transfer of knowledge to FD through MCBU STA’s lead in offering similar CB training to Field Senior management.
- Ensure continued buy-in from MoE TF and FDs in order to identify all possible policy options related to LEI in K-12 Jordan schools early in the 2nd quarter Year 3.
- Proceed with and expedite implementation of ASK CB plan as soon as budget realignment is approved by USAID.

LETS OPERATIONS

1. Procurement

Lessons learned from the Semester 02 procurement:
The method of procurement that has been adopted to perform procurement for the 2nd batch of materials for LETS schools proved time consuming. Hence, it was strongly recommended that the 3rd batch of materials would be procured through an Invitation for Bids.

Procuring for SEM3:
Upon each school closing their seed money accounts, they were informed of their final budgets. A new list of 187 items was developed (stationary, office supplies, sports equipment, maintenance equipment, cleaning and hygiene materials, science laboratory supplies, furniture and electronic devices and appliances) to cover all school needs.
The receipt of bids was closed on 05 August. Bids were received as follows:

1. Tender #1: Stationary, Office Supplies, Mathematics and Science Classes Supporting Kits 11 bids
2. Tender #2: Sports Gear and Equipment 7 bids
3. Tender #3: Cameras, Printers and Multi-Function Machines 7 bids
4. Tender #4: Office Furniture 10 bids
5. Tender #5: Maintenance Gear, Paint, and Electrical Devices 9 bids
6. Tender #6: Cleaning and Hygiene Materials 8 bids
7. Tender #7: Appliances (fridges, fans, etc.) 7 bids

Tenders were awarded by the last week of August to 18 vendors as per the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tender</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Appliances</td>
<td>47,963.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Furniture</td>
<td>19,699.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cleaning</td>
<td>18,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maintenance</td>
<td>63,217.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Printers</td>
<td>21,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sports</td>
<td>33,802.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Stationary</td>
<td>83,383.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>287,486.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Shipping</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>312,909.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four attributes are taken into consideration before any awarding; (1) price, (2) quality, (3) availability of quantities, (4) and ability to deliver on time.

Vendors started the delivery of materials the first week of September which lasted for 3 weeks. All items are currently available at the MOE’s warehouses and ready to be inspected by the committee comprised at the ministry.

Next steps:

- Delivery of packages to schools is scheduled to start on 02 October and will spread over 10 working days.
- Those few schools that have not exhausted all of their budgets will be allowed to procure additional materials at currently set prices.
- SPSU will close the Seed Money account by 31 December 2013.

2. Human Resources
Mr. Laith Zumot’s new consultancy agreement (as LETS M&E support) was signed effective 08 August. LETS has secured Mr. Zumot’s professional services over 55 working days in support of PMP and RBB documentation

Ms. Samah Bazbaz, LETS new Schools Procurement & Supplies Specialist started working with LETS on 21 August

Mr. Ali Al-Nsour – Driver/Logistics Assistant resigned his position on 17 September.

Three candidates were interviewed for the position of Driver/Logistics Assistant; we are in the process of selecting one of the three.

Next Steps:
To fill the position of Driver/Logistics Assistant

The table has been removed.
Quantitative Report – PMP reporting

G.1: Chronic Non Attendance of School

The Ministry of Education (MOE) tracks attendance and other data on public school student performance at the end of each semester. Attendance data for the 120 schools were obtained from the EMIS department at the MOE for the last school year (Q4 Year 1, Q1, Q2, & Q3 Year 2). Data for this semester (Q4 Year 2 and Q1 Year 3) will be obtained at the end of this year to allow for a comparison. The data of last school year is shown below for reference.

| Total Population | 2.34% |
| Male Students    | 2.40% |
| Female Students  | 2.29% |

G.2: Positive Behaviors

Learning Environment teams in each school were also tasked with collecting information on students who participated in extracurricular activities as a sign of positive behavior change. The activities are limited to those related to Learning Environment improvement and generated by this project’s activities.

Although many such events and activities have already taken place in the schools, actual data collection only began this school semester (Quarter 4 yr 2). For the period Aug 26-Sep 26 the percentage participating in extra-curricular activities was 41%. The target percentage by end of this quarter is 25% of students participating in at least 1 extracurricular activity.

The number of extracurricular activities listed by schools to have taken place with student participation was 358. 214 activities were listed but no figures provided yet. The largest contributing activity to the tally of student participation was held in the first week/day of school “a bright start” and was reported to include almost all students in the school.

G.3: Negative Behaviors

Learning Environment teams in each school were tasked with collecting information on student referrals to school principal, counselors or health officers for various reasons including violent behaviors, or illness (using form E3 in the PMP Annex). Types of referrals monitored were:

- Referrals due to troublemaking in the classroom
- Behavioral referral due to destruction of school property
- Physical incidents (Not resulted from violence)
- Referrals due to bullying
- Referrals due to physical violence among students
- Referrals due to verbal violence among students
- Students’ complaints about physical violence of the teacher against them
- Students’ complaints against verbal violence by the teacher
- Referrals due to physical assault against teachers by students
Referral due to verbal assault against teachers by students
Physical assaults against teachers by parents
Illness referrals to school health teacher
Referrals due to learning difficulties

Data was collected by the end of last semester (Q2+3 Yr2) and a comparison was made between semesters for the school year 2012/13 to arrive at percent of schools that reported a reduction overall. In order to qualify as a drop, the aggregate number of referrals (summation of all referrals regardless of type) must drop by at least 5% compared to the previous semester. The below table shows the previous result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.3 Percent of Schools that report a reduction in negative behavior (Q2+Q3 Versus Q1 2012+Q42011 AKA semester 2 versus 1 school year 2012/13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicator will be revisited at the end of this quarter to calculate drop percentage between semesters.

