

**Investing in Children and their Societies (ICS)-Cambodia and
Ponleu Kumar (PK)**



**Evaluation Report
Skillful Parenting Project**

***“Enabling Local Empowerment Action for Child Protection
Environment (LEAP)”***

Based in Odor Meanchey Province

Prepared by the Consultant

Dr. Meas Nee

May 2015

ICAcknowledgment

As the consultant for this evaluation, I would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the villagers, the community leaders and the community network representatives of the villages supported by Ponleur Kumar (PK). I especially thank the target communities selected for this study and would like to express my special thanks to all the key informants involved in the Focus Group Discussions, as well as in the individual interviews.

I would like to acknowledge the special support of PK management and Project Manager, Mr. Chey Kimsan who always provided me with both personal and logistical support including his time interviewed during this evaluation.

Furthermore, I also would like to take this opportunity to thank Miss Daniela Scalise, ICS Regional PM &E Officer and Mr. Chhay Vivodin, ICS Skilful Parenting Project Manager, who have made invaluable contributions and worked intensively in the whole process of this evaluation. For the amount of time they spent assisting me in the field as well as their involvement in the interview process, without their invaluable contributions this report would not have materialised.

I would like to express my sincere thanks, to all of the participants, the key staff of PK and the community leaders, who contributed significantly to the formulation of this evaluation report and Finally, for everyone who assisted in all the different ways during this evaluation, whether directly or indirectly.

The Consultant

Dr. Meas Nee

List of Acronyms

CC	Commune Council
CCWC	Commune Council for Women and Children
CSG	Community Saving Group
DCWC	District Council for Women and Children
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HHS	Household Survey
LEAP	Enabling Local Empowerment Action for Child Protection Environment
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PCWC	Provincial Council for Women and children
PK	Ponloeu Kuma
ICS	Investing in Children and their Societies
PDoWA	Provincial Department of Women Affairs
PDoSA	Provincial Department of Social Affairs
PDoE	Provincial Department of Education
SP	Skills in Parenting

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
I. Background	8
II. Project Summary	8
III. The Scope of the evaluation	9
IV. Methodology	11
V. Key Constraints and Limitations of the Study	13
VI. Key Findings	14
A. Project basic Parameters and Relevance	14
B. Efficiency	17
C. Effectiveness	18
D. Gender Empowerment/Domestic Violence	31
E. Sustainability.....	31
F. Building Partnership.....	32
VII. Analysis of the Achievement goals & Objectives	32
VIII. Conclusion & Recommendations	34
IX. Annexes	38

List of Tables

Table 1: Number of key Respondents HHS by Villages	12
Table 2: The Marital Status Amongst key Respondents	14
Table 3: Level of Education among SP Parents	15
Table 4: Level of Education for Spouses	15
Table 5: How Parents Decided to Join the SP Training	16
Table 6: View of key Respondents on the Teaching Method	17
Table 7: Views of Participants on the Quality of the Training	18
Table 8: The Level of Parents' Interest in the SP	19
Table 9: The level of Attendance by Parents in the SP Training Sessions	19
Table 10: Observed changes in the practice and ideas amongst parents after the SP training.....	20
Table 11: Capacity of Parent to Deal with Children Behaviors	20
Table 12: Capacity of Parents to Manage their Children Behaviors	20
Table 13: The Ways for Dealing with Disagreements in Families	21
Table 17: Kinds of Stresses Experienced	21
Table 23: Level of Knowledge Sharing Between Parents	24
Table 20: Number of Participants who have lived with their Spouses	26
Table 25: List of Community Saving Groups	28

Executive Summary

This section provides a summary of key findings gathered during an evaluation of the Skilful Parenting Project (SP) “Enabling Local Empowerment Action for Child Protection Environment (LEAP)” based in Odor Meanchey Province.

This evaluation identified that the project has managed to achieve significantly in the objectives and goals set out by the proposal, the SP training has been treated as an invaluable tool for rural parents who, for the most part, have little or no schooling. It was identified that the learned skills and knowledge on SP has been used and practiced by many parents who were involved in the training. The sharing of knowledge and skills has been reported by many parents, although it has faced some resistance due to cultural practices and norms. Furthermore, the project appears to have been well received by local authorities including Commune Council and District officials who are engaged in the project.

This report has found that a certain level of achievement has been generated, particularly in the capacity development of parents on the SP programme. Training not only brings public awareness of skills, techniques and knowledge but it has the added value of the practice of child rights and child protection. When learning about the stages of child development, children enjoy the right to get support and care based on their different stages of development, through the SP training, more model parents have emerged and new ways of parenting practices have been established in hearts and minds of parents. At the same time, the formation of Community Saving Groups (CSGs) in parallel with SP groups can also be said to boost people empowerment, as families work together to build their own financial resources, this way individual and community social capital is generated.

The current support and engagement expressed by members of the Commune Council, especially from the Cambodian Committee of Women and Children (CCWC), towards Ponleu Kumar, the partner NGO in the SP project implementation, was fully recognised. Based on the interviews with members of the Commune Councils, the majority suggested that the project should be further expanded to more villages, and especially to rural communities where many parents still hold misleading cultural views of Parenting.

The study identified that the project relies on the enabling support from the implementing agency Ponleu Kumar (PK), and that field staff and trainers are well equipped with skills in training and community engagement. PK has drafted and adhered to different basic policies to maximize the capacity, to manage the project and to ensure transparency and accountability within the organization and to the community they are supporting.

Regular meetings (at least once per month) have been organized for information sharing amongst PK trainers, staff and management team,. These meetings constitute the basis for staff to discuss strategies undertaken, problems identified and key challenges met or to meet.

Despite the positive achievements of the project, there are some still key areas of constraints reported by this evaluation. Firstly more time and adequate space needs to be allocated if the project aims to reach the same number of parents, and a dialogue with parents on existing parenting practices needs to be opened up so as to understand their stages of skills development; this would enable the project to provide appropriate coaching, mentoring and follow up. Attempts to share knowledge and skills on SP have met some resistance due to traditional practices and norms in family parenting culture. The SP training method applied has not always succeeded in capturing the interest of older people since they cannot read and write and are deeply rooted in their traditional values, norms and practices. This evaluation raises the fundamental question regarding the objective set by PK “*empowering vulnerable parents to access the training*”. It has been identified by this study, that there was no selection process in place to select vulnerable families and recruitment of the SP trainees proceeded on a voluntarily basis, following parents’ express interest.

To improve the level of project efficiency and effectiveness over its phases, a number of basic recommendations can be made as follows:

- 1) Since more parents are well equipped with SP knowledge and skills, the project should develop a criteria for selecting key parents in the community amongst those who were trained, and provide them with more skills in peer education and coaching. This selection process and capacity development will help the community to have their own human resources within SP families to whom they can address and ask support whenever necessary.
- 2) It is essential for PK to work with key parents and local authorities to detect vulnerable families in need of special support of SP skills. Those families should be provided with adequate training and a monitoring system should be put in place to track their progresses through time.
- 3) This evaluation has found that SP is cross cutting issues that concern all parents, therefore it is recommended that SP training is treated as an integrated activity that can be combined with other community based development projects such as saving, community self-help groups and other development schemes initiated either by PK or by other organizations in the target villages.

I. Background

ICS (Investing in Children and their Societies) is an international organization established in the 1980s currently with offices and initiatives in Cambodia, Kenya and Tanzania while the head office is in the Netherlands. ICS improves the well being of families and their children in rural areas of Cambodia and Africa. The organization works together with communities on sustainable businesses – agriculture, water and youth entrepreneurship – and Skillful Parenting to bring about positive change at both economic and social level. Target areas in Cambodia are Siem Reap, Oddar Meanchey, and Banteay Meanchey.

Skillful Parenting is a parenting support program that departs from the idea that change will only take place if parents perceive there is a need for change and believe in their own capacity to make that change. SP provides a holistic approach that reinforces positive parenting practices and empowers parents/caregivers to:

1. Address challenges that they face in bringing up their children;
2. Better promote and facilitate their child's health, development, achievement and protection;
3. Reduce parental stress thereby making them more content with parenting and family life, thereby helping them to foster/ preserve their relationship and, improve the family well-being.

ICS trains local professional facilitators to provide Skillful Parenting to parent peer groups, consisting of fathers, mothers and other caregivers. The facilitators address basic parenting topics in different sessions geared towards providing parents with basic knowledge and opening opportunities for social comparison and joint reflection.

The three main approaches currently, used by ICS Cambodia are:

1. Training of facilitators on Skillful Parenting;
2. Direct implementation by ICS Cambodia
3. Implement Skillful Parenting in partnership with local NGOs, including Ponleur Kumar (PK)

II. Project Summary

Over the past 2 years ICS has built up an innovative Skillful Parenting Program in Cambodia, the initial feedback from parents indicates that this program has a positive impact on parental well-being and the well-being of their children and families. However, as yet such qualitative (more anecdotal) information is insufficient to draw evidence-based conclusions on the effectiveness of the Skillful Parenting program..

This evaluation mainly focuses on Ponleur Kumar (PK), which implemented a project called “Enabling Local Empowerment Action for Child Protection Environment” (LEAP) under ICS support. PK works in partnership with Community-Based Organizations, Civil Society Organizations, NGO networks, International organizations and relevant government agencies, to further sustainable community development and to see the implementation of children's rights.

Since 2013 PK has worked in 5 communes in Oddor Meanchey province to provide Skillful Parenting to parents/caregivers, strengthening structural enablers in their direct environment to help children grow up in a safe and protective family environment. PK reaches out to 1,850 parents and caregivers in communities and schools and strengthens the capacity of 5 CCWC personnel and village chiefs in order for parents to hold them accountable when addressing child protection issues in their direct environment. The basic objectives set out in the proposal are:

1. To empower vulnerable parents, child care givers, children, Community-based Child Protection Networks (CCPNs) as rights holders in the 3 target provinces. The aim is to make them aware of their rights and prominent roles in protecting all children from abuse, negligence and exploitation; to increase their representation and participation in the Commune Investment Plan (CIP) and to monitor the delivery of education and child protection practices.
2. To strengthen the capacity of Commune Council for Women and Children (CCWC) and Commune Councils (CC) in three target provinces. For participants to take primary roles in caring for and protecting all children from abuse, negligence and exploitation in the target communes.
3. To effectively manage and coordinate the project.

PK facilitators mobilize parents/caregivers to form saving groups and train them (Saving for Change Manual) on how to run saving schemes, lending and group management. Saving groups consist of voluntary members who meet on a weekly basis to deposit the savings and manage lending.

III. The Scope of the evaluation

This is the final evaluation of the LEAP project whose implementation started in 2013 in Beanteay Ampil and ChhongKal district, Oddor Meanchey province. The parents assessed by this evaluation are those who have previously participated in the project (not those who are currently participating).

Objectives

The aim of this final evaluation is to generate evidence of the influence of the Skillful Parenting program on the levels of parents, children and family, with the purposes of:

- Providing ICS and PK with program management information to adjust or refine the Skillful Parenting program design;
- Providing information to improve the project design and operational plans of PK for the continuation of the project;
- Providing donors such as the Dutch Ministry of Affairs, with a clear overview of the outputs and the immediate outcomes delivered in this project.

Initial status of the project:

The main target beneficiaries of the LEAP project are parents living in rural areas; PK provides them with parenting skills to improve the relationship between partners and between parents and children.

Parents represent the main beneficiaries of the project whilst children are the secondary direct beneficiaries. Child's right and child protection components are fully embedded in all of LEAP's common goals i.e. *"to reduce the vulnerability of Cambodian girls and boys especially the ones vulnerable to abuse, negligence and exploitation"*. To reach the project final goal PK works in close collaboration with other actors present in the community, i.e. local authorities and schools. The project aims to empower parents, caregivers and child protection networks in the community, and make them aware of their rights and protection roles. The end goal is to adequately support the family and protect children.

