

School Performance Evaluation through Systemic School Inspection in Cambodia

Chansean Mam¹, Eva Lanteli², Juntaro Kato³, Tsutomu Iwayama³, Hideki Shimizu³

(1. Graduate School of Education, Aichi University of Education & Shizuoka University, Japan;

2. Former trainer of inspector trainers in Cambodia, Sweden; 3. Aichi University of Education, Japan)

Abstract: Systemic school inspection has been implemented widely in Cambodia since 2015 as a way to improve school quality and raising student performance. The purpose of this study is to explore the possibility of how systemic school inspection may contribute to enhance school performances. The paper utilized the ideas and information from more than 73% school inspectors of the total 109 inspectors in the whole country. Questionnaires were designed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The findings show that systemic school inspection plays a role in evaluating school performance but it is not the deciding factor when it comes to improving school quality and raising student performance. Through systemic school inspection it has been revealed that basic factors for school quality such as relevant equipment and school material as well as a an improved teaching methodology need to be in place in order to improve school quality and raising student performance. Systemic school inspection is a good approach to check school quality, but it is not enough to improve the quality. In order to do that the Ministry of Education Youth and Sports in cooperation with national and international development partners should take measures structurally and monetary in order to deal with the problems revealed by the systemic inspections.

Key words: school performance, systemic school inspection, regular inspection, thematic inspection, science education

1. Introduction

1.1 Inspection History and Reform in Cambodia

School inspection is today a common and widely used method to check the quality of formal education. In Cambodia school inspection has been used since the French protectorate in the 1930's. Some primary schools were inspected annually since 1935 by one French educational officer who played a role as an inspector, and some pagoda schools were inspected by a delegated person of the King. In 1947, the school inspections were conducted by two teams, one team inspected pagoda schools and another team inspected French-Khmer educational schools. There were two ranking-category inspectors: (1) primary school inspectors who provided advice on teaching of French language, pedagogy, autonomy and punctuality, and (2) secondary inspectors who were specialized subject

Chansean Mam, Master of Education, Master of Educational Planning and Management, Doctoral Candidate; Aichi University of Education (Japan) and National Institute of Education (Cambodia); research areas/interests: educational quality assurance and science education. E-mail: mamchansean@gmail.com.

inspectors and provided advice on for example teaching and learning Khmer literature. This kind of school inspection was used until 1970. (MoEYS, 2015a). From 1970, the inspection work as well as education decreased gradually because of the civil war. During the regime of Pol Pot, 1975-1979, Cambodia had no definite education system.

The formal education system was re-established in 1979, after the country was rescued from the Pol Pot regime. Since then, the system has been reformed several times in order to enhance the quality of schools and develop the capacity to meet the needs of education in Cambodia. In 1994, the Ministry of Education Youth and Sport (MoEYS) established an inspection framework to monitor school performance and recruited primary education inspectors and secondary education inspectors for this purpose (MoEYS, 2015a). However, in order to catch up with the global world education reform, the MoEYS decided to change the inspection perspective from subject inspection conducted by secondary education inspectors, and primary school inspection conducted by primary education inspectors to a “Systemic School Inspection”. This was done through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the MoEYS and the Swedish School Inspectorate in 2012 (MoEYS, 2015a). Through the MoU, Swedish inspectors and experts have supported the training of Cambodian inspector trainers and the development of inspection tools. The inspector trainers organized training for existing inspectors (primary education and secondary education inspectors) and newly recruited inspectors. The inspectors in the systemic school inspection have mandates to inspect public and private schools, from pre-schools to secondary schools. The systemic school inspection has been widely implemented in Cambodia from 2015, after the existing inspectors finished their training on the new inspection system.

1.2 Systemic School Inspection Definition and Methods

Systemic school inspection is different from subject-based inspection which inspects only specific subjects, it evaluates school performance on the whole from management to teaching and learning. In the systemic school inspection, the inspection can be performed in two ways, internal inspection and external inspection. The internal inspection conducted at school-level through school self-evaluation, and conducted by District Training and Monitoring Team (DTMT) in line with Child-Friendly Schools (CFS). In Cambodia, CFS has been supported by United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) including 6 dimension: (1) all children have access to schooling, (2) Effective teaching and learning, (3) Health, safety and protection of children, (4) Gender responsiveness, (5) The participation of children, families and communities in the running of their local school, and (6) The National Education System supports and encourages schools to become more child-friendly (Sheldon Shaeffer & Kreng Heng, 2016). The external inspection has two forms, thematic inspection and regular inspection. Thematic inspection is conducted by inspectors of Educational Quality Assurance Department (EQAD) of MoEYS while the regular inspection is conducted by inspectors of Provincial Office of Education (POE). The cycle of regular inspection is three to five years for a school while the thematic inspection is conducted when schools are at-risk in a certain area, for example chemistry teaching and learning at 12th grade, or the priority topic defined by MoEYS. A regular inspection of one school takes for 1-2 days with two inspectors. The Swedish School Inspectorate and the MoEYS have defined the following (MoEYS, 2015a).

Regular inspection means a systematic examination and assessment of all schools, to ensure that they comply with the laws and regulations applicable to its business. The assessment is based on an interpretation of national regulations. The audit results in a breakdown of what works well and what must be developed.

Thematic inspection means a systematic examination and assessment of the quality of a business within a defined area. The assessment is based on an interpretation of national goals and guidelines, supported by research findings and best practices. The audit results in a breakdown of what works well and what needs to be developed.