Referrals for the period Sep 1-26th had been collected from the 120 schools. The numbers below are reported as a count showing both the total count as well as the count if 8 outlier schools reporting very high incidence rates are dropped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrals reported by type</th>
<th>Q4 12+Q1 13 Jun-Dec 12 1st Semester</th>
<th>Q2+Q3 13 Feb-Jun 13 2nd Semester</th>
<th>Q4 13 Sep 1-26 2013</th>
<th>Q 4 13 Sep 1-26 2013 w/out 8 outlier schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troublemaking in the classroom</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of school property</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical incidents (Not from violence)</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence among students</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence among students</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1642***</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher physical violence against students</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal violence by teacher against students</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault against teachers by students</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal assault against teachers by students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103**</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assaults against teachers by parents</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness referrals to school health teacher</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difficulties</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>262*</td>
<td>221*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator Performance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Disaggregate</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Baseline Period</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Target Period</th>
<th>Actual FY2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal: Improved Quality of Learning Environment for 5-18 year olds in 120 Jordanian public schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1</th>
<th>% change in proportion of students with chronic non-attendance in the 120 schools</th>
<th>% of students absent more than 10% of the time in a semester</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>2.34%</th>
<th>Yr 2 Q3 (School Year 12/13)</th>
<th>2.22%</th>
<th>Yr 3 Q1 (Sem. 1 13/14)</th>
<th>2.34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>% of students who practice positive behavior.</td>
<td>% students engaged in extracurricular activities</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1 (Sem. 1 13/14)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>% of schools that report a reduction in negative behavior prevalent at their schools.</td>
<td>Schools that show reduction of at least 5% overall in incidence of negative behaviors</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>Yr 2 Q3 (Sem 2 12/13 Vs. Sem 1 13/14)</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1 (Sem. 1 13/14 Vs. Sem. 2 12/3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline Period</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Target Period</td>
<td>Actual FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR1</td>
<td>Improved school capacity to support enabling environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR1a</td>
<td># of School with Improvement Plans that include an LE component</td>
<td># of schools that included an LEI plan within ISP</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sem. 1 13/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.1</td>
<td>Improved school community access to and use of learning environment data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.1a</td>
<td>Number of schools that have developed Individual School Profiles (ISPs)</td>
<td>Schools that have developed ISP forms.</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yr 2 Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 2 12/13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 1 13/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.1b</td>
<td># of schools that integrate RBB use to Improve LE</td>
<td>Schools that have used the RBB in assessing their LE</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yr 2 Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 2 12/13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Oct &amp; Dec 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.2</td>
<td>Strengthened school capacity and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.2a</td>
<td># of school staff successfully completing &quot;Towards Better LE&quot; sessions</td>
<td>32 Hours of training spread over 2 semesters</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 1 13/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.2b</td>
<td>% of Teachers attending &quot;Towards Better Learning Environment&quot; sessions</td>
<td>32 Hours of training spread over 2 semesters</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 1 13/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.2c</td>
<td># of LE Teams formed</td>
<td>Teams (1 principals + 2 staff) per school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yr 2 Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 2 12/13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Yr 2 Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sep 13)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.3</td>
<td>School and Community Based projects implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR1.3a</td>
<td>% of school that have reached project LEI goals</td>
<td>Schools that achieved completion criteria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sem. 1 13/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Disaggregate</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline Period</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Target Period</td>
<td>Actual FY2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR2: Improved school capacity to support enabling environments</td>
<td>IR.2. a</td>
<td># of MoE Units trained in supporting Positive LE in schools</td>
<td>Ministry Units attending training sessions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR 2.1: Improved MoE capacity to sustain and institutionalize improved learning environments</td>
<td>SIR2. 1.a</td>
<td>Capacity building plan developed from Needs Assessment &amp; approved</td>
<td>CB plan approved by AID and MOE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1 Sem. 1 13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIR2. 1.b</td>
<td># of MOE workshops conducted</td>
<td>3 2-day workshops conducted for MOE LE staff on topics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q2 (by Feb* 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIR2. 1.c</td>
<td># of FD team members completing training</td>
<td>MOE directorate staff (7-8 per) on topics</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q2 (by Feb* 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR 2.2: Improved capacity of local subcontractor to conduct business with USAID.</td>
<td>SIR 2.2.a</td>
<td>Assessment completed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIR 2.2.b</td>
<td>Capacity development plan approved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yr 3 Q1 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Figures for LD referrals were calculated using the highest figure mentioned in the month to account for unnecessary repetitive recording of LD referrals.

**If the rates of incidence remain as is, it is already evident that verbal assault referrals will exhibit a major increase this school semester.

Component 1 Indicators

IR.1.a: # of School with Improvement Plans that include an LE component
Each school already creates an improvement plan as per Ministry of Education guidelines. It is expected that the 120 schools receiving the intervention shall include a learning environment component within said school improvement plans by the end of the next semester. Data on this indicator shall be obtained by Q1 YR 3.

SIR 1.1: Improved school community access to and use of learning environment data

SIR1.1.a: Number of schools that have developed Individual School Profiles (ISPs)
Learning Environment teams completed their own school profiles in May/June 2013 (Q2 YR2). The 120 school profiles were developed in sessions facilitated by the field implementation unit. It is expected that the profiles will be updated again in October 2013 at the start of Semester 1 2013/14 as had been presented to AID in the FIRM conducted in August.

SIR1.1.b: Number of schools that integrate RBB use to Improve LE
Learning Environment teams also completed a benchmarking exercise using the rubrics benchmarking guidelines. 120 schools completed their benchmarking in (Q2 YR2), with two more review set for October and December 2013 as had been presented to AID in the FIRM conducted in August.

SIR 1.2: Strengthened school capacity and support.

SIR1.2.a: Number of school staff successfully completing "Towards Better Learning Environment" training sessions
The "Towards Better Learning Environment" training sessions are a series of training session spanning two semesters with 16 hours of training (8 sessions, 2 hrs each) scheduled per semester for a total of 32 hours over 16 sessions.

The total number of school staff that did attend at least 1 session last semester was 2396 as per FIU figures is, however the total number of staff as per FIU is 3073. The table below shows data from the previous report for Q2+3 Yr2.

| SIR1.2.a Number of school staff successfully completing "Towards Better Learning Environment" training sessions (Quarter 2+3 Year 2) |
|-------------|--------------|
| Total       | 796 (3073)   |
| Male        | 236 (1110)   |
| Female      | 560 (1963)   |

Up to Sep 26th this quarter, the total number of staff attending at least 1 training session for the period Aug 26th - Sep 26th was 2340 out of a total of approximately* 3510 staff (2987 teachers and 520 admin) tallied with 1300 staff not attending a session.

*Note: Figures for staff counts were unstable in the first month of teaching and are expected to stabilize by the next report. These figures will be verified by 30 December against MoE data on staff counts.

The final tally of successful completion (attendance of 80% of the 32 hours) will be reported by Dec 2013.
SIR1.2.b: Percent of Teachers attending "Towards Better Learning Environment" training sessions

The field implementation unit held 3 sessions on learning environment topics this Quarter. The proportion of teachers attending at least 1 of the session was 60.8% (about 1813 teachers from 2987), the ratio among male teachers was 62.6% (680/1087), compared to 59.9% (1133/1891) among female teachers.

The ratio of last two quarters’ (previous semester) attendance was as shown below, and the figure will be updated by Dec 30 to reflect the current semester (Q4 Yr 2 and Q1 yr3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIR1.2.b Percent of Teachers attending at least 1 session &quot;Towards Better Learning Environment&quot; training sessions (Q2+Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1990 (2585) = 77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>731 (939) = 77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1259 (1646) = 76.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIR1.2.c: Number of Learning Environment Teams formed

Learning Environment teams are formed in each school at the launch of activities prior to completing ISP's, RBB's and upon completion of the first session of training. Each team must consist of a principal + 2 other staff members. 119 LE teams consisting of at least the three members were formed last semester, and 1 school's LE team was formed of only 1 principal + 1 teacher.

This semester, 113 teams were formed meeting the minimum criteria with 7 schools having teams formed only of teachers. Furthermore, 5 schools out of the 113 only had an assistant principal as part of the team. The lack of principals in the teams may be partially explained by not having a MOE assigned principal at the time of team creation.