Empowerment does not only take the form of parenting skills, it also consists of a set of other skills that parents need to acquire to be able to deal with life challenges and externalities. The modules delivered (9 modules) during the promotions organised are shaped accordingly, to include themes and subjects that support parents in their daily lives. Economic empowerment has been tried out with the formation of saving groups, which PK either tried to form in parallel with parenting groups or by integrating the SP program into an existing saving group.

Some saving groups have received SP training, whilst others are only active as saving groups. The idea behind saving groups is twofold: On one side, to empower families to build up their own financial resources and create social capital and on the other side, to see to what extent the creation of saving groups can support the creation of parent groups and *vice-versa*.

Strengthening the capacity of local authorities in the targeted provinces is also a key area of LEAP's involvement, both Commune Council and CCWC have been identified as key actors to train and involve. They possess the experience and leadership to inform the project throughout its implementation. However, beside the Commune level it has not been defined up to what level PK wants to establish relations, and to which extent the organisation wants built strategic partnerships with local entities and other NGOs. Within the community schools have been supported as environments where children grow, learn and feel safe to share with peers and teachers about issues happening inside of the family.

The good coordination of the project is an achievement and a prerequisite for the smooth running of other activities, good communications and a culture of sharing among team members at the different organizational levels has been identified. Furthermore, the project proposal has been shared amongst staff and a list of activities included in the training schedule has been prepared.

The model and content of the training (9 modules) has been provided by ICS Skillful Parenting team, those trainers were in charge of training PK staff who in turn delivered the training to parents.

Evaluation Questions:

1. How many of the parents continue to participate in parenting groups after the PK's facilitators gave the kick-off? And how much and in which way is the formation of saving groups affecting the Skillful Parent groups and vice-versa?
2. Up to what degree do participating parents consider Skillful Parenting to be increasing their self-efficacy and facilitating open discussions about parenting?
3. How many participating parents are talking about what they discussed at their parenting groups with their partners (co-parent)? What specific issues do they discuss or not discuss?
4. Up to what extent do the participating parents and their partners (co-parents) perceive that their in-family communication and parenting behaviour has changed? If changes took place, what activities and events caused these changes?

IV. Methodology

A. Literature Review: (Review all relevant documents)

The consultant carried out a comprehensive Literature Review of all the related documents. The documents included:

- The current PK Strategic planning
- The project proposal
- Narrative reports
- Baseline information
- Monitoring report and field notes
- Other reports made available by both ICS and PK.

B. Qualitative and participative approach

The following methods of data collection were employed for this evaluation:

i) Semi-structured interview: *(See the list attached)*

- ▶ Individual interviews with the PK's senior management and staff involved in the project, based in Odor Meanchey Province.
- ▶ Individual interviews were conducted with community focal persons and committees, trained and non-trained parents, village chief's, local Commune Councils responsible for Women and Children (CCWC) and others who are directly involved in the project based in the villages.
- ▶ Individual interviews were conducted with key government officials, schoolteachers, school principals and district office for education.

ii) Focused Group Discussions (FGDs)

- ▶ Focus group discussions were organized, in order to get a better understanding and to validate findings and interpretations, which provide an opportunity for interaction and

engagement between stakeholders and target beneficiaries. In this case, a series of FGDs were organized with the following groups:

1. (6) Parents Groups,
2. (1) A teacher Group, who was involved in the SP training
3. (4) Community saving groups

iii) Observation

Direct observation of activities were employed as a basis for assessing the current practices of trained parents to understand the level of engagement between parents and their children and between the parents.

C. Quantitative Survey

The Evaluation scope suggested an investigation through a quantitative approach using a household survey (HHS). This approach provides a measurable assessment of the level of knowledge, skills and behavioral practices acquired by the parents.

The sampling methodology was decided upon in a consultation with PK and ICS, the evaluation team proposed that, at least 10% (or 100ps) of the parents involved in the training would be selected as key informants of sampling population.

A random selection of the villages was carried out following prior consultation with PK and ICS. and in order to comply with the technical aspects of the research, the random selection method was decided upon based on the situational context and nature of differences with the local communities. The study team obtained a list of all of the villages and the number of families within the selected communities, and then a random selection was made. To ensure reliability, 10 out of the 40 target villages were selected, and 100 families were randomly selected from the list of parents who attended the SP training. The table below shows a list of villages and the number of key respondents selected for HHS.

Table 1: Number of key Respondents HHS by Villages

No	District	Commune	Villages	No of Respondents
1	Banteay Ampil	Ampil	Baray	12
2			Kok Thom	10
3		Beng	Po Thmey	12
4			TumnuP Thmey	8
5		Kok Mon	Thnal Dach	13
6			Roneam Thom	8
7		Kok Khpous	Sras Srong	9
8			Prey Totoeung	12
9	Chong kal	Chong kal	Banteay Chas	8
10			Samor	8
Total				100

A quantitative method to collect data was used, a set of structured questionnaires were developed and delivered by a team of trained enumerators. The questionnaire was formulated in consultation

with ICS and PK, aiming to answer the research questions and focusing on the following areas (see annexes):

- 1) The level of knowledge that has been built amongst parents and their views on the importance, the process and approach of the training they received
- 2) How the trained skills have been practiced, including key challenges and constraints.
- 3) The level of behavioral change observed in the parent themselves and in others who participated in the same training, and how this differs from the non-trained parents
- 4) The potential benefits, especially of the relationship between parents and their children and how these have had an impact on the lives of families.

To ensure questions were relevant and fully understood by key informants, the questionnaire was piloted and then adjusted, before proceeding with interviewing.

D. Consultation workshop with key stakeholders

A consultation workshop, with all of the key stakeholders was organized at the end of the fieldwork, and a draft of key finding was presented to the audience. This consultation workshop needs to be considered as part of the evaluation process, so more inputs and suggestions from participants can be gathered and integrated into the final report.

V. Key Constraints and Limitations of the Study

The design of methodology for data collection ensures a strong representation and generalisation of the key findings. However, some minor issues have arisen during the fieldwork, which could affect the overall quality of the evaluation. Such constraints included the low education levels amongst SP parents and parents' difficulties in recalling their memories from the training sessions. Parents were often unable to provide a thorough explanation or express their views on the quality of training that they had received. Furthermore, the period of this fieldwork was conducted during the cassava-planting season therefore; it was sometimes difficult to meet with villagers who were busy with agricultural activities. This caused the random selection design to be replaced by a snowball approach method. In order to minimize the impact on the study, the evaluation team worked closely with PK, to make sure that people could make themselves available for interviews, the random household selection would be changed only when necessary.

At times, a comparison was been made between this evaluation and the baseline study conducted prior to the project start. It is important to bear in mind that comparisons are made as indicators, and that people interviewed for the baseline report and for this evaluation might not be the same. The sets of questions people were asked in the two cases differ slightly, therefore, before and after the project cannot be fully compared.

VI. Key Findings

The evaluation key findings outlined in this report, considered the following criteria: Parameters/ Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Sustainability, furthermore, some conclusions are drawn for gender and partnership building.

A. Project basic Parameters and Relevance

The document reviews shows that the SP project has been implemented in 40 target villages, out of the 5 communes and 2 districts, in Samrong Chon Kal and Banteay Ampil in Ordor Meachey province. The two main activities are:

Skillful Parenting (SP) and Community Saving (CS) which was carried out by the project involving 1,006 parents, (848 female or 84% women).

The composition and characteristics of the sample selected for this evaluation vary slightly from the baseline. In the baseline, up to 95% of the participants were women, all of them (100%) married. For this evaluation only 85% of the women are married, 11% are widow and up to 4% are single (see table 2 below). The presence of participants who are single was also identified by the FGDs.

Table 2: The Marital Status Amongst key Respondents

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Single	4	4.0
	Married	84	84.0
	Divorced	1	1.0
	Widow	11	11.0
	Total	100	100.0

The following topics were included in the training modules:

- Life as a parent
- The role of model parents
- Time for me
- Traditional values
- Positive disciplinary reinforcement
- Communication within the family
- A peaceful family
- Child protection
- Family budget

Saving groups were formed amongst the SP families and interviews with project staff revealed that, due to time constraints and workload, only 7 CSG out of the 9 groups planned by the proposal had been formed.

Up to 40% of the parents selected for the HHs has had no schooling and 22% had completed grade 1 to 3 in primary school (see table 3), whilst 22% of their spouses had also had no schooling, another 24% has reached only grade 2 and 3 in primary school.

Table 3: Level of Education among SP Parents

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	No school	40	40.0
	Primary 1	7	7.0
	Primary 2	8	8.0
	Primary 3	7	7.0
	Primary 4	7	7.0
	Primary 5	7	7.0
	Primary 6	3	3.0
	Lower secondary 1	7	7.0
	Lower secondary 2	5	5.0
	Lower secondary3	5	5.0
	Higher secondary 1	3	3.0
	Higher secondary 2	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0

Table 4: Level of Education for Spouses

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	No school	21	22.1
	Primary 1	3	3.2
	Primary 2	10	10.5
	Primary 3	13	13.7
	Primary 4	8	8.4
	Primary 5	5	5.3
	Primary 6	9	9.5
	Lower secondary 1	11	11.6
	Lower secondary 2	3	3.2
	Lower secondary3	2	2.1
	Higher secondary 1	7	7.4
	Higher secondary 2	1	1.1
	Higher secondary	2	2.1

	Total	95	100.0
--	-------	----	-------

Local authorities and teachers from local school have expressed a strong support to the project, arguing that, the SP has filled a big gap in areas of traditional knowledge and beliefs of parents on child care practices. The local government institutions such as the District and Commune officials, responsible for Women and Children have voiced their strong support to the project and suggested that this project be further expanded to all villages in their Commune and District¹. They argued that the project has a genuine relevance to the rural context, where many parents have low education and lack access to information on parenting skills.

The evaluation team consulted local teachers involved in SP training to find out the potential for this project to be further integrated into local schools. Teachers stated *“this project has added value to our professional skills as teachers, and we see it as relevant knowledge for teachers who can share or care for children whilst they are in the school”*². They further suggested that, it would be more productive if, a two-way communication between the local school and parents could be encouraged or established, so that both teachers and parents could work together to deal with children who are in needed of special support.

Despite the fact that the SP project has positive support by all of the people involved in the interviews, minor cultural resistances were reported. Results from the HHs show that about 51% of the participants came to training based on their interest in learning skills, whilst the rest came along with their neighbors or they were asked by PK to join (see table 5).

Table 5: How Parents Decided to Join the SP Training

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1.It was my own interest	51	51.0
	2.Just went with my neighbors/ relatives	23	23.0
	3.I was called by PK	22	22.0
	4.Because I was one of the PK project participants	4	4.0
	Total	100	100.0

Although strongly maintained, the cultural opinion expressed did not confront the projects efforts to provide new skills and knowledge for parents. Considering these perceptions and the great importance attached to Khmer traditional values, it can be argued that, the SP training should be an integral part of a cultural transformation process where wisdom and traditional skills are appreciated and duly considered before the SP methodology is introduced and accepted.

¹ This request was expressed by CCWC and DCWC in both districts – Manteay Ampil and Samrong Chong Kal.

² Quoted from the teachers in the FGD, Samrong Chong kal Clauter School.

B. Efficiency

This section presents the level of efficiency in the project implementation, it was identified that there are 4 PK staff directly involved as trainers for SP. The staff are well equipped with skills and knowledge for training and teaching, and they have received certificate awards from SP and ICS. All of the staff have demonstrated strong community skills and during the field work it was observed, that the presence of PK staff in the community was warmly welcomed by parents, and their relationship with local authorities (CWCC and DCWCC) appeared to be mutual and respectful. Table 6 below explains the level of acquired skills amongst trainers, as perceived by parents in the HHs.

Table 6: View of key Respondents on the Teaching Method

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1.Very Skillful	94	94.0
	2.Prossess Limited skills	6	6.0
	Total	100	100.0

An experienced teacher (Mr. Chey Komsan, the PK project Coordinator) who has a strong background in pedagogy and child development has been efficiently managing the project. He is able to provide back up and advice on SP to other trainers who are still fairly young but energetic and enthusiastic.

It has been also been observed that there is strong teamwork amongst the project staff, especially in their level of collaboration and cooperation during the period of this fieldwork. All of the staff claimed to have received strong and sufficient administrative support from PK management. Financial matters linking to the project are transparent and conveyed to all of the staff, since the financial report is always sent or disseminated to them during their regular meetings. Staff meetings are held on a weekly basis, which allows the project staff to meet and share their experiences, discuss monitoring results and the problems and issues faced.

Since PK is working with a vulnerable population a children's policy has been formulated and implemented, staff have to sign an agreement to abide by this policy before starting to work with the organization.

Based on interviews with PK staff, some issues have been raised regarding the efficiency of the project, such as: the SP project proposal that has only been made available in English, whilst most trainers have limited English skills. Although some sections have been translated, particularly for activities and outputs, it has been difficult for the staff to reach an in-depth understanding of the concepts of the project and of its framework. Therefore, the staff has become quite familiar with activities to implement only; they have not acquired knowledge of the goals and objectives of the project in its specific context.

The PK staff and trainers consider the project rather ambitious since it aims to cover a large number of parents (over 1000), relying on only 4 trainers in 40 villages, within a set time frame. Both the staff

and the PK management have agreed that in principle it is hard for trainers to ensure the both the quality and the capacity development for the 1000 parents, within a one-year project cycle. This has been exacerbated by the fact that significant time and space must also be allocated in dealing with cultural issues linking to parenting. Staff suggested that more outcomes might emerge if they spent more time with the families to observe their current practices, so that they may be able to, provide the right degree of coaching and support parents. Although trainers' skills were appreciated, some parents felt that some of trainers were too young and lacked the personal experience to teach parenting practices.

The SP project also attempts to reach teachers at local schools so a pilot session was been carried out in Samrong Chongkal, with a group of 30 teachers from the Samrong Chongkal cluster school. FGD with these teachers revealed that although teachers have welcomed the project they argued that, whilst the SP training is relevant to parents, minor adjustments in topic contents and process are necessary if teachers are to learn how to deal with children who need special attention/support³.

C. Effectiveness

1) The Skillful Parenting Training

This study was carried out in 10 out of the 40 of PK's target villages, up until the time of this evaluation, 9 training sessions on SP have been introduced for parental capacity building.. On the basis of this evaluation, two paralleled methods were used to collect data from the field:

- 1) Household survey (with 10 families in each village)
- 2) 6 FGDs with group of SP parents (8 to 15 persons per each group).

This section presents the research's key findings and includes the results of both, household survey and FGDs;

The results of HHs survey reveal that, the training prepared by SP was clear and easy to understand for all of the parents. See the table 7 below:

Table 7: Views of Participants on the Quality of the Training

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Easy to understand	99	99.0
	I don't know?	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0

The interviews results show that the level of interest in the SP was highly considered by the large majority of parents. 78% found the SP very helpful for them and their families and children (table 8

³ This suggestion was made by teachers involved in the interviews in a local school, in suburb of Samrong chongkal district town

below). At least 72% of parents involved in the HHs interviews had attended the whole training sessions and 28% attended some parts of the training course (see table 9).

Table 8: The Level of Parents’ Interest in the SP

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Very helpful	78	78.0
	Helpful	19	19.0
	A waste of my time	1	1.0
	I don’t know	2	2.0
	Total	100	100.0

Table 9: The level of Attendance by Parents in the SP Training Sessions

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1.The whole course	72	72.0
	2.A part of the course	28	28.0
	Total	100	100.0

Most of parents involved in the interviews were aware that, childcare practices should begin as early as before a child is born. Parents understand the need for proper nutrition and undertake more regular health checks during pregnancy. A commonly expressed comment in the FGDs was *“we no longer follow the traditional practice where mothers were advised to eat less during pregnancy so as to not make the child fat which causes a difficult delivery. We have learned to eat more nutritional food and go regularly to pre-natal care”*. The SP training does not refer to such details as how to care for the child during pregnancy, but knowledge acquired on child development (provided by the SP training) has triggered an increase in parents’ knowledge on children’s needs and care before they are born.

Similar discussions took place during interviews when assessing the changes in behavior and practices of parents after childbirth. Almost all parents understood the importance of breast-feeding and the need for supplementary feeding when children are 6 years old. Mothers said *“in our tradition, a baby can eat rice porridge as early as 3 month old since training most of us arrange to have porridge for the baby when they are 6 months old.”* Based on discussions in the FGDs, certain levels of awareness were reiterated amongst parents, who see parenting skills as a tool to acquire good practices that are related to child rights.

Nevertheless, although there are improvements, gaps exist and were reported in regard to the changes in parenting practices within the family. Approximately 43% of the key respondents

admitted to a significant change in their parenting practice, whereas, the other half (46%) reported some change in their thoughts and practices, after the SP training. See table 10 below.

Table 10: Observed changes in the practice and ideas amongst parents after the SP training

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1.Yes, a very big change	43	43.9
	2.There are some changes	46	46.9
	3.There is No change at all	4	4.1
	4.I can't say	5	5.1
	Total	98	100.0

Furthermore, although significant progress has been made, some complaints were expressed amongst parents with older children. For example, over 70% of key respondents involved in the HHs still have some difficulty in knowing how to deal with the behaviors of grown up children (see table 11 below). Most parents in the FGDs explained, *“Some threats must be imposed, if we want our children to behave as well as we expect them to, and. To follow our beliefs system, some disciplines and threats are unavoidable⁴”*.

Table 11: Capacity of Parent to Deal with Children Behaviors

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Very difficult	10	40.0
	Difficult	9	36.0
	Not difficult	6	24.0
	Total	25	100.0

Although some SP parents admitted to have some level of difficulty in dealing with their children’s behaviors, for example: when children go out, refuse to go to school, hang around with bad company etc., they recognised that, it was easier now for them to manage those situations than it was before joining the SP training. This statement was confirmed by 86% of the key respondents involved in the in HHs. See table 12 below:

Table 12: Capacity of Parents to Manage their Children Behaviors

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	More easy	84	85.7

⁴ Based on such beliefs, some parents still use violence or threats as basis for children obedience.

	Still the same	8	8.2
	I cannot explain	6	6.1
	Total	98	100.0

The FGDs put an emphasis on the impacts of SP on the relationship between family members, especially between the husband and wife.

Most community groups involved in the interviews observed a decrease in the level of domestic violence in their community. When asked how change occurred; some mentioned the skills learned in the SP training, whilst other referred to public awareness campaigns on the law on domestic violence.

Tracking the trend in domestic violence in the target villages, and the extent to which Skillful Parent training has played on it, is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

Some improvements in behavioral change, especially, in the ways couples deal with disagreements are reported in the table below. At least 28% of the key respondents approached and talked to each other when disagreements occurred, while more than half (53%) keeps quiet and does not talk about the issue until it is forgotten. Some level of violence between husband and wife still occurs, about 8.6 % continue to yell at each other and 6% have been involved in physical violence such as punching or throwing things at each other when a disagreement occurs (See table 13).

Table 13: The Ways for Dealing with Disagreements in Families

		No of respondents	Percent
Valid	We talk about it	23	28.4%
	We ask other people to solve it for us	1	1.2%
	We don't talk for a long time, until we forget	43	53.1%
	We yell at each other, the one who yells the most wins	7	8.6%
	We throw things at each other	1	1.2%
	Sometimes we punch or hit each other	4	4.9%
	I cry	1	1.2%
	Other	1	1.2%
Total		81	100.0%

Stress management has also been part of the SP training session, to improve the parents' capacity to cope with personal and family issues such as those described by table 17. The kinds of stress experienced included income (35%) and health (24%) followed by increased workloads (13%).

Table 14: Kinds of Stresses Experienced

Reasons for Stresses	Number of responses	Percent
----------------------	---------------------	---------

• Work – not enough	6	3.7%
• Work – too much	21	12.8%
• Income	57	34.8%
• Conflicts with your spouse	2	1.2%
• Health	43	26.2%
• Difficulty in raising children	21	12.8%
• Reputation of your family	4	2.4%
• Debts	6	3.7%
• Other	4	2.4%
	100.	100%

In comparison to the baseline survey, the record for reasons related to stress shows a significant decrease in stress caused by “*conflict with spouse*”, a reduction from 10% in the baseline record to 1.2% was found by this evaluation. The level of family stress caused by by financial debts has also decreased from 11%, in the baseline record to only 3.7% in this study. The level stress caused by health and difficulties in raising children remains the same (respectively with 26% & 11% in the baseline record). A significant increase is revealed in this evaluation in the level of stress caused by income issues, the baseline record shows, only 11% of the key respondents who had experienced stress caused by income issues, whereas now it is up to 35% .

At the initial period of this project implementation, the baseline survey revealed that, about ¾ of the key respondents had experienced stress (encountered stress 38% & often with severe stress 38%). However, this evaluation identified that a majority of key respondents (85%) has reported more improvement in their ability to manage stress, after they received the SP training (see table 18 below).

Table 18: Capacity of Parents in Stress Management, after receiving SP Training

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Improved	85	85.0
	Worsened	4	4.0
	The same	9	9.0
	Total	98	98.0

Some minor progress was revealed by the HHs, in the area of gender role within the families (husband and wife). 38% of the key respondents indicated some change whereas; up to 60 % stated that no change had occurred (see table 19). 77% of housework and child care remains heavily placed in the hands of women (see table 20). However, this figure shows a slight decrease from the result of the baseline report, which revealed that up to 81% placed the responsibility on the mother alone. Furthermore, the cases of joint efforts between the mother and father in caring for children has increased from 10% by the baseline report to 18% found by this study.

Table 19: The Status of Changes in Gender Role within the Families

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1. Yes	38	38.4
	2. No	60	60.6
	3. I don't know	1	1.0
	Total	99	100.0

Table 20: The Role of Women in Caring for Children and Housework

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Mother	77	77.0
	Together	18	18.0
	Older siblings	1	1.0
	Other	4	4.0
	Total	100	100.0

The majority of parents said that they considered the SP training as a vehicle that brought about change. Table 21 below, reveals that over 67 % of the HHs key respondents admitted to the change as a result of the SP training, whilst 21% saw it as a natural process within the family.

Table 21: Reasons for the Change in the Capacity of Parents

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1. Result of training skills learned	25	67.6
	2. It changed naturally	8	21.6
	3. I cannot say	2	5.4
	Total	35	100.0

In light of these results, it can be argued that SP has had an impact on managing stress conditions and dealing with conflicts within the family.

The impact that SP has had on violence against women is extremely hard to measure and beyond the scope of this evaluation. Some cases of domestic violence are still being reported in all villages involved in the study, and no collective effort has been made to stop such violence within the family⁵. Women complained about the lack of men attending the training, arguing, *“we want to see more men to come to the training, because at times the violence is started by men”*⁶.

⁵ In Baray village, a women who attended the FGDs has reported that, even if she is married and her husband loves her, she still suffers violence committed by her drunken father who beats her after drinking. She was

Knowledge Sharing and Peers Engagement

This evaluation also assesses the levels of engagement and knowledge sharing of SP amongst parents in the community. As was revealed by the HHs, at least 55% of parents claimed to have shared what they learned with other parents, while 44% have never done so, (see table 23).

Table 15: Level of Knowledge Sharing Between Parents

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Yes	54	55.1
	No,	44	44.9
	Total	98	100.0

Some parents have expressed that peer discussions and knowledge shared between SP parents and non SP parents, often encountered some level of resistance from parents. The most common reactions reported by the SP parents were: *“I have raised many children so far and now they are growing up, so I have no need for your advice”*⁷. In addition, some parents say that they are too busy to share (42%) or that they have no confidence to do so. (44%).