It is expected that the number of teams meeting minimum criteria will increase although not entirely, and an updated figure will be presented in the next report if possible.

SIR 1.3: School and Community Based projects implemented

SIR1.3.a: Percent of school that have reached set project LE Improvement goals

School project focused on Learning environment improvement in the four domains of Healthy, Caring, Engaging and Safe were to be launched this semester. The LE teams and coaches were tasked with recording project description, activities planned, their linkage degree to the 4 domains, in addition to listing lead team members. The projects would be evaluated against specific criteria (available in form E4 of PMP annex). The target for the semester is 66% of all projects reaching success criteria.

So far all 120 schools submitted required project planning forms. 761 activities were listed for the projects of which 611 were linked to the 4 domains. The average degree of linkage of activities to anyone of the 4 domains (safe, healthy, caring, engaging) ranged between 67-75% as per the opinions of the LE teams and coaches.

1306 school members were listed as lead team members in the projects, of which 1181 were principals or teachers. Only 4.7% of lead team members were students, another 4.8% were local community or parents. The figure for student inclusion in project planning as lead team members should be addressed in the coming. In relation to the total population, only 0.1%-0.3% of students are part of any school project team compared to 25% of teachers, and 60% of principals.
Component 2 Indicators

IR2.a: Number of Ministry of Education Units trained in supporting Positive LE in schools
The Ministry of Education is receiving capacity building via the LETS program. It is expected that 11 units within the MOE including 10 field directorates and a special unit in the MOE will receive training between Oct 2013 and Feb 2014 as per the MCB Unit at LETS. The indicators below will not show any figures until the next two quarterly reports.

SIR 2.1: Improved Ministry of Education capacity to sustain and institutionalize improved learning environments.

SIR2.1.a: Capacity building plan developed from Needs Assessment & approved
No capacity building plan was created as yet for the ministry, although a consultant has been recently appointed to perform this activity with a plan expected Oct 2013.

SIR2.1.b: Number of Ministry of Education workshops conducted
It is expected that workshops for the ministry will take place in Oct, Nov 2013 with the third session in Feb 2014. Aside from targeted sessions and workshops, senior MOE Taskforce did attend a two-day retreat in Aqaba in August 2013 (Q4 Yr.2). A pre-post evaluation of this retreat was conducted.

SIR2.1.c: Number of Field Directorate team members completing training
It is expected that workshops for the Field directorates will take place between December 2013 and February 2014. FD members also participated in three regional principals meetings held in (Q4 year 2).

SIR 2.2: Improved capacity of local subcontractor to conduct business with USAID

SIR2.2.a: Whether assessment completed
Assessment of FIU completed in June 2013.

SIR 2.2.b: Capacity development plan approved
Assessment of FIU is due by Dec 2013. A plan has been drafted awaiting approval.

Quality Assurance Activities

Planning for Semester 1 2013/14
Two separate meetings were held with FIU supervisors and coordinators to ensure requirements for M&E tools are mutually agreed upon and clear. Instructions on specific issues to pay attention to and specific requirement for data delivery were agreed including cutoff period, hardcopy requirements and data structure.

Quality Assurance Visits

In line with M&E function, quality assurance visits were conducted in the month of September focused on ensuring proper implementation and usage of data collection tools.

A total of 8 visits were conducted to schools in Zarqa, Jerash, North Ghor and Tafileh, with further visits planned in the coming period such that total visits cover 10-20% of schools in the three regions.

Each visit included conversations with at least one member of the LE team as well as a review of the status of forms (E1, E3, E4, and E5 as per PMP Annex) with photos of forms taken when possible to confirm observations.

Initial visits at the start of the month showed forms had not been delivered to coaches yet and older forms were being used to record referral data. Later visits showed forms were finally in place, however only 1 of the schools visited was actually using the forms as expected.

Many schools did not have copies of the forms in the hands of the LE teams, with only coaches responsible for recording data as per the feedback of teachers and principals met. Although LE teams did recognize the
forms, they failed to produce their own copies, and almost all confirmed that they were available with the coach only. It was emphasized to the FIU that coaches must build the capacity of the schools to use such monitoring tools themselves as opposed to rely on the coach.

At the moment of conducting the visits, it was evident that even with the forms delivered to the coaches and schools. Neither extra-curricular activity form (E5) nor school project planning form (E4) were utilized. This is despite the fact that many extra-curricular activities had already been conducted as per LE team members interviewed.

Furthermore, some teams had already planned for their school project but had not recorded any information in the required tool. These issues were address on the spot to the coach, and further addressed to the coordinators/supervisors of FIU after the visits.

Finally, it was evident from the series of visits that the data provided for this round of reporting was filled mostly by the coaches in the very last few days of the cutoff period (the cutoff being 19 - 26 September). This meant that some information was most likely filled from memory rather than recorded as time passed. This point was communicated to FIU and future QA visits will ensure that LE teams are in charge of the monitoring of their own information in a consistent manner.

All issues raised above will be addressed in detail in upcoming meetings with FIU management and with ASK leadership with a view to underline LETS coaches’ role in a) training the LET in data collection best practice and b) monitoring the entire data collection process at the school level.

In-House Quality Assurance

Once data was received from the FIU, it was reviewed to ensure data consistency. At this stage some issues arose per form. Some of these had already been communicated to FIU for justification, and a meeting is set in October to review all issues and action the changes.

**Form E1 - LET membership**

The data indicates 7 schools did not have a principal within the team and hence failed to meet minimum criteria for them to be considered an LE team. It was obvious by studying at least 2 of these forms that the principal did stamp and sign the actual form but was not listed as a member. FIU also explain that MoE may not have finalized staffing for some schools.

A review of the LET forms shows that coaches have been reassigned to 60 schools. 10 schools did not have teachers (in the strict sense) within the team as members. These teams may have included lab supervisors, or other admin staff. This figure is unchanged from last May. A follow-up meeting with FIU management will document changes as they occur.

**Form E2 - Session Attendance Logs**

Data was provided in soft form, and hard copies were not available on agreed time hence no data entry integrity check was performed.

Data used to arrive at a population count for staff will be regularly updated by FIU to ensure population counts arising from the table are as accurate as possible.

**Form E3 - Referral Logs**

Analysis of referral data showed schools were repeating the recording of learning difficulty referrals on a regular basis. This meant repeated recording of the same students each time they were referred to the counselor and caused an increase in the number calculated.

This anomaly was addressed and a figure minus the repetitions was estimated by taking into account only the maximum number referred that month. This is of course a temporary fix and the FIU have been informed to amend the situation, with further school visits arranged to confirm such matters.

Eight schools were shown to have very large numbers of referrals most of which are boys’ schools. Furthermore, some referrals were recorded during weekends. These will be communicated to FIU to address and take corrective actions or provide appropriate explanations.
Form E4- School Project Planning Form

This form was only introduced this semester. From analysis of the data received it was evident that some schools or coaches confused the school project (a specific project) with all activities to be performed at the school. This led to a listing of project activities that were either not specific enough (at least 10 cases) or simply generic ideas with no clear timelines (at least 10 cases).

Forty eight of the forms received were not signed by any team member making it difficult to validate them. Furthermore, more than 760 activities were listed by the schools in support of the school project, but only 611 were linked to any one of the four domains of LE indicating some of these activities were simply added on without much thought to the linkage. 13 schools did not link the activities set out to the four domains at all.

With regards to the project Lead members, some schools listed a lot more than 15 lead members. The average number was 10 members, but some schools listed 30 members, which indicated that the term “lead member” was not clearly understood despite past explanations. That said it was evident that only 5% of the total membership list was of students, indicating little concern for student leadership.

FIU had communicated that some of the schools did not plan their projects in time hence filled the forms to the best of their ability. All of these issues shall be raised with the FIU in the planned QA meeting in order to rectify the issues and ensure LE teams take ownership of the school project form for their current and future planning needs.

Form E5- Extra-curricular activity log

This form is meant to be monitored by LE teams to track class participation in LE extra-curricular activities. The LE team is supposed to record all activities with a short description, and then record number of students within each class that participated in the activity along with gender of class.

It was shown during the visits that this form was not really utilized until much later in the cutoff period (last three days). Furthermore, many issues with the process of recording the figures and activities appeared. Many schools (or more realistically coaches) failed to follow instructions on how to record information.

572 activities were listed by the schools, yet only 358 were actually shown to have student participation. About 20 schools did not record any participation at all, while many schools were found to have merged classes and grades together causing issues in our ability to count figures correctly. Furthermore many schools did not provide specific dates for the activities performed making it difficult to verify them.

This issue will be discussed with FIU in an upcoming QA meeting to ensure better compliance with instructions and clearer recording with more ownership by the LE teams versus the coaches.
A. Project management: Stakeholder meetings over the Quarter

**Color code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings with USAID</th>
<th>FD Meetings</th>
<th>MoE/MoE related meetings</th>
<th>Meetings with ASK</th>
<th>RBB internal training</th>
<th>Other meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LETS MEETINGS RUNNING LOG - QUARTER FOUR – 01 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03 JUL</td>
<td>09:00-2:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB CB for coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 JUL</td>
<td>09:00-2:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB CB for coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 JUL</td>
<td>9:00-11:30 am</td>
<td>US MISSION</td>
<td>Partners Mtg re Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 JUL</td>
<td>10:30-12:00 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>FIU/CAI re RBB follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 JUL</td>
<td>10:00-12:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Debriefing re current issues with ASK and SEM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 JUL</td>
<td>1:30-2:15 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 JUL</td>
<td>10:00-1:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB training for coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 JUL</td>
<td>1:30-2:45 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 JUL</td>
<td>10:00-10:45 am</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Staff MTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 JUL</td>
<td>4:00-5:30 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>FIU wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 JUL</td>
<td>10:00-1:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB coach training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 JUL</td>
<td>9:00-9:45 am</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Laith – PMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 JUL</td>
<td>1:30-2:45 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 JUL</td>
<td>6:00-7:00 pm</td>
<td>Royal Hotel</td>
<td>MoE TF – before Iftar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 JUL</td>
<td>10:00-1:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB coaching – initial wrap-up on benchmarks before benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 JUL</td>
<td>1:15-2:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>PMP mtg with Laith – update (in lieu of wkly mtg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 AUG</td>
<td>1:30-2:45 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 AUG</td>
<td>10:00-1:00 pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Phase 01 Training Closing mtg on RBB with coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 AUG</td>
<td>3:00-5:00 pm</td>
<td>LETS → ASK</td>
<td>Wkly mtg with ASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 AUG</td>
<td>1:00-2:15 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Wkly mtg with AID – (Thu is Eid holiday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3:00-5:00 pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Wkly mtg with ASK to plan for Aqaba Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 15</td>
<td>1:30pm – 2:45pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 17</td>
<td>07:30 pm – 08:30pm</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>MoE Retreat launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 18</td>
<td>09:00am – 4:30pm</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>MoE Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 19</td>
<td>09:00am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>MoE Retreat and travel back to Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 22</td>
<td>09:00am – 1:00pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>RBB training Phase II - benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 22</td>
<td>2:45pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 25</td>
<td>07:30pm – 8:00pm</td>
<td>Dead Sea</td>
<td>Launch LETS Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 26</td>
<td>09:00am – 5:00pm</td>
<td>Dead Sea</td>
<td>LETS Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 28</td>
<td>03:00pm – 05:00pm</td>
<td>CAFE</td>
<td>Private MTG: COP/ASK CEO re Management Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 29</td>
<td>2:45pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG 29</td>
<td>09:00am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Phase II last session – RBB Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 02</td>
<td>09:15am – 10:30am</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Tech mtg planning FIRM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 03</td>
<td>09:00am – 11:00am</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Tech mtg planning FIRM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 03</td>
<td>03:00pm – 05:00pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Tech mtg with FIU – planning FIRM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 05</td>
<td>11:00am – 1:00pm</td>
<td>DAYS INN</td>
<td>FIRM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 05</td>
<td>1:30pm – 2:45pm</td>
<td>DAYS INN</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 08</td>
<td>09:30am – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Geneva Hotel</td>
<td>REGIONAL principals meeting 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 09</td>
<td>10:00am – 11:00pm</td>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Mtg with Dr. Saleh – PHASE II RBB extension over SEM3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 12</td>
<td>10:00am – 1:00pm</td>
<td>Zarqa School</td>
<td>Model benchmarking session with all 43 coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 12</td>
<td>2:45pm – 4:00pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>Regular wkly mtg with AID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 13</td>
<td>3:00pm – 5:00pm</td>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Wkly planning mtg with ASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 15</td>
<td>09:30am – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Aqaba Hilton</td>
<td>REGIONAL Principals meeting # 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 16</td>
<td>09:30am – 10:30am</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>School Visit – Al-Thawra Al-Arabia Kubra Essential School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 18</td>
<td>09:30am – 2:00pm</td>
<td>Jerash Leb. Hse</td>
<td>REGIONAL Principals meeting # 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 19</td>
<td>2:30pm – 3:45pm</td>
<td>LETS</td>
<td>AID wkly mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 29</td>
<td>07:00am – 1:00pm</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>School Visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. SUMMER 2013 LETS INTERNAL RBB TRAINING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Technical Leads</th>
<th>Support Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3/7/2013</td>
<td>09:00 am 02:00 pm</td>
<td>Development Stages (Rubrics)</td>
<td>Farah Mawla</td>
<td>Munif Abu Rish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maha Bseiso</td>
<td>Noura Dawani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Fagueret</td>
<td>Maria Ghazaleh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lina Sharkas</td>
<td>Aladdin Qattouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jacqueline Salman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mohammed AlHmoud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4/7/2013</td>
<td>09:00 pm 02:00 pm</td>
<td>Benchmark 1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>16/7/2013</td>
<td>10:00 am 01:00 pm</td>
<td>Benchmarks 1.2. 1.3. – 1.4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>23/7/2013</td>
<td>10:00 am 01:00 pm</td>
<td>Benchmarks 2.1. &amp; 2.2. 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>30/7/2013</td>
<td>10:00 am 01:00 pm</td>
<td>Benchmarks 3.2. &amp; 4.1. 4.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6/8/2013</td>
<td>10:00 am 01:00 pm</td>
<td>Benchmark Analysis wrap-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>22/8/2013</td>
<td>09:00 am 02:00 pm</td>
<td>Development Stages Ex: 4.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>29/8/2013</td>
<td>09:00 am 01:00 pm</td>
<td>Development Stages wrap-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>12/9/2013</td>
<td>10:00 am 12:00 pm</td>
<td>RBB Model Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Sessions</td>
<td>Over three months</td>
<td>29 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. LETS REVISED PWS AS PER FIRM4 – 2013 09 05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>PWS</th>
<th>LEADS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1. FIELD-BASED INTERVENTION</td>
<td>MOHAMMED GHABBASH</td>
<td>Mousa Coordinators</td>
<td>1.1 Three-Phase Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Mousa</td>
<td>1.2. Implementation Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lina 1 Coordinator FD Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mousa Mohammed Al-Hmoud</td>
<td>1.3. School Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESSING</td>
<td>2. RBB INITIATIVE</td>
<td>FARAH</td>
<td>Mohammed Ghabbash</td>
<td>2.1. ISP Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Maha</td>
<td>2.2. Lead up to Benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammed Ghabbash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maha Lina</td>
<td>2.3. RBB technical issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammed Ghabbash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FD Contact</td>
<td>2.4. Benchmarking sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING</td>
<td>3. SCHOOL VISITS</td>
<td>JACQUELINE</td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FD Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoE Contact USAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINKING UP</td>
<td>4. MINISTRY LIAISON</td>
<td>LINA</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>4.1. Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FD Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoE TF Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>4.2. Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammed Hourani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSURING</td>
<td>5. PMP MONITORING</td>
<td>LAITH</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>5.1. PMP Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammed Ghabbash</td>
<td>5.2. Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoE EMIS Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARING</td>
<td>6. DOCUMENTATION</td>
<td>ALADDIN</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. FIU Successful Activity Examples
FIU interventions have impacted the students, teachers and parents as demonstrated in the following examples.