Table 23: Reasons for not sharing the SP Knowledge and Skills

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	1. I am too busy	19	42.2
	2. I have no confidence	20	44.4
	3. I don't know	6	13.3
	Total	45	100.0

Whilst the outcomes outlined above can be regarded as improvements in the capacity of parents, the level of good practices amongst them varied from village to village. Table 22 below provides a basic assessment on the level of parenting practices and participation identified by this evaluation:

Table 22: Level of Functioning of SP

No	Name of the Villages	Capacity Level	
		Strong	Weak
1	Baray		X
2	Kok Thom		X
3	Po Thmey	X	
4	TumnuP Thmey	X	

about to cry when talking about her case. This case has been well-known by everybody in the community but no one intervened, and thus appears to belong to a culture where one should not interfere.

⁶ Quoted from group of women in TumnuP Thmey Village, Banteay Ampil District.

⁷ This quote was shared by parents in all FGDs

5	Thnol dach	X	
6	Roneam Thom		X
7	Sras Srang	X	
8	Prey Toteung		X
9	Bateay Chas	X	
10	Sromor		X

There are some basic reasons at the root of the differences in the table above such as: education, which, can possibly contribute, to the weakness in the capacity of parents. Other evidence shows that, in the village, where there is no strong community based groups, the level of engagement and shared knowledge on SP (amongst SP parents) have been weak or socially fragile. These findings seem to indicate the fact that, the SP project would be more effective if it were carried out as an integrated approach (or treated as cross cutting issue) with other community based groups or community development activities. In the villages of Po Thmey; Tumnup Thmey; Thnol dach, Sras Srang and Banteay Chas, community based SHGs/Saving (either supported by PK or by other NGOs) had already been developed long before the SP, was in these villages, the level of engagement amongst parents in the SP activities appears to be high. It was observed that in Baray and Kok Thom village, where the SP training was introduced alone, without the saving group, the level of people engagement in the SP was low and participation was difficult to attain after the training finished. On the contrary, in the village of Po Thmey and Sras Srang, where the saving group was developed before the SP was introduced, the parents were actively engaged in group discussions and able to describe more about the changes they had observed in their SP practices.

It is clear that both the formation of the SP group and the sharing between SP peers works better in those groups or communities where a strong social capital is already in place.⁸ This analysis has been confirmed by the staff of PK who managed the SP training and who explained “*over the course of the SP project, we have observed that, in the villages where parents were involved in the saving groups, the introduction of SP training and the level of collaboration amongst parents in the training seem to proceed more smoothly, compared to the villages where only the SP training exists*”⁹.

Child age and education

In relation to children, this evaluation reveals a decrease in the number of child access to school in comparison to the baseline results. About 65% of the key respondents have all of their school aged children placed in school, whilst 17% have sent some children to school and another 17% never sent their children to school (see table 22 below). This figure indicates a shifting in percentages compared to the baseline report where up to (76%) of parents have placed their school aged children in school. The parents have attributed the current decrease in the number of children who are sent to school, to family migration, since children have to stop school to follow their parents or otherwise be involved in labor works.

⁸ Where there is strong and well-functioning community based groups and people are socially organized.

⁹ Quoted from PK trainers, in the semi-structured interviews

Table 21: Number of Families Sent their Children to School

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Yes all	63	64.9
	Some of them	17	17.5
	None of them	17	17.5
	Total	97	100.0

The migration of populations has been raised as a major issue now affecting the SP project, for instance, when the project started, almost all (up to 95%) parents claimed to have stayed together in the village, however, since then this evaluation shows that almost 15% of the key respondents now have their spouses (either father or mother or both) away from home. Some have migrated for short periods of time before returning, whilst others have stayed away for prolonged periods (see table 20).

Table 2016: Number of Participants who have lived with their Spouses

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Yes	83	86.5
	No	9	9.4
	Partly	4	4.2
	Total	96	100.0

Odor Meanchey, reported the highest level of people migration, and migration is much higher in the provinces next to the Thai Border. Many cases have been reported across the villages selected for this study, of parents who have left their children with their grand parents, almost of all older women participants of the SP, (especially for those involved in the interviews), have to take care their grandchildren whilst their parents are working in Thailand. The SP training can provide helpful inputs to these older women on how to best care for their grandchildren. It was observed during FGDs that a majority of these old women were quiet and unable to engage in the conversations held. This observation was also confirmed by other young participants who said *“as often the case, older participants attend the training regularly but most of them are quiet¹⁰”*. The reasons for the lack of active engagement amongst older people in the SP training is still difficult to verify through this evaluation, however preliminary discussions with some participants revealed that, low education and cultural norms could be argued as being key barriers preventing them from speaking up or sharing their views. Furthermore, FGDs with older women reported that, many of them have expressed greater difficulties in the care of grown up children.

¹⁰ The evaluation team has checked this issue with all FGDs and received the same explanation

It was revealed by the HHs survey that a large proportion of children (up to 36%) whose parents were involved in the interviews, are now aged between 11 to 18 years old¹¹ (see table 21 below). This figure indicates that catered coaching and mentoring might be needed for parents and grandparents who take care of children in this age group.

Table21: Ages of Children of the key Respondents (in recent HHs)

Ages		Responses	Percent
	0-5	40	31.7%
	6-10	38	30.2%
	11-14	22	17.5%
	15-18	23	18.3%
	18 and above ¹²	3	2.4%
Total		126	100.0%

Similarly, catered training could be provided to young participants aged 18 or below or to young single women who were found in the SP groups. Youths have claimed that, *“although, I am too young or single and I am not a parent yet, I can use what I have learned, to care for my nephews or cousins”*. Although this claim can be perceived as logical and acceptable, more discussions with these young women revealed that, some of them still have great difficulties in how to use their skills and knowledge learned with SP with other family members.

2) SP Training to Teachers Group

The SP training with teachers was seen as a pilot activity carried with a group of teachers from a local school in Chong Kal district with the plan to attempt to reach 30 teachers from Chong Kal cluster School. The evaluation team tried to meet more teachers who were involved in the SP training, however, since the field work interviews were organized during the school holiday, only 6 teachers were able to participate in the FGD meeting. Nevertheless the FGD with these schoolteachers was productive and fruitful, teachers have strongly affirmed that, the SP training was still in big demand, especially from parents in rural areas, where access to knowledge and skills in parenting is rare or does not exist. They described the training as simple and easy to follow and elaborated that the SP training could provide teachers with more skills for them to better relate with children in schools as well as with their own children.

Discussion with teachers focused on how SP knowledge has been used or could be used in the school context, it was suggested that, the SP training methods and topic contents may need slight adjustment to make the training more relevant for teachers, who work with children in the school.

¹¹ This figure was just slightly increased from the baseline report that shows 33% aged between 11 to 18ys.

¹² This figure shows big difference from baseline report where up to 19% was above 18 years

3) Community Saving Groups (CSGs)

The proposal planned that at least 9 community saving groups should have been formed over the course of this project cycle, however, up until the time of this evaluation, only 7 saving groups have been formed. Staff work loads and the communities slow responses to the CSGs initiative were described as the key constraints preventing PK from achieving the expected output. The table 25 below provides details figures and location of these CSGs.

Table 17: List of Community Saving Groups

No.	Villages	Names of Groups	Total Members	No of women
1	Po Thmey	Kasekar Rikray	22	22
2		Samaki Rikray	18	17
3	Reaksmey Sophy	Samaki Chamroeun	8	8
4	Prsat Lboek	Model Parents	11	8
5	Beng	Beng Rikreay	16	11
6	Sras Srang	Model parent Rik. Chamroeun	11	10
7	Tumnup Chas	Tumnup Chas Samaki	13	12
		Total	99	88

The members of the CSGs are formed mostly amongst SP parents, each member is entitled to save a certain amount of money ranging from 2000 riels to 20,000 riels each week. Through the saving fund, members can loan money to set up income generation activities or to use the money for other family needs. It was reported that, the loan has generated between 2 to 3% interest and the cycle of saving was set mostly between 1 to 2 years. By the end of each cycle, all of the savings funds, including the interest earned, were redistributed amongst members, before the new cycle of saving could begin again. Each group has presented clear book keeping records that were filled out by the group leaders, who are elected by the members.

Similar to the SP groups, the level of functioning for CSG varies from village to villages, depending on the nature of the group formation, leadership and community background. For instance, in economic terms, the saving fund has been treated as the group bank, where funds and interests earned from the loan remains inside the village, and members can access a loan for a business or other personal urgencies. Whilst the impacts on family incomes generated by the loan from CSGs have been identified as minimal, due to the easy access and the low interest charged, the members of the functioning CSGs have expressed a strong commitment to further building their capacity so as to carry on with the project, even if PK withdraws from their villages. Through the CSG, parents can learn how to elect their leaders (the committee for saving).

It should be noted that, in most target areas of PK, there is a significant increase in the number of loan institutions actively engaged in credit loans. At least 3 to 5 Micro Financial Institutions (MFI) have been reported in each village visited by this study. Credit loans from institutions outside of the villages have also been encouraged, especially over the last 5 years, however, members explained

that the saving groups, *“compared to the banks and MFIs, we highly appreciate to our saving groups, where we can loan money without worrying about collateral or submitting documents, we just inform our group leader and, then, we get the money as soon as it is available”*. It was reported by the group members as well as by village chiefs, that only a very few families in the CSG have borrowed money from the bank or MFIs, compared to the non-CSG members.

Socially, the CSG plays a crucial role in building community social capital, where both solidarity and collective actions can be organized to serve the interests of the community. It was identified by this evaluation, that through CSG, members meet not only for saving, but that they share their experiences, and information or discuss other personal matters. A member stated, *“each time, on the date of the saving, members have met to deposit our saving, we have a chance to chat about our personal experiences and stresses or sharing information ”*. In some communities that this study visited, the CSGs have been used by the community as basis for community discussions on other development activities going on within the village.

Positive progress has been made, however, some core issues were identified by this evaluation, for example, in some communities visited by this study, the functioning of the CSGs remains weak and fragile. More in-depth discussions were made during the FGDs, to understand the reasons why some CSGs can function well while others do not. As result, a number of reasons were identified such as trust between members of the CSGs, which plays an important role in the functioning of the FGDs. In Sras Srang and Po Thmey villages, the members of the CSGs were formed amongst families who have lived close together, either as kinship, relatives or neighbors, these families, have shared their resources and have supported each other even before the CSGs existed. In this case, it was observed that, the level of participation and engagement amongst members appears to be high and their long-term commitment to the project has also been strong.

In the village of Prasat Lboek, however, the CSG were formed following the SP training, and group members were selected amongst the parents from across the village (no kinship or no family's link). In this case, the functioning of the CSG has been weak and almost dysfunctional, only about half of the members have put their money into saving, while the rest have either not contributed to the saving or have been migrating to Thailand.. The leadership of the CSGs has been a crucial factor, as reported in Sras Srang village, the members of the committee were selected amongst the most respected women in the villages and therefore, the CSG has been solid since the start, and members have committed to further continue with the scheme even without the support from PK.

Discussions also put emphasis on the CSGs' capacity to manage the groups, especially the financial matters. Due to the nature of the loan that still be small and the system is less complicated and easy, both members of the SGs and leadership confirmed that, they are able to manage the scheme by themselves. A minor concern, however were raised, regarding the confidence of the group to calculate interest rates earned by each members at the end of each saving cycle, where members

have invested different amount in capital into the saving. They said, *“at the time being, the calculation of different interest rate still has been mostly assisted by PK staff¹³”*.