- **Students**
  - **Zay Secondary School for Boys:** As part of the student initiatives, an activity titled “Guidance and Awareness Activity” was implemented, in which the students committee responsible for guidance and awareness hung a guidance board with instructions of students discipline and the importance of hygiene and positive relationships like respect.
  - **Al Rweiha Mixed Basic School:** the Cooperative Team in the school have implemented an awareness activity titled “Traffic Light and Crossing the Street”, in which the students have designed a board that shows the traffic light and explains what it means, and this segment was presented to all students in the morning assembly.
  - **Al Twal Al Janoubi Basic School for Boys:** 6th grade students have implemented the activity “Wall of Wishes” in the presence of their class teacher and the principal, in which each student writes his name on different colorful cards and write their wishes and ambitions on them, then hang them on a special board in their classroom.
  - **Ras Al Majar Mixed Basic School:** Launching the initiative “To Have A Brighter Start” by 185 students in the school, by hanging cards and their ids on the each classroom wall. Also the initiative “Commitment” was implemented by the student teams aiming to organize and clean the school and the play areas, and to pay more attention to the students. And it is worth mentioning that this activity was implemented after getting over the challenge faced before which was students escaping from the school during the lunch breaks, especially in the early levels of the school.
  - **Halawah Basic School for Boys:** a group of students launched an initiative titled “Dialogue instead of Violence”, that was a result from the workshop they were given earlier “Leaders of Change”, in this initiative the students have monitored violence cases and problems among the students and communicated with the school principal in order to find solutions based on dialogue to solve these cases.
  - **Al Safineh Mixed Basic School:** 4th grade students have implemented an activity titled “My Fingerprint in my Classroom”, in which a flower was drawn on a cartoon board and each student’s name was written on one of the petals. Then four statements were written: I Love God, I Love my Teacher, I Love my School and I Love my Colleague. Under each statement the students wrote their own comments, such as I Love My Teacher – I listen to her, I Love God – I Pray, etc. this left a very positive and wonderful effect on the students as they are committing to all the comments they have written.
  - **Ain Ammoun Mixed Basic School:** A group of students have used theatre sketches to deliver messages concerned about positive behaviors, as they presented an act in the morning assembly about reducing the consumption water. Another sketch was about how to use the personal hygiene tools and showing the other students of the difference between the person before and after using these tools. Also this group of students have played a sketch on the positive behaviors and the importance of doing the home works.

- **Teachers**
  - **Yarqa Mixed Basic School:** to implement what has been discussed in a previous workshop, a 2nd grade teacher organized a competition for 2nd grade Mathematics related by using the
Learning By Playing strategies and using numbers cards, then stationary was distributed on the winning students.

- **Wadi Al Rayyan Mixed Basic School**: as a result of encouragement of the teachers to activate the Learning Styles and Multiple Intelligences, a 2nd grade teacher implemented an activity titled “Easier Lessons”, in which the teacher taught the students how to calculate mathematical formulas through music, images and movement in the classroom. This has included using an abacus to calculate, flashcards and a stereo to listen to songs about numbers.

- **Mahes Secondary School for Boys**: a teacher have selected a group of students and implemented a workshop titled the “Poetic Workshop” for the Arabic poetic lesson, this activity included the students to compete on the school level in organizing and writing the best poem, taking into consideration that this activity is one of the Second School Project activities.

On another note, the school assembled a Maintenance Committee this semester which installed student seats in the school yard by recycling old material found in the school.

- **Hay Abu Hweidi Mixed Basic School**: within the “Academic Achievement Initiative” the school counselor distributed a schedule for teachers to select a number of students who have academic issues in order to give these students enhancement lessons to strengthen their struggles in the free periods and classes.

- **Abu Al Hoal Basic School for Girls**: within the school activities to welcome student for the new school year, a group of teachers implemented the “Attention” initiative, in which they printed out several awareness flyers and distributed them all around the school to better guide the new students to the different school facilities.

The “Happiness Package” initiative was implemented, in which school bags and stationary were distributed to students in need, helping 27 students from the lower grades.

- **Phosphate Secondary School for Boys**: the school counselor and the teachers implemented an activity titled “Your Worry is Our Concern”, that aims to identify the problems and issues faced by the students among each other, and try to find solutions for them. And one of the major issues discussed was “Nervousness”, and the counselor have conducted a workshop discussing this topic and its effect on the behaviors and relationships between people.

- **Fatimah Al Zahra’a Mixed Secondary School**: the Behavior Change team led by the school counselor implemented an activity titled “Reject Violence”, which was aimed at eliminating the bullying among male students in the first three grades, and counseling sessions have been conducted for the students using a captivating style like using games to deliver guided messages.

- **Um Hammad Basic School for Boys**: the LE team in the school implemented an activity that explains the evacuation process in case of a disaster, and the students have been trained to evacuate in 3 minutes successfully, with the plan to re-do this training another time and achieve the evacuation in less time.