The overall operation of the CSGs has also been challenged by the current activities of MFI institutions that operating in all villages selected for this study. As was explained by a village chief, who was involved as official eyewitness for the MFI loan *“I have greater concerns now as more villagers have approached the loan from MFIs, to pay for all related expenses in their commercial farming such as cashew nut and cassava plantation¹⁴”*. Discussions with members of the saving group and local authorities revealed that, the costs for commercial farming have often been too high to be afforded by the existing capital generated by the community saving. The shortage of capital in the saving has also been affected by the fact that, at the end of each saving cycle, all saving funds including interests have to be redistributed to members, and waited for the new saving to begin. As result, in order to expand the commercial farming activities, people might be ended up, by taking more loans from MFIs, and, thus, people might become less interested in the CSGs, unless more capital in the CSG can be built up.

4) Engagement and Capacity of the CCWC

This evaluation has identified that over the course of this project cycle, the PK has provided some basic facilitation support to the entire target Communes, and especially to the Commune Councils. The PK staff participated in their regular meetings and other events such as parent’s day, through this relationship, the work of LEAP and PK has been informed by the CCWC. The activities of SP and saving groups have often been presented and discussed in the Commune Council meetings, and, to a larger extent, they have been integrated into the Commune Investment Plan (CIP). From the interviews conducted with the local Commune officials, it has emerged that the work of PK, especially the SP project, has been well informed by the local authorities. At the village level, some village chiefs were actively engaged as trainees for SP, it was reported that, as a part of the child rights and child protection measures, that linkages have been built amongst the communities, NGOs and governmental institutions, to deal with cases of child abuse and domestic violence whenever they may happen.

Nevertheless, based on PK experiences, the level of collaboration with local Councils has been strong and productive in only 2 (Kok Mon & Beng) out of the 5 PK target Communes. The workload of the PK staff/trainers, who carry out many other activities with limited time, constrains relationship building between staff and authorities, which has undermined the establishment of a mutual relationship.

¹³ Quoted from CSGs in Sras Srang and Thnal Dach village

¹⁴ Quoted from village chief in Beng Commune, Banteay Ampil District

D. Gender Empowerment/Domestic Violence

This evaluation has identified that the project has been embedded with strong gender bias, since, 85% of the parents who participate in the SP groups and CSGs are women and furthermore, women mainly lead all of the groups. Over the course of this review, most women, both leaders and members of the groups have expressed confidence, they can explain about activities in their groups and able to engage actively in discussions without fear. Group meeting are organised, where space and time has been allocated for women to engage with each other, share experiences and express their views; it has been an essential tool for empowering women and for building their confidence. As some women said *“each time when we meet, we chat about this and that, sometime we discuss our own personal issues and identified solutions, we have found our meeting as a place where we can talk more¹⁵”*.

The issue of domestic violence was brought up as a topic and most of the groups interviewed confirmed that, the level of domestic violence, especially violence against women has been significantly decreased in their communities. Gender training and law reinforcement were argued as the key factors contributing to this overall progress.¹⁶

However, although this claim was made, a few cases of chronic violence against women, especially between husband and wife, are still being reported in all of the villages visited by this study. These cases are always well known by people in the village, however there is little reported on any community collective support to deal with such case as yet; and as result, women continue to suffer abuses.

E. Sustainability

According to findings, although the project has encountered time constraint and, at the same time, has tried to cover a larger target population, some key areas of sustainability can still be identified. For example, as result of the SP training, some parents have expressed a stronger capacity in their learning skills and they have been able to share what they have learned with others in the villages. The current improved access to health care and the changes in parenting practices and norms, using the SP knowledge, can be identified as a major success generated by the LEAP project to date. These skills and knowledge will remain with parents, and the sharing and support amongst parents will continue in the community. At the same time, the present role of parents as the peer educators, who are well equipped with skills and Knowledge by SP, can be seen as a potential human resource, that other parents can access for consultation or advice.

Some signs of sustainability can be explained by the key findings in SGs, where some groups appear to have a strong commitment and capability to manage the scheme by themselves. It is believed that, with minimal support from PK and some field visits to other advanced CSGs, that are run by other organizations, that the CSGs will continue running and this in turn will help to build the communities social and economic capital.

¹⁵ Quoted by group of women in Thnal Dach Village

¹⁶ Measuring Violence Against Women and the impact SP project had on it is not in the scope of this evaluation

F. Building Partnership

At the provincial level, PK has established networking links with local partners, based in Odor Meanchey, where child rights and children issues are shared and discussed. These institutions include the District Council responsible for Women and Children (DCWC) the Provincial Department for Women Affairs (PDWA) and the Provincial Council responsible for Women and Children (PCWC). These key connections enable PK to share common issues relating to child rights and child protection, and sometimes, to mobilize support and resources to organize provincial workshops or other special events relevant to the SP/LEAP.

At the national level, PK has established linkages with other gender organizations, to share gender issues and improve the capacity of gender mainstreaming to support project field implementation. While relationship and networking with these agencies have been described as mutual and helpful and should be further pursued, the linkage with other child expert institutions such as the Provincial Department for Social Affairs (PDSA) and Education (PoE) has been reported as weak or yet to be established.

VII. Analysis of the Achievement goals & Objectives

This section provides basic analysis on the achievements against the project goals and objectives set out by the proposal.

Objective 1: To empower vulnerable parents, child caregivers, children, Community-based Child Protection Networks (CCPNs) as rights holders in the target provinces. To know their rights and protection roles, to care for and protect all children from abuse, negligence and exploitation and to increase their representation and participation in the CIP and monitoring service delivery of education and child protection.

A certain level of achievement has been generated under this objective, particularly in capacity development for parents on the SP. The training not only raises public awareness on the skills, techniques and knowledge of SP, it also has the added value of the practice of child rights and child protection. SP teaches the stages of child development, indicating that, children enjoy rights to obtain adequate support and care and through the SP training, more model parents emerge and new ways to parenting practices have been observed. At the same time, the formation of Community Saving Groups (CSGs) can also be treated as another approach to people empowerment, where families can work together to build their own financial resources and become a player/tool for further enhancing the community social capital.

However, as expressed early in this report, some key challenges still exist, which prevents the successful achievement of the specific objective. An identified, key constraint are that the staff lack the space and the time to provide coaching and mentoring to parents, similarly, it is difficult for staff to provide monitoring and follow up, due to the changes in the capacity of communities to absorb new parenting practices. Furthermore, attempts to share knowledge and skills on SP have found resistance since they clash with some traditional practices and norms in the family parenting culture.

In other cases, the SP training method may have not as yet been able to engage or capture the interests of older people, with poor or no literacy skills, and who are deeply rooted in their traditional norms cultural and practices.

A fundamental question has been posed by this evaluation, regarding the term “empowering vulnerable parents to access the training”. In reality, there was no selection process organized, to screen vulnerable families and the recruitment of SP trainees was mainly conducted on the parents’ voluntarily basis.

Objective 2: *To strengthen the capacity of CCWC and CCs in the target provinces to be able to provide protective roles in caring for and protecting all children from abuse, negligence and exploitation in the target communes.*

The findings reveal that the achievement of this objective can be indicated by the current support and engagement expressed by members of Commune Council, especially the CCWC, towards PK in the SP project implementation. Based on interviews with members of Commune Councils, most of them have suggested that this project be further expanded to more villages, especially to rural communities where parents are still bound by traditional practices and some inappropriate forms of parenting. A sign of progress is being made under this objective as seen by the active participation of the CCWC, at any time when requested by the project staff. Nevertheless up until the time of this evaluation, the SP only succeed in mobilising members of Commune Council from 2 out of the 5 target Communes, to support or engage in the project. At the same time, as was reported by the PK trainers, the CCWC has been involved only when it has been invited, but it did not show on-going support or active participation.

Objectives 3: *To effectively manage and coordinate the project*

This objective has been achieved through the strong commitment expressed by the field staff and trainers, who are well equipped with skills in training and community work. To maximize the capacity to manage this project, PK has signed up to all forms of basic policy implementation, to ensure transparency and accountability within the organization as well as within the community they are supporting. A system of reporting and sharing has been developed through regular monthly meetings amongst PK trainers, staff and the management team. Such meetings are used as a platform for staff to discuss progresses, key challenges as well to work collectively to solve any arising problems.

Despite these positive supports and effective management, the staff has admitted difficulties in understanding the whole conceptual framework designed by the proposal, since it is only available in English. The majority of staff has limited English skills, and as a result, they are interested mostly in the activities section where some Khmer translation has been made, therefore, they become more familiar with the project outputs and activities but lack capacity in monitoring outcomes and possible impacts.

Furthermore, the project concept is designed to achieve a common goal i.e. *“to reduce the vulnerability of Cambodian girls and boys especially the ones vulnerable to abuse, negligence and exploitation”*.

The proposal document provides a strong link among the project objectives and explains how activities set out by each objective can be coordinated to achieve the common goal. However, while the SP training (objective 1) can be seen as a direct activity to achieve the common goal, there has been very little evidence that shows how activities in objective 2 can lead to the achieved goal.

VIII. Conclusion & Recommendations

Generally, the project has managed to make significant achievements in the objectives and goals set out by the proposal and the SP training has been considered an invaluable tool for rural parents who for the most part have little or no schooling. It was identified that the acquired skills and knowledge on SP have been used and practiced by many parents involved in the training and that the sharing of knowledge and skills have been reported by many parents, even though they face some resistances due to cultural practices and norms. Furthermore, the project has recognized the potential role of women in leadership, where they can lead the group successfully in both the SP and CSGs. The project has also been well received by local authorities including Commune Council and District officials who have been engaged in the project. Nevertheless along with the progress some key areas of improvement are still needed, to support parents to integrate SP in their parental practices. To enhance the level of effectiveness of this project, the key recommendations are proposed:

A. Proposed Strategic Focus

The following recommendations can be proposed as the key strategic focuses that could be considered for the next phase:

1. Since more parents are well equipped with SP knowledge and skills, the project should develop criteria for selection of peer facilitators/ educators amongst those who were trained, and provide them with more skills in peer discussions and coaching. This approach will enable the community to have their own human resources in SP where families can seek advices and support.
2. Since the skills and knowledge of SP have been fully acquired by many parents, it is essential for PK to work with these peer facilitators and local authorities to detect vulnerable families that are in needed of SP support.
3. This study confirms that, SP is a cross cutting issue that all parents need, it is recommended that the SP training be provided as an integrated activity to be inserted into other community based development projects such as the savings, the community self-help groups and other development schemes initiated by either PK or by other organizations in the target villages.

B. Recommendation for ICS

SP training can contribute enormously to the current government efforts to improve children's well-being and education in Cambodia. The SP does not only generate positive impacts on children's education but it also helps to promote good practices in child rights and children protection through the improved SP knowledge and skills developed by parents.

However, more promotion and public awareness on the importance of the SP practices is needed in order to draw attention from donors and governmental institutions for further collaboration.

The evaluation recommends that ICS should:

- i) ICS should ensure best practice by providing monitoring support on the SP projects that are currently implemented by ICS/NGOs partners. It should capture all of the lessons learned and make recordings of the positive impacts made. ICS should share its results with key stakeholders including government ministries and development partners (donors), through workshops and conferences;
- ii) ICS could engage with other development partners, to market together core concepts on parenting, children education and child rights;
- iii) Following (i) & (ii), ICS can find individual or collective ways to communicate potential policy changes or policy adoptions.

C. Recommendations for PK program management

4. PK should put more efforts into building the capacity of the CCWC, if possible going from an invitation to attend workshops to a real involvement in the training process. For instance, the CCWC can be involved in the LEAP to select peer facilitators, assist in monitoring child rights and child protection, especially with vulnerable children;
5. It is recommended to further develop the capacity of PK field staff in coaching and mentoring parents, not only for building staff capacity, but also for them to better support the peer facilitators, which will ensure project sustainability;
6. Proposal documents should be translated into the Khmer language, including the overall project framework, concept, goals, objectives and outcomes. The project plan and log-frame needs to be communicated to all of the field staff prior to the start of the project;
7. It is crucial for the LEAP to establish a connection between parents selected as peer facilitators and the SP trained teachers, who can work together or advise each other, when dealing with families and children who are in distress or need special assistance.

D. At operational level

i) Capacity Development in SP to Parents

8. PK in consultation with ICS should consider to either make the module content more specific by following some groups' suggestions, or to cater to the training of different groups (have different SP manuals) who requested/showed the need for specific kinds of support, e.g. teachers, grandparents and young women aged 18 or below;
9. A proper system of monitoring and follow up needs to be implemented to track the improvements of parental practices and children's well-being, particularly of those left with relatives or that require specific protection practices;

10. Organised adequate training spaces and the allocation of more appropriate time for coaching and mentoring is needed. It is recommended that PK reduces the number of parents trained and that it establishes a good monitoring and follow up system to capture lesson learned, before the project can be expanded to include more parents.

ii) Community Saving Groups (CSGs)

This evaluation has indicated a need to further strengthen the CSGs, as an alternative approach to protect the community from relying on unnecessary external loans, provided by local banks and MFIs. The followings are some key recommendations to support the CSGs:

11. The process and approach of the CSGs formation should be reviewed, especially that of the CSGs that are poorly functioning. Selection criteria, with selection processes and approaches could be discussed in consultation with SP model parents (suggested above). Support for the CSGs from other consolidated and well- functioning CSGs such as the ones present in Sras Srong and Thnal Dach villages is strongly recommended, for the communities to share experiences and help each other upon request;
12. In some communities, such as in Prasat Laboek village where the CSGs has been identified as poorly managed and inefficient, PK should work with this group to review its operations, and decide to let go of some members who are inactive, and to re-group the saving with families that are interested in the scheme. This suggestion was also proposed by the members of CSG in Prasat Laboek village;
13. Field visits to other CSGs are recommended, either within or outside the PK target areas, where representatives of the CSGs can learn from each other and share their experiences, as well for building the level of efficiency and effectiveness in the saving;
14. In response to the current demand for more capital inputs to support commercial farming, it is suggested that PK consult the current CSGs that are functioning well, to assess if some portions of the saving capital can be kept as an added up fund to the next saving cycle, rather than distribute all funds to saving members, as it is presently practicing.

E. Partnership Building

15. PK still needs to deepen the involvement of the CCWC and District CWC, going beyond their participation in meetings and workshops, it could train its members and build their capacities to become a resource people for the SP training;
16. It is essential for the project to establish a partnership with PDoSA, a *fora* where issues of child labor and child protection can be discussed and shared;
17. Similarly, following the engagement that has been achieved with teachers at local schools and the relationship established between schools and the parents on child issues, the project should aim at building links with the PDoE and The Office of District for Education, for more advocacy and effective interventions.

IX. Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Skillful Parenting Program

I. Position Information	
Position Title:	Consultant for Evaluation of Skillful Parenting Project by ICS-Cambodia and PK
Theme	Parenting
Location	Beanteay Ampil and Chong Kal district, Oddor Meanchey province
Reports to	Chhay Vivodin, Child Protection Manager

This Terms of Reference (ToR) is written to invite consultants to send an action plan to conduct an evaluation about the Skillful Parenting Program by ICS Cambodia and PK. Evaluators who are interested can respond before **31 December 2014** and send their action plan to ICS by sending their report to the following address:

Ms. Heng Hally

Human Resource Officer

Tel: 092 180 319

Email: heng.hally@icsasia.org

Address: #228, Street Lok Taney, Group #10, Vat Bo village, Salakamreuk commune, Siem Reap city, Siem Reap province.

Tel: (855) 63 763 528

Fax: (855) 63 763 529

Web: www.icsasia.org

The Action Plan should not be a repetition of the ToR but a description of how the consultant interprets this evaluation and a detailed methodology, sampling design, planning and budget.

II. Organization

ICS (Investing in Children and Societies) is an international organization established in the 1980s currently with offices and initiatives in Cambodia, Kenya and Tanzania while the head office is in the Netherlands. ICS improves the well-being of families and their children in rural areas of Cambodia and Africa. We work together with communities on sustainable businesses - agriculture, water and youth entrepreneurship – and Skillful Parenting to bring about positive change at both economic and social level. Target areas in Cambodia are Siem Reap, Oddar Meanchey, and Banteay Meanchey.

III. Specific program for evaluation: Skillful Parenting Program

Skillful Parenting is a parenting support program that departs from the idea that change will only take place if parents feel there is a need for change and believe in their capacity to change. It provides a holistic approach that reinforces positive parenting practices, empowering parents/caregivers to:

1. Address challenges that they face in bringing up their children;
2. Better promote and facilitate their child's health, development, achievement and protection;
3. Parent children with less stress, fewer problems, more satisfaction with parenting and family life, and to foster or preserve the couples relationship and, in general, improve family well-being.

ICS trains local professional facilitators to provide skillful parenting to parent peer groups, consisting of fathers, mothers and other caregivers. The facilitator's addresses basic parenting topics in different sessions geared towards providing parents with basic knowledge and opportunities for social comparison and joint reflection:

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Being a Parent | 2. Roles and Responsibilities | 3. Time for Me |
| 4. Value | 5. Positive Discipline | 6. Family Communication |
| 7. Peaceful Family | 8. Child Protection | 9. Family Budgeting |

For further detail of the program, please see the Factsheet Skillful Parenting

Currently, there are three main approaches by ICS Cambodia:

4. Training of facilitators on skillful parenting;
5. Direct implementation by ICS Cambodia
6. Implement skillful parenting in partnership with local NGOs, including Ponleur Komar (PK)

IV. Scope and objectives of the evaluation

Over the past 2 years ICS has built up an innovative Skillful Parenting Program in Cambodia. Initial feedback from parents in Cambodia indicates that this program has a positive impact on parental well-being and the well-being of their children and families. However such qualitative (more anecdotal) information is not sufficient to draw evidence-based conclusions on the effectiveness of the Skillful Parenting program in Cambodia.

This evaluation will mainly be focused on Ponleur Komar (PK), which has implemented a project under ICS support. The name of the project is: Enabling Local Empowerment Action for Child Protection Environment (LEAP). PK works partnership with Community-Based Organizations or Civil Society Organization, NGO networks, International organization and relevant government to furthering sustainable community development and implementation of children's rights.

Since 2013 PK has worked in 5 communes to provide skillful parenting towards parents/caregivers, to strengthen structural enablers in their direct environment and help children grow up in a safe and protective family environment in Oddor Meanchey province. In the project PK reaches out to 1850 parents and caregivers in communities and schools and strengthens the capacity of 5 CCWC and village chiefs in order for parents to hold them accountable for addressing child protection issues in their direct environment.

PK facilitators mobilize parents/caregivers to form saving groups and train them (Saving for Change Manual) on how to run saving schemes, lending and group management. Saving groups consist of voluntary members who meet on weekly basis to deposit the savings and lend.

The evaluation focuses on the implementation of the project since 2013 in Beanteay Ampil and Chhong Kal district of Oddor Meanchey province. The focus only lies on parents who already participated in the project (not those who are currently participating).

Objectives

This is a mid-term evaluation of the LEAP project but the focus lies on parents who have already participated in this project. The aim is to generate evidence of the influence of the Skillful Parenting program at the level of families, parents and children with the purposes to:

- Provide ICS and PK with program management information to adjust or refine the Skillful Parenting program design;
- Provide information to improve the project design and operational plans of PK for the continuation of the project;
- Inform donor organizations, such as the Dutch Ministry of Affairs, a clear overview of the outputs and the immediate outcomes delivered in this project.

In the evaluation we expect that the findings of the evaluation are linked to the perused strategy in this project, to give an insight in the strengths and weaknesses.

Evaluation questions:

5. How many of the parents continue to participate in parenting groups after PK's facilitators gave the kick-off? Were groups that also focussed on group savings, in addition to parenting, more likely to continue?
6. Up to what degree do participating parents consider Skillful Parenting to be increasing their self-efficacy and facilitating open discussions about parenting?
7. How many participating parents are talking about what they discussed before at their parenting group with their partner (co-parent)? What specific issues do they discuss and not discuss?
8. Up to what extent do the participating parents and their partners (co-parents) perceive that their in-family communication and parenting behaviour has changed? If changes took place, what activities and events caused these changes?

VI. Methodology

The evaluation requires a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. The consultant is expected to develop a coherent methodology and sampling design that can adequately answer the evaluation questions.

Before conducting interviews, the consultant should review the documentation about the project, which includes baseline and narrative reports by PK and ICS Cambodia. Interviews with both organizations are scheduled to make sure that the theory of change is clear. A theory of change is an overview of the various conceptual links between the project activities and the foreseen results.

A total of 650 parents has already been reached, out of which 526 parents were in cohorts 2 in 2014. Not all participating parents and their partners can be interviewed in the evaluation and

therefore a sample needs to be drawn by the leading consultants that gives a good representation of the parents involved and their partners.

The first research question is specifically about parenting groups. We expect the consultant to interview the group representatives if the groups still exist, and if so how frequently meetings take place, how many parents participate in these meetings and what topics are discussed on these meetings. We are interested in both formal and informal meetings.

To answer research question two to four, a selected sample of the parenting groups, the consultants interviewed parents who participated in the parenting groups and their partners independently. The consultant is free to choose their method, as long as the method guarantees that in-depth questions can be asked.

Cohort I:

January – April 2014

13 groups/villages

261 parents (224 women)

2 out of the 13 groups are also saving groups

Cohort II:

April – June

11 groups/villages

265 parents (236 women)

2 out of the 13 groups are also saving groups

VII. Duration and budget

The consultant is expected to develop a budget that is based on the methodology and sampling design.

VIII. Organization, Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation will be conducted by a consultant or consulting team with assistance of ICS-Cambodia and partner staff.

The external consultant will be responsible for:

- Writing an action plan
- Describing the Theory of Change, based on documentation
- Designing tools for data collection, including sampling, questionnaires and software in use
- Data collection
- Providing orientation to staff supporting the evaluation process
- Organizing a workshop with key staff of ICS and PK to present key evaluation findings
- Submitting a clear draft report in business English to ICS-Cambodia for comments and review
- Incorporating critical comments in the final report'

- Submitting final report to ICS-Cambodia no later than 10 days after approval from ICS-Cambodia in both soft and hard copies.

ICS-Cambodia

- Providing feedback on the methodology and tools for data collection Support the work of the consultant with information provision and practical matters, such as access to program files, information, photos
- Providing feedback with regard to findings and recommendations on the first draft report
- Monitoring the planning, progress and implementation of the evaluation
- Reviewing and approving the final draft of the evaluation report duly revised by ICS
- Making plans for evaluation, dissemination and follow-up
- Arranging transportation to the consultant for fieldwork.

The consultant or consulting team will sign and adhere to ICS Cambodia’s Child Protection Policy.

IX. Desired qualifications:

- The team leader has a higher degree in social and/or psychological, research, or relevant discipline
- At least 3 year of experience in similar program evaluation and research, shown by a clear track record
- Strong participatory approach with relevant stakeholders, including children
- Excellent knowledge of parenting practices and child participation
- Excellent writing skills in English
- Good communication skills

A Cambodian citizen in the evaluation team (he or she can also be the team leader) is preferred who has a proficiency in English and Khmer;

In the action plan the roles of all team members are explained. Attached to the action plan, the consultant provides the CVs of the all team members who are involved in the evaluation. Individual consultants are free to submit a proposal as long as is made clear how the interviews will be conducted.

X. Payment Schedule

The consultant will receive a consultant fee including tax. Payment to the consultant shall be made in three installments: 20% at the beginning of the work, 40% after submitting the draft report and 40% after approval of final report by ICS-Cambodia.