- **Al Jbarat Mixed Basic School**: the LE team registered the names of the students who suffer from any sort of disability, so they can be accommodated in the appropriate way, including informing the teachers to give special attention to them. For example, a girl with vision impairment has been given books with larger fonts.

- **Derar Bin Al Azwar Basic School for Boys**: As part of the New School Year activities, “Names Chain” initiative was implemented as an introductory activity, in which each student is asked to introduce himself and the student before him and the one before him and so on, this way old and new students are introduced to each other in a better more enjoyable way. A sports activity was also implemented in the school engaging Syrian students, as was the “My ID” initiative in which each student’s card included his name, hobbies, dreams, goals and his personal picture and hung inside the classroom for everyone to meet him.

Another successful example in this school is a box that was hung in each classroom, in which every teacher at the end of the lesson writes the name of the ideal student on a paper and places it in the box, then by the end of the week the ideal student’s names are collected and are rewarded for their performance, encouraging the student for similar positive behaviors.
Parents and local community:

- **Al Mshaqar Secondary School for Girls**: A meeting with the school principal and staff with the mothers of the students was held to discuss major issues facing the students in terms of academics and socially, and set the school rules and regulations with the parents to involve them in limiting the unwanted behaviors.

- **Bilal Bin Rabah Basic School for Boys**: Contributions from the local community started to elaborate as the National Electricity Company with the presence of the Head of Field Directorate and a representative of the company distributed school bags for the students in need including the Syrian students, which was a kind gesture that left a great effect on the students and the parents of these students as well.

- **Ras Al Majar Mixed Basic School**: The school has conducted a meeting with the local community members that included 20 parents, 5 people from the local community and a group of the school staff and students, this meeting resulted in assembling an advisory council to help the school in the decision making and finding solutions for the challenges facing the school. And the first session of this meeting had a positive atmosphere where challenges related to school hygiene and infrastructure were discussed, and one of the local contractors had donated 300 JDs to fix the water leakage in the ceiling as it is considered a threat to the students and the electricity of the school. On a similar note two of the parents and local community sent a formal document to the Ministry of Education regarding these hazards in the school and they have been fixed urgently.

- **Dair Al Liyat Mixed Basic School**: A member of the local community has donated to build a fence surrounding the backyard of the school, in order to reduce discomfort of the intruders who come inside the school from other schools.
## Training Reporting Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Workshop Name</th>
<th>Description of Workshop</th>
<th>Training period</th>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Trainee Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Days/ Sessions</td>
<td>Duration Hours</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>City/ Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Brighter Start for a Better Learning Environment</td>
<td>Identify past semester’s achievements to build on them. Identify major challenges and derive lessons learned to inform future implementation. Enable the school community to reflect on school LEI profile as per RBB trial results. Draft a detailed Plan for semester 3 activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>School Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second School Project</td>
<td>Identify LET’s roles in implementing the second school community project. Identify all activities and events to be executed in this phase. Target school staff, parents and the local community – as a result, each team has identified school community project activities to be implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>School premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Using Drama in Education</td>
<td>Enable teachers to use Drama techniques in classrooms effectively, such as Role Play, Debate, and the “Expert Guest”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>School premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leaders of Change</td>
<td>Build on past semester’s achievements in order to reach a better learning environment focused on encouraging positive behaviors and addressing negatives ones. Highlight students’ leadership roles when leading change in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5 hrs</td>
<td>Training session</td>
<td>School premises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ONSITE SUPPORT Activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Onsite Support</th>
<th>FIU-developed Implementation Guide for onsite implementation and field support</th>
<th>Days/ Sessions</th>
<th>Duration Hours</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Trainee Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hr for coach &amp; principal on different topics 30 min for School Counselor on different topics 1 hr for LET on main topics: Coordination between School Teams and Follow-up 1 hr for other School Teams on different topics: Executing project activities and engaging students and local community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 hrs./day</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>School Premises</td>
<td>School Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. ASK Capacity Development Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Management</th>
<th>Financial Management</th>
<th>Human Resources Management</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist in the development of manual</td>
<td>Assist with update of manual, as needed</td>
<td>Help update manual to reflect USG Local Compensation Plan</td>
<td>Assist in the development of manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide training in:**

- **Strategic planning**
  - Vision, mission review
  - Strategic plan

- **Contracts and grants**
  - Contract management
  - Role of FAR, AIDAR, CFR

- **Organizational governance**
  - Governance body roles and responsibilities
  - Operational manuals
  - Role of leadership in fundraising
  - Development of internal policies/procedures
  - Relationship b/t governance body and management
  - Meeting/reporting schedule
  - Internal comms systems
  - Transparency and integrity

- **Accounting**
  - Accounting standards
  - Direct-indirect costs
  - Allowable/non-allowable costs
  - Tracking costs
  - Internal financial controls
  - Dealing with multi donor funding

- **Audit/External Financial Review**
  - Preparing for NICRA
  - USAID rules and regulations on accumulating allowable, reasonable and allocable costs
  - Preparing for audit, USAID, DCAA corporate
  - Minimizing financial loss

- **Project Management**
  - Proposal development skills
  - Work plans for departments
  - Monitoring and reporting through indicators

- **Procurement for services**
  - Purchase request
  - Solicitation document
  - Advertisement
  - Issuance of bid
  - Offer-based Ranking of services
  - Procurement committee
  - Source selection
  - Client approval
  - Purchase order/service agreement
  - Invoices: Monitoring and receipt
  - Invoice approval
  - Payment/file close

- **Procurement for equipment**
  - Purchase request and approval
  - RFQ/solicitation document
  - Advertisement
  - Issuance bids to responders
  - Bid receipt
  - Bid opening
  - Technical evaluation
  - Cost evaluation
  - Source selection/negotiation
  - Vetting
  - Conflict of interest
  - Client approval
  - Issue purchase order or contract
  - Receipt of equipment
  - Invoice, payment

- **Procurement for travel**
  - USG travel/per diem regulations

- **External Relations**
  - Selecting partners and stakeholders

- **Budgeting**
  - Financial goal
  - Forecasting Annual budget development
  - Forecasting cash flow

- **Gender**
  - Policy development
  - Commitment to gender policy
F. Q4 LETS IMPACT ON STUDENTS, STAFF, & COMMUNITY MEMBERS

1. **Zay Secondary School for Boys:** As part of LETS student-lead initiatives, the students committee responsible for guidance and awareness launched the “Guidance and Awareness Activity”. Students prepared and posted a guidance board showing instructions for student discipline, the importance of personal hygiene, and positive relationships such as respect between peers.

2. **Al Rweiha Mixed Basic School:** The school’s Cooperative Team implemented ran the “Traffic Light and Street Crossing Safety” activity. Students designed a poster showing how pedestrians must heed traffic lights. They introduced their poster to the entire student body during a morning assembly.