Annex 2: List of Questionnaires

a. GUIDED QUESTIONNAIRES FOR PARENTS INVOLVED IN THE SAVING GROUP (FGDs)

1. How long has LEAP has been implemented in your village?
2. What are the key development activities that are supported by LEAP/PK in your villages?
3. How are these activities relevant to the context of your families, your community, culture and your children?
4. Can you recall, how your group was formed in the first place? The Selection criteria? And the process? Did they select the right people? (Examine the relationship and empowerment process)
5. What are the changes/impacts, you have observed as result of your group work and the saving? Compare between before and after you joined the saving?
 - The socio economic condition and livelihood status?
 - Your family dynamic?
 - Your relationship with your children?
 - Relationship between people in your family
 - Family violence
 - The engagement of exchange support between your peers?
 - Links to child right and child protection
6. Have your received any training or capacity development support from PK, while running or managing this saving activities? if yes, what are they? How do you feel about these capacity development supports? Effective? Sufficient? Relevant?
7. What are the key challenges & constraints, that you have been experiencing, whilst managing these saving groups? How do you overcome them?
8. Based on you current experiences with this saving group, what are the key areas that you still need support from PK?
9. What are your comments and suggestions, to improve the level of achievement, if PK will continue to work with you and your community?

**b. QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDES FOR PARENTS INVOLVED IN THE SP TRAINING
(FGDs)**

1. How long has it been since LEAP was implemented in your village?
2. What are the key development activities that are supported by LEAP/PK in your villages?
3. How these activities relevant to the context of your families, your community culture and your children?
4. Can you recall, "How your group was formed in the first place? Selection criteria? And processes? Did they select the right people? (Examine the relationship and empowerment process)
5. What are the changes/impacts, you have observed as result of support from this project? Compare between before and after you join the LEAP?
 - The socio economic condition and livelihood status?
 - Your family dynamic?
 - Your relationship with your children?
 - Relationship between people in your family
 - Family violence
 - The engagement of exchange support between your peers?
 - Links to child right and child protection
6. How do you feel about the quality of the SP training course?
 - The message was clear?
 - The materials used were easy to understand?
 - The quality of the teaching? (Relationship between the trainees and trainers)
7. After the training, have you ever shared or discussed with others in the village, about your experiences and skills learned from the SP training?
8. What are the key challenges & constraints, as you have been experiencing, while applying the skills you have learned from SP? How do you overcome them?
9. We have learned that, some of your group members have joined the saving group, can you described how your groups was formed? The selection criteria?, the saving process? The management capacity, documents, transparency etc.....?
10. Based on you experience with this project, including the SP training and community saving, what are the key areas that you still need support from PK? .

11. What are your comments and suggestions, to improve the level of achievement, if PK will continue to work with you and your community?

c. KEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FLIP MANAGEMENT AND PROJECT TEAM

1. How long has you been working in this position, in PK?
2. What role do you have to play, in this project?
3. How was the program was designed in the first place, who has been involved in proposal writing? Monitoring?
4. How many staff have been working within project? Are they enough compared to the target areas and all responsibility required?
5. What training have you received, while working with this project?
6. What are your strengths, while working in this position, based on your role and responsibility?
7. What are your key weaknesses?
8. What are the main objectives set in your program?
9. What are the key activities/outputs designed by your program? What successful? What are major difficulties? Why?
10. What are major changes have you noticed, as result of your project interventions?
 - Family socio economic condition and livelihood status?
 - Family dynamic?
 - Relationship between parent and children?
 - Relationship between people in the family?
 - Family violence?
 - Gender practice?
 - Child rights and child protection
11. Based on your experiences in this project, can you elaborate how this project design fits with the context of community and family and culture?
12. List all key partners, involved in this project? What are your experiences, while working with these partners?
13. What are the form of coordination do you have, with other activities in PK?
14. What are the key challenges & constraints, as you have been experiencing, while working with this project?

15. What are basic tools are you using for monitoring this project? and how were it carried out?
What were effective?
16. What are your comments and suggestions, to improve the level of achievement for this particular project?

a. Questionnaires for Household Survey

Guidelines

Before starting the interview please introduce yourself and your organization. Explain why you are collecting the following information and reassure that none will be disclosed if not anonymously. Also let the person know that she/he can always refuse to answer a question.

Please try to keep the interview as short as possible without losing on quality.

Thank at the end of the interview and make yourself available for further questions or comments.

Code Number:.....

Interviewer _____

Date _____

Interview no. _____

A. Socio-demographic characteristics and employment

1. Name:.....

2. Age:.....

3. Gender:

1. Male

2. Female

4. Marital Status:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Single	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Married
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Divorced	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Widow
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Cohabitation	

5. No. of family members (living with you): _____

Adult(s) _____

Child(ren) _____

6. Does your spouse live at home?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Partly

7. In what age range does your children fit in?

- 1. 0-5 _____
- 2. 6-10 _____
- 3. 11-14 _____
- 4. 15-18 _____
- 5. 18 and above _____

8. Do your children in school age go to school?

- 1. Yes all of them (skip to Q10)
- 2. Some of them
- 3. None of them

9. If only some or none, explain why. Please, tick one of the box below:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. No money to pay for the school,	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Stay home & help family;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Earn income for family	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Cannot follow the class
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Others, please specify...	

10. What grade did you complete? (Choose the one that applies)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. No school	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Primary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Primary 2
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Primary 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Primary 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Primary 5
<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Primary 6		
<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Lower secondary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Lower secondary 2	
<input type="checkbox"/> 10. Lower secondary 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 11. Higher secondary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 12. Higher secondary 2
<input type="checkbox"/> 13. Higher secondary 3		
<input type="checkbox"/> 14. College 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 15. College 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 16. College 3
<input type="checkbox"/> 17. College 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 18. Graduate school	

11. What grade did your spouse (if applicable) complete?

(Choose the one that applies)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. No school	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Primary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Primary 2
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Primary 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Primary 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Primary 5
<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Primary 6		
<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Lower secondary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Lower secondary 2	
<input type="checkbox"/> 10. Lower secondary 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 11. Higher secondary 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 12. Higher secondary 2
<input type="checkbox"/> 13. Higher secondary 3		
<input type="checkbox"/> 14. College 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 15. College 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 16. College 3
<input type="checkbox"/> 17. College 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 18. Graduate school	

12. At what age did you become a parent? _____

B. Family Income

13. How many hours per week (average) do you work?

- 1. *Less than 20 hours*
- 2. *Between 20 and 40 hours*
- 3. *More than 40 hours*

14. What is the average family income per month?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Less than 50 USD	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Between 50 and 100 USD
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Between 100 and 200 USD	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Between 200 to 400USD
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Over 400 USD	

15. Has this income increased or decreased, compared to the time before you join this project?

- 1. Yes, it has increase a lot (skip to Q17)
- 2. Small increase (skip to Q17)
- 3. The same
- 4. Less than before

16. If it is still the same or less than before you join the project, Please explain why.

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

C. Parent Views on the Training Methodology

17. Have you taken part in the parenting skills training?
 1. yes 2. No

18. How did you decide to attend this training, in the first place?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. It was my own interest	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Just went with my neighbors/ relatives
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. I was called by PK	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Because I was the PK project participant
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. I have no idea	

19. If yes, how long did you attend the training?
 1. The whole course 2. Just part of it

20. How did you find the training course?
 1. Very helpful
 2. Helpful
 3. Just a waste of my time
 4. I don't know

21. How did you find the method of training?
 1. Easy to understand (skip to Q23)
 2. Not so easy
 3. I don't know

22. If not easy, please explain why
 1. Too technical
 2. Too much writing
 3. Too long
 4. I don't know

23. How to do find the teaching materials used in the training?
 1. Easy to understand (skip to Q25)
 2. Difficult to understand
 3. I don't know

24. If it was difficult, can you describe what are they?
.....
.....
.....

25. How did you find the skills of the trainers?
 1. Very Skillful
 2. Possess limited skills
 3. Not skillful at all

D. Parental challenges

26. In general, have you felt any change in your thoughts, ideas or practice related to parenting after this training?
 1. Yes, a very big change

- 2. There are some changes
- 3. No change at all (Skip to Q28)
- 4. I cannot say (Skip to Q28)

27. If there is a big change or some changes, please describe the key changes you have observed in yourself?

.....

.....

.....

28. What are your 3 most difficult challenges in raising your children?
(Ask this as open question, but match the answers with options if possible. Use "1", "2" and "3" to rank the challenges in order of urgency, "1" is most difficult)

		Rating
A	Child does not listen, show no respect, doesn't do what parents asks them to do (difficulty in discipline)	1
B	Child could have accident when going outside	2
C	Child becomes friend with wrong/bad people	3
D	Child does not attend school (escape from school)	4
E	Child cries a lot and don't know how to stop	5
F	How to take care of children when both parents work	6
G	Conflict or disagreement between parents about raising child	7
H	Children fight a lot among each other	8
I	Not enough money to cover basic needs of child (food, school, hygiene, health etc.)	9
J	Harvest is not enough for eating	10
K	Not enough money to buy nice things for child to play (leisure)	11
L	Not enough money to let child marry and give them property	12
M	Limited access to health care when child is sick (hospital is far, bad road, no transport, etc.)	13
Other		
Other		

29. Based on the key challenges above, do you feel these challenges are easier to manage, after you have received the parenting skills training?

- 1. More easy
- 2. Still the same
- 3. Still difficult
- 4. I cannot explain

30. In the past 6 months, how many times did you experience the following?
 (Read the statements and answers and check the right box)

No.	Statement	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often
1	Sleeping problems	1	2	3	4
2	Headache	1	2	3	4
3	Stress	1	2	3	4
4	Feeling overwhelmed	1	2	3	4
5	Loss of appetite	1	2	3	4
6	Having the feeling that I cannot do things very well	1	2	3	4
7	Having the feeling that I cannot do things I like to do	1	2	3	4

31. If Sometimes or often (Refer Q30) in your opinion what is/are the main reason(s) (tick all that applies):

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Work – not enough	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Work – too much	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Income
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Conflicts with your spouse	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Health	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Difficulty in raising children
<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Reputation of your family	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Debts	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Other _____

32. Have these problems worsen or improved, in comparison to the time before you got the skills on parenting?

1. Improved
 2. Worsened
 3. The same

E. Communication and relations

33. In your family, who is responsible for the following tasks:
(Read the statements and answers and tick the right box – in case of older siblings add age)

No.	Statement	Mother	Father	Together	Older siblings	Other
1	Taking daily care of children (cooking, washing, feeding, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
2	Discipline of children (setting rules, punishment)	1	2	3	4	5

	etc.)					
3	Helping children with homework	1	2	3	4	5
4	Staying home when children are sick	1	2	3	4	5
5	Playing with children	1	2	3	4	5
6	Family Budgeting - make decisions about income + expenditure	1	2	3	4	5

34. Have some of these roles changed over the past year?

1. Yes
 2. No (Skip to 37)
 3. I don't know (Skip to 37)

35. If yes, in your opinion what are the reasons that made this change happened?

1. Result of training skills learned
 2. It changed naturally (Skip to 37)
 3. I cannot say (Skip to 37)

36. Are you happy with this change of tasks?

1. Yes
 2. No

Please explain _____

Questions 37 to 40 (Read the statements and answers and tick the right box)

Q No.	Statement	1 a day	2/3 times a week	1 a week	Less than 1 a week	Never
37	How often do you play *with your children?	1	2	3	4	5
38	How often do you talk about "personal matters" ** with your children?	1	2	3	4	5
39	How often do you help/encourage your children with homework?	1	2	3	4	5
40	How often do you meet with	1	2	3	4	5

	the full family at home?					
--	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

**** Personal matters here refer to the feeling and relationship between the he/she as parent and children.**

41. From what you have observed, are there any change in your practices above, if you compare the time before and after your parenting skills training?

(Please refer to each question in the table above, reading the options again)

- Q37: 1. yes big change 2. Just small change 3. The same as before
 Q38: 1. yes big change 2. Just small change 3. The same as before
 Q39: 1. yes big change 2. Just small change 3. The same as before
 Q40: 1. yes big change 2. Just small change 3. The same as before

42. How long have you and your spouse been married for?

1. Less than 5 years
 2. Between 5 and 10 years
 3. More than 10 years

43. How is the relationship between you and your spouse?

1. Very good
 2. Good
 3. Sometimes good, sometimes not good
 4. Not good

If sometimes not good/not good why?