3. **Al Twal Al Janoubi Basic School for Boys:** A group of Grade 6 students implemented the “Wall of Wishes” activity. With their classroom teacher and school principal watching, each student takes turn writing their name on different color cards and writes their wishes for the future. Then, they hang all cords in a colorful display them on a special bulletin board in their respective classrooms.

4. **Ras Al Majar Mixed Basic School:** Before LETS began in the school, primary grade students often left the school overextending lunch breaks, missing many classes. In an effort to address this serious issue, 185 students in the school launched the “To Have a Brighter Start” initiative. First, they hung cards with their names on each classroom wall. Then, they added a number of commitments whereby student teams took it upon themselves to clean up the schoolyard and play areas around the school. This initiative was successful in mobilizing students’ attention and focusing it on their school and school community, thereby significantly reducing student absenteeism.

5. **Halawah Basic School for Boys:** A group of students launched the “Dialogue instead of Violence” initiative. That came about as a result of the “Leaders of Change” workshop that had been offered earlier in the year. Students monitored incidents of violence in the school and undertook to find solutions based on dialogue to resolve these cases with the school principal.

6. **Al Safineh Mixed Basic School:** 4th grade students implemented the “My Fingerprint in my Classroom” activity. Drawing first a large colorful flower on poster board, each student chose a petal to write his or her name on it. They added four positive statements: “I Love God, I Love my Teacher, I Love my School and I Love my Peer”. Under each statement, students offered personal comments, such as “I Love My Teacher – I listen to her, I Love God – I Pray”, etc. This simple initiative left a very positive effect on most students, as they were encouraged to behave in accordance with their own statements.

7. **Ain Ammoun Mixed Basic School:** A group of students used skits to deliver simple messages about positive student behaviors. Some presented a skit in the morning assembly urging their peers to reduce water consumption. Others showed how to use the personal hygiene kit through another skit. They cleverly articulated their message by showing students a person’s visible improvement before and after using their hygiene kit. The same group of students played a skit about the importance of positive behaviors and that of doing one’s homework regularly.
LETS IMPACT ON TEACHERS

8. **Yarqa Mixed Basic School**: In an attempt to put to immediate use the message received as part of a previous workshop, a 2nd grade teacher organized a grade Two Maths competition related to “Manazel al A’dad”. She used numbers cards (Learning by Playing) to carry out the challenges and gave stationary to winners.

9. **Wadi Al Rayyan Mixed Basic School**: Teachers had attended a LETS workshop on Learning Styles and Multiple Intelligences. One of the 2nd grade teachers chose to teach basic math computation with the support of sound (taped songs), image (flashcards) and movement (abacus). Students greatly enjoyed the new experience and did very well.

10. **Mahes Secondary School for Boys**: A teacher chose to offer her Arabic poetry class a “Poetry Workshop”. As part of the school’s second LETS school community project, all students in the school were invited to compose the best poem. On a different note, the school assembled a School Maintenance Committee this semester: student managed to create sitting for themselves in the school yard using exclusively recycled material found in the school.

11. **Hay Abu Hweidi Mixed Basic School**: As part of the “Academic Achievement Initiative”, the school counselor asked all teachers to identify those students struggled academically. She followed this up by organizing a series of additional support classes for the benefit of identified students.

12. **Abu Al Hoal Basic School for Girls**: This new school year student welcome initiatives took a different tone this year as a group of teachers implemented their “Attention” initiative. They printed out several awareness flyers and distributed them all around the school to guide new students and orient them through campus. Furthermore, they also distributed “Happiness Packages” to 27 needy students. Those consisted in school bags filled with stationary and various items students were very happy to find.

13. **Phosphate Secondary School for Boys**: The school counselor with the support of a few teachers decided to identify problems and issues students might face among each other. For that, they implemented the “Your Worry is Our Concern” initiative. They found that nervousness (apprehension related to uncertainty about what to expect in the school) was a serious concern for many students and undertook to offer a workshop entirely devoted to this topic. They could explore the effect of tensions on student behavior and discussed how to improve relationships between people in the school.

14. **Fatimah Al Zahra’a Mixed Secondary School**: The school counselor leading her Behavior Change Team implemented the “Reject Violence” initiative. The aim was to eliminate as much as possible all incidents of bullying among primary grades male students. She offered counseling sessions based on a game approach thus making her sessions quite captivating for students and making her message much more effective.

15. **Um Hammad Basic School for Boys**: The school’s LE team lead the entire school evacuation procedures. Students were successful in orderly evacuating the building in three minutes following a planned, well-rehearsed evacuation plan. The LE Team will repeat the exercise twice over the balance of the school year with a view to further reduce evacuation time.

16. **Al Jbarat Mixed Basic School**: The LE team decided to survey and list all students who may suffer from a form of disability, so they can be offered additional support wherever possible. The list was
shared with the entire school staff with a request to pay attention to the specific conditions noted. In one case, a visually challenged student was identified and with support from the larger school community, she could be provided with specially designed, large print textbooks.

17. **Derar Bin Al Azwar Basic School for Boys:** As part of the New School Year activities, the school launched the “Names Chain” initiative. Each student introduced himself and the student before him, so that returning students and new students alike could be introduced to each other in a fun, enjoyable way. The school also offered a variety of sports activities so that all kids, including Syrian youngsters could join in. Finally, the “My ID” initiative (each student fills in a card with his name, hobbies, dreams, goals and picture then hangs it in his class for all to see) facilitated initial contacts between all students.

**LETS IMPACT ON PARENTS & LOCAL COMMUNITY**

18. **Al Mshaqar Secondary School for Girls:** The school principal and her staff met with others to discuss major academic and/or social issues facing students might be facing. They took that opportunity to involve all parents in reviewing school rules and regulation and urged them to address unwanted behaviors jointly.

19. **Bilal Bin Rabah Basic School for Boys:** A representative of the National Electricity Company in the presence of the Head of Field Directorate distributed school bags for needy students and outreached to Syrian students. This kind gesture left a very positive impression on all students and parents.

20. **Ras Al Majar Mixed Basic School:** The school held its first meeting with local community members. Twenty parents attended along with five members from the larger local community and a group of the school staff and students. The assembled group made the decision to create a School Advisory Council whose task will be to support the school and join in the decision making process as well as to help find solutions to challenges facing the school. During this first session, members in attendance discussed openly school hygiene and infrastructure challenges. One of the local contractors stepped in and donated 300 JDs towards fixing ceiling leaks as it is was identified as a threat to the student safety and well-being. In addition, two parents and local community members sent a formal letter to the Ministry of Education regarding these hazards, which resulted in having them urgently repaired.