.....

44. How often do you and your spouse disagree?

1. Always
 2. Very often
 3. Often
 4. Rarely
 5. Never

45. How do you solve a disagreement? (Check all that applies)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. We talk about it	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. We throw things at each other
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. We ask other people to solve it for us	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Sometimes we punch or hit each other
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. We don't talk for long times until we forget	<input type="checkbox"/> 7. I cry
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. We yell at each other, the one who yells the most wins	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other _____

46. Do you feel, this problem (above) has improved or worsened?
- 1.** *Yes, much better* **2.** *Little bit better*
- 3.** *It is the same* **3.** *it has worsened*

47. Do you feel, you have got sufficient support from your spouse?
- 1.** *Yes* **2.** *No*

F. Discipline in the family

Questions 48 to 56 (Read the statements and check the appropriate box)

No.	Statement	Totally agree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Don't know
48	Before I do something about a problem I give my child several reminders or warnings	1	2	3	4	5
49	When I tell my child not to do something I take some time to explain what and why	1	2	3	4	5
50	When my child behaves badly I raise my voice or yell	1	2	3	4	5
51	If saying no does not work right away I hit him/her	1	2	3	4	5
52	When my child does something I don't like I do something about it every time it happens	1	2	3	4	5
53	When there is a problem with my child I do things I regret later	1	2	3	4	5
54	When I give a threat or warning to my child I always carry it out	1	2	3	4	5
55	When my child misbehaves I make my child tell me why he/she did it	1	2	3	4	5
56	If my child gets upset when I say no I feel for him/her (empathy)	1	2	3	4	5

G. Perceived level of support (ask for advices/talk about problems)

57. Have you talked with someone in the community about other difficulties linked to parenting (ex.

Difficulties with children, stress symptoms, problems with partner)?

1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Q62)

58. If yes with whom? (check all that applies)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Spouse	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Monk	<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Consult with experts
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. your peers	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Friends as non- trainee	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Children	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Friends as trainees in the parenting skills course	

59. If yes for what?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Difficulties with children	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. communication with partners
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Disturbs linked to parenting duties (sleeping, stress, overwhelmed etc..)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Problems in the relation with your spouse
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Communication with children/	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Others, Please describe.....

60. . Do you feel sufficient support from your community members when seeking support or talk about your problems?

1. Yes 2. No

61. In which way has the support you have received been useful? Please describe

.....

62. Self-efficacy (self-confidence) scale

(Rate your degree of confidence from 0-10 using the scale below).

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Cannot					Moderately					Highly
do at all					certain					can do
					can do					

Ex. "How confident are you in speaking Khmer?"
 "How confident are you in speaking English?"

62.1	Efficacy to Create a Positive Home environment	Rating
A	<i>Keep a positive relationship with your spouse (if applicable)</i>	
B	<i>Keep a positive and open relationship with your child</i>	
C	<i>Plan family meetings or events with all family members</i>	
D	<i>Solve conflict or problems in the family in a positive way</i>	

62.2	Efficacy in discipline and monitoring your child's activities	Rating
A	<i>Get your child to listen to you when they are at home</i>	
B	<i>Get your child to help you with household activities at home</i>	
C	<i>Keep track of what your child is doing when they are outside home</i>	
D	<i>Prevent your child from doing things you don't want him/her to do</i>	

62.3	Efficacy to protect your children	Rating
A	<i>Keep your children from doing dangerous things in your house</i>	
B	<i>Keep your child from going to dangerous areas, corners, or playgrounds</i>	
C	<i>Prevent your child from becoming involved in drugs, alcohol, gangs</i>	
D	<i>Prevent your child from becoming involved in premature sexual activity</i>	

62.4	Efficacy to manage family budget	Rating
A	<i>Track your family income</i>	
B	<i>Plan and prioritize family expenditure</i>	
C	<i>Stay or get out of debts</i>	
D	<i>Teach your children how to manage money</i>	

62.5	Self-Efficacy for Enlisting Parental and Community Support	Rating
------	--	--------

A	<i>Get my spouse to help me with a problem</i>	
B	<i>Get my parents to help me with a problem</i>	
C	<i>Get other family members or friends to help me with a problem</i>	
D	<i>Get local authorities to help me with a problem</i>	
E	<i>Get religious people to help me with a problem</i>	

63. Have you ever share what you have learned from the parenting program, training with others?

1. Yes 2. No, (Skip to Q68)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. My siblings	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. My Friends
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. My children	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. My neighbors
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. My relatives	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Other, please specify.....

64. If you have shared, with whom you have shared with?

65. Have you observed any change in those you have shared your knowledge with?
Please describe based on your observation? (re: the change in the parenting skill practice)

.....
.....

66. If you did not share, why?

1. I am too busy 2. I have no confidence 3. I don't know

“Close the interview: Here, I would like to thanks for your time and efforts in providing this information. I wish your sharing will not disturb much to your emotion and feeling and strongly hope that, these information will definitely help to further improve the future program quality and practice”.

Thanks you !!!

Annex 3: List of Key Respondents

A. List of Individual Interviews

N	Name	Sex	Position	Instituions
1	Chey Kimsan		Project Officer	PK
2	Mao Dara		Amin Finance	PK
3	Sophorn		Trainer	PK
4	Moun Solin		Trainer	PK
5	Kunty		Trainer	PK
6	Slong Kim Lorn		DCWC	Banteay Ampil
7	Hean Yob		CCWC	Banteay Ampil
8	Soun Udom		Commune Council	Bateay Ampil
9	Sorn Sary	F	CCWC	Beng Commune
10	Neam Hout	M	Village Chief	Tumnup Thmey
11	May Lom	M	Village Chief	Thnal Dach
12	Hang Hoeub	M	Village Chief	Roneam Thom
13	Chheth Eth	M	Village Chief	Sras Srang
14	Soan Samley	F	CCWC	Kok Kpous Commune
15	Pheak Mok	M	Village Chief	Prey Totoeung
16	Khlat Sovann	M	Village Chief	Bateay Chas
17	Klin Sophorn	F	DCWC	Chong Kal District
18	Houng Makara	F	CCWC	Banteay Ampil Commune
19	Phoeun Phoeun	M	Village Chief	Samor
20	Long Pich	M		Deputy of Village Chief

B. List of SP Parents Involved in the FGDs

1. Village: Banteay Chas

N°	Name	Sex	Age
1	Rin Pak	M	63
2	Chav Chay	M	56
3	Sok Nhanh	M	66
4	Yang Yom	F	51
5	Len Pheak	F	60
6	Len Nem	F	54
7	Van Choeut	F	52
8	Kong Plaev	F	55
9	Chhoeung Sophy	F	36

10	Nhan Saphai	F	35
11	Van Chet	F	55
12	Heng Chantha	F	25
13	Pov Sariev	F	17
14	Kim Hoeut	F	58
15	Let Thea	F	39

2. Village: Samor

N°	Name	Sex	Age
1	Phat Moeuy	F	77
2	Plek Moun	F	57
3	Sem Nhoeun	F	54
4	Ploeut Sarang	F	25
5	Kheam Khoun	F	32
6	Klat Vanh	F	49
7	Phem Van	F	55
8	Phok Ek	F	64
9	Ram Sak	F	56

3. Village: Thnal Dach

N°	Name	Sex	Age
1	Khat Sareuy	F	49
2	Mun Chot	F	32
3	Em Thea	F	50
4	Lang Puy	F	62
5	Ann Pork	F	42
6	Seun Deang	F	32
7	Ant Kea	F	56
8	Nat Peun	F	54
9	Thang Puv	F	49
10	Kert Poy	F	44
11	Touchh Vit	M	32
12	Oul Den	F	22
13	Tlorb Savath	F	
14	Teuy Loutt	F	

4. Village: Roneam Thom

N°	Name	Sex	Age
----	------	-----	-----

1	Phoun Toeur	F	63
2	Yeum Srey	F	26
3	Vork Kong	F	52
4	Toun Thong	F	70
5	Chem Theub	F	38
6	Pheug Sophea	F	24
7	Norng Thuk	F	43
8	Penh Theut	F	47
9	Meuy Thea	F	50
10	Nhung Hoob	F	50
11	Pho Bunthon	M	31
12	Chea Kowb	M	44
13	Neam Pheun	F	60
14	Hour No	F	28
15	Hang Heum	F	53
16	Yan Eum	F	52
17	Roun Sophan	F	25
18	Penh Leut	F	50
19	Hal Tery	F	56

5. Village: Sras Srang

N°	Name	Sex	Age
1	Nem Eab	F	43
2	Teuy Leap	F	25
3	Hol Dom	F	31
4	Lanh Theab	F	42
5	Seun Deang	F	32
6	Eun Dow	F	37
7	Nat Peun	F	54
8	Kert Poy	F	44
9	Nom Peut	F	43
10	Hol Pun	F	27
11	Oul Den	F	22
12	Chi Lav	F	
13	Chi Kdok	M	
14	Neum Vuth	M	

6. Village: Kok Thom

N°	Name	Sex	Age
----	------	-----	-----

1	Ploy Ra	M	
2	Hun Koun	F	
3	Pluy Soeur	F	
4	Phut Saret	F	
5	Khorn Sair	M	30
6	Vann Khoun	M	62
7	Gnoun Bol	M	26
8	In Ploy	M	63
9	Ploy Channa	M	26

7. Village: Beng

N°	Name	Sex	Others
1	Lam Rat	F	
2	Pun Kimrek	F	
3	Pay Buntheng	M	
4	Sea Reang	F	
5	Mao Ou	F	
6	Lair Yus	F	
7	Huv Kun	F	
8	Ran Kam	F	
9	Ran Salav	F	
10	Hong Lyneng	F	
11	Ran Saloer	F	

8. Village: Prasat Labaock

No	Name	Sex	Ages	Commune/Village
1	Tim Loeuy	M	41	Prasat Lboeuk Village
2	Keo Phoun	M	24	
3	Lmoung Yan	F	65	
4	Phay Phann	F	34	
5	Eng Sar	M	28	
6	Soeub Chheang	F	26	
7	Nov Soeub	F	34	
8	Soeub Lamut	F	28	

9. Village: Tumnup Thmey

No	Name	Sex	Age	Village
1	Soy Se	F	40	Tumnop Thmey
2	Pat Sourm	F	45	

3	Siem Srey Moa	F	23	
4	Nget Ngan	F	26	
5	Gnet Nika	F	32	
6	Thoun Hak	F	35	
7	Toun Sarom	F	65	
8	Hout Kim Sear	F	21	
9	Nhov Lay	F	54	
10	Tin Sayhorn	F	21	
11	Sim Lam	F	33	
12	Phoet Toeuy	F	48	

10.Village: Baray

No	Name	Sex	Age	Village
1	Noeun Phol	F	27	
2	Phoet Soeun	F	16	
3	Choun Chen	F	17	
4	Smon Sourt	F	55	
5	Linh Sam ay	F	16	
6	Ry Thy	F	26	
7	Pich Eng	M	25	
8	Houy Lenh	M	34	
9	Sban Sao	F	57	
10	Het Savuth	F	42	
11	Puth Ngoun	M	40	
12	Ou Saloa	F	33	
13	Chhut Tham	F	21	

C.List of Teachers Involved in the FGD

Cluster School: Chong kal District: Chong Kal

N°	Name	Sex	Role
1	Chem Euk	M	Teacher
2	Gnet Sreyleak	F	Teacher
3	Tor Sokhan	F	Teacher
4	Horm Sreygnet	F	Teacher
5	Sang Sokun	F	Teacher
6	Yin Mayuri	F	Teacher
7	Kling Vireak	M	Teacher

8	Ut Chan Sokna	F	Teacher
9	Soun Sokhun	F	Teacher