21. **Dair Al Liyat Mixed Basic School:** A generous member of the local community donated materials to build a fence around the schoolyard. This prevented intruders from coming inside the school to wander around making it unsafe for young students.
G. Ministry Trainings over Q4

In-Country Training- Central Region
Training Program Name: Regional Principal/FD Meeting
Field of Study: Benchmarking
Start Date: Sep 8, 2013
End Date: Sep 8, 2013
Training Type: Participatory
Facility: Geneva Hotel, Amman, Jordan
Trainee Information:
Group Name: LETS schools Principals & MoE Field Directorates Learning Environment Support Teams: # of Males-34; # of Females - 38

In-Country Training- North Region
Training Program Name: Regional Principal/FD Meeting
Field of Study: Benchmarking
Start Date: Sep 18, 2013
End Date: Sep 18, 2013
Training Type: Participatory
Facility: Lebanese House/ Jerash
Trainee Information:
Group Name: LETS schools principals and MoE Field Directorates Learning Environment Support Teams: # of Males - 45; #of Females- 39

In-Country Training- South Region
Training Program Name: Regional Principal/FD Meeting
Field of Study: Benchmarking
Start Date: Sep 15, 2013
End Date: Sep 15, 2013
Training Type: Participatory
Facility: Double Tree Hotel/Aqaba
Trainee Information:
1. Group Name: LETS schools principals and MoE Field Directorates Learning Environment Support Teams: # of Males 32; # of Females 21

In-Country Training- Central MoE
Training Program Name: Professional Retreat
Field of Study: Benchmarking/LEI Best Practice
Start Date: Aug 17, 2013
End Date: Aug 19, 2013
Training Type: Participatory
Facility: Mövenpick Hotel, Aqaba, Jordan
Trainee Information:
Group Name: LETS MoE Task Force members
# of Males-16; # of Females - 05
**H. A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF LOOK-FOR FORMS FILED BY Q4 SCHOOL VISITORS**

The look-fors list is comprised of a series of retrospective questions to be answered by visitors to LETS schools based on their own subjective impression of the school. Some of these are Yes/No type questions that are easily observed during the visit. Other questions are qualitative in nature.

In this current analysis, only the dichotomy questions shall be analyzed. The statistical base is of visitors not visits or schools. This is primarily because some school visits would have produced more than one look-for sheet by visitors, while others may have produced only one.

Furthermore, at this stage the number of visits makes it difficult to provide a reasonable statistical analysis of the responses. Hence, rather than show proportions, the actual number of yes or no responses is provided herein as an indication of the status of the schools visited.

The visits took place in September 2013 and 35 schools were visited in total. The tally of answers shows teachers were lending a hand in administration, classroom doors were open (30-32 out of 35-6 visitors)...

To a lesser extent, many visitors affirmed they felt student health was a concern in the school, the school itself looked clean and the principals’ office was easy to find (23-26 out of 35-6 visitors).

The students’ work as well as the school vision and mission were clearly posted for many visitors to see (21 out of 34 visitors).

Conversely, very few visitors saw an elderly student help a younger one (three visitors). Only 10 visitors saw staff engaged in activities other than teaching, and a similar number observed presence of a safe room for students. The same number observed school wide campaigns.

Future analysis with larger numbers of answer sheets will attempt to account for multiple entries for a single school, and to provide proportions rather than counts to allow for a more balanced comparison.
Number of visitors that observed a specific look-for in a school visit (Sep 2013)

- Did you see an older student helping/guiding a younger peer? 3 yes, 29 no
- Have you seen staffs engaged in activities other than teaching? 10 yes, 23 no
- Does the school have a safe room that is open to students needing health or psychological support? 10 yes, 24 no
- Is the school currently running a specific school-wide campaign? 10 yes, 22 no
- Do you see members from the larger school community in the school? 11 yes, 22 no
- Do you see students engaged in physical activity? 11 yes, 21 no
- Are there students-run activities? 12 yes, 22 no
- Are there any broken windows? Are curtains falling off their rod? etc. 13 yes, 22 no
- Does the school canteen sell (truly) healthy food to students? 15 yes, 20 no
- Can we spot students in prominent roles in the school or classes? 15 yes, 20 no
- Did you notice any parent’s involvement in the school? 17 yes, 14 no
- Can you spot any evidence (posting) that values children’s non-academic activities? 18 yes, 17 no
- Are there postings that invite students and school members to a higher level of student engagement? 18 yes, 17 no
- Can you see any indication that child safety is a concern, a priority? 19 yes, 16 no
- Can you see illustrated posters of current school activities where students are active? 20 yes, 15 no
- Does the school’s Vision & Mission statement easily and directly relate to what I see? 20 yes, 14 no
- Does posting of students’ work (anywhere) reflect higher expectations and values? 21 yes, 11 no
- Do we know (from what we see) that student health is a concern, a priority? 23 yes, 13 no
- Can I find the Principal’s or counselor’s office easily? 25 yes, 10 no
- Is the school clean and visibly welcoming? 26 yes, 10 no
- Are classroom doors open? 30 yes, 2 no
- Are some teachers lending a hand in school administration? 32 yes, 2 no
**I. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM**

**Q4 LETS School Visits Schedule**

### Week 1 (September 09 - 11) Center Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Names of Creative Staff</th>
<th>MoE Staff</th>
<th>ASK Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 09</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Zarqa 2</td>
<td>Ahmad Basbous</td>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Amer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 09</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Zarqa 2</td>
<td>Karam Hayef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 09</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Wadi Al-Sir</td>
<td>Muna Hatug</td>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>Alaa</td>
<td>Walid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 09</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Na’our</td>
<td>Omayma Al Asa’ad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Der Alla</td>
<td>Ghassan Al Sayyed</td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Der Alla</td>
<td>Yahia Rmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Der Alla</td>
<td>Awad Abu Narr</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Amer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Der Alla</td>
<td>Shadi Al Diset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Al Sult</td>
<td>Najha Sunjou</td>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Al Sult</td>
<td>Budoor Ghoshe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Al Sult</td>
<td>Muna Hatug</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Alaa</td>
<td>Walid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Al Sult</td>
<td>Al Muthana Shabib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Week 2 (September 16) South Schools - after Aqaba Principals Meeting - Aqaba Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Names of Creative Staff</th>
<th>MoE Staff</th>
<th>ASK Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>Khalid Al Farayeh</td>
<td>Munif</td>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Aqaba</td>
<td>Khalid Al Farayeh</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>Amer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Week 3 (September 22 - 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Names of Creative Staff</th>
<th>MoE Staff</th>
<th>ASK Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Ibrahim Twal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Mohammad Khasheh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>Khaldaoun Ababneh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>Malik Al Momani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>North Aghwar</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North Aghwar</td>
<td>Mahmoud Lhbehn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>North Aghwar</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>North Aghwar</td>
<td>Mu’taz Rababah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Tafelah</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Tafelah</td>
<td>Bilal Hwamdeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Tafelah</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Tafelah</td>
<td>Ibrahim Al Wohsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Week 4 (September 29 - October 01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Names of Creative Staff</th>
<th>MoE Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Sept. 29</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Muthana Al Sheyyab</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Omar Darwesh</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Sept. 30</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Samer Mansour</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Ibrahim Traiegh</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Mayadah Qashou</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Jerash</td>
<td>Yazeen Azzam</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Oct. 01</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>Malik Al Momani</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Ajloun</td>
<td>Khaled Ababneh</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Zarqa 2</td>
<td>Ahmad Basbous</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Zarqa 2</td>
<td>Mohammad Quraan</td>
<td>FIU Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>