In this research, we focus on the external school inspections. Inspection tools such as questionnaires and assessment areas and indicators, have been developed by EQAD with the support from other relevant institutions of MoEYS and the experts from the Swedish School Inspectorate. The regular inspection is conducted focusing on four areas: leadership and management, teaching and learning, students' result and achievements, and school self-assessment. The developed questionnaires and assessment tools are used by inspectors in all POEs. The questionnaires and assessment tools for the thematic inspections have been developed based on the inspection topics. In a regular inspection, inspectors are required to write a school inspection report for each school and send it to the District Office of Education (DOE) within two weeks after the inspection date. They are also required to write a provincial inspection report which is a summarized report of the quality of all the inspected schools in the province, to EQAD (MoEYS, 2015b).

1.3 Research Objective and Questions

The systemic school inspection has just been implemented in Cambodia. The inspection cycle is at least 3 to 5 years why there is still no result when it comes to improvement due to systemic inspection of schools. The study, therefore, will explore the possibility of the new inspection system to contribute to the development of school performance in Cambodia. In order to achieve the objective, the authors raised the following research questions: (1) what are the current school performances found by systemic school inspection? and (2) what are necessary actions to improve school performance in Cambodia?

2. Literature Review

Evaluation and accountability are perceived as a key to ensure educational quality, and in the most of Europe, school inspection is an important instrument of educational evaluation and accountability (Gustafsson J. E. et al., 2015). Harris (2009) has mentioned that school inspections are used as the means of steering quality improvement, they often form the basis for targets agreed between education authorities and individual schools, and the sanctions will be applied if schools fail to meet the target (Gaertner H. & Pant H. A., 2011). J. E Gustafsson et al. (2015), indicated that some studies have suggested that sanctions and rewards have a positive effect on educational quality in schools, performance criteria and feedback alone may not be sufficient to motivate schools to perform high standard. However, inspection only will not improve school quality, good interaction characteristics of inspection and school lead to school improvement (Marielle C. J. L. Klerks, 2012). Educational efficiency and productivity can be increased by inspection system and the purpose of inspection is to identify the defects with the aim of correcting and preventing them from happening again, but should not focus on only the faults, defects, and errors of employees (Aysun E. & Baris A., 2009). Koklu has underlined the purpose of inspection is to develop the teaching and learning process, and Bradly and Kottler has emphasized the objective of inspection on ensuring personal and professional development as well as competencies of those who inspected (Aysun E. & Baris A., 2009). Jassens 2007 said that supervision has played an important role in the practice of inspection since 2002 in the Netherland and the poorly performing schools or at risked schools were prioritized to be inspected (Janssens, F. & Gonnig H. W. C. H., 2008). In Europe, external evaluations by inspectorates provide

information to policy makers and the public about the state of education system, compliance with regulations, and quality differences among schools. Inspection reports provide feedback to schools about their strengths and weaknesses, and indicate the way to the internal evaluation (Janssens F. & Gonnée H. W. C. H., 2008). Janssens F. and Gonnée H. W. C. H. (2008) also indicated some researchers have recognized that inspectorates that carry out independent evaluations make contribution to improve the education sector. The ideas that the education system can be developed through inspection is the concept in Swedish education policy and has been conducted in various organizational forms since the late 1800s (Lindström L. & Perdahl S., 2014). The regular school inspection in Sweden focuses on four main areas such as attainment of objectives and results, pedagogy leaderships and development, learning environment, and individual pupils' right (Segerholm C. & Hult A., 2018). Inspection processes, including school visits with inspectors observing lessons, interviewing with relevant people such as school leaders, teachers, parents, students; and questionnaires completed by those people; and the study of school documents are necessary to evaluate one school (Gaertner H. & Pant H. A., 2011; Christina S. & Agneta H., 2018). External and internal evaluation can be regarded as two interrelated areas for school reform and school-self-evaluation (SSE), inspectors use the result of SSE in some ways to improve the quality of schools (Janssens F. & Gonnée H. W. C. H., 2008). Head teachers considered school inspection reports to be positive support for change and an opportunity to push through modifications and served as an eye-opener concerning student performance and the school actors were very positive with the inspection in Sweden (Segerholm C. & Hult A., 2018).

In Cambodia, POE leaders and high school directors expressed that Systemic School Inspection should be implemented in order to ensure educational quality because the educational problems at school level is often due to a number of interrelated problems. Inspectors using Systemic School Inspection can point out strengths and weaknesses in several relevant areas that together make up a good quality of education. One high school director said that "systemic school inspection should be implemented because it can help a lot of teachers, which is different from subject inspection that one inspector can observe only his or her specialized subject, not others". The educational officers also confirmed that the systemic school inspection can ensure high education quality because it investigates in several important educational areas related to educational quality. Moreover, all of them desire to implement Systemic School Inspection in order to strengthen the quality of education (Mam et al., 2017).

3. Methodology

The participants in this research are 87 inspectors who received training on systemic school inspection from the National Institute of Education (NIE) of the Ministry of Education Youth and Sport (MoEYS) of Cambodia. Most of them (71%) are new inspectors who just finished their pre-service training from NIE in 2016 & 2017, and the others are existing inspectors who received in-service training on systemic school inspection from the NIE in 2015. The inspectors in 18 out of 25 provinces and EQAD inspectors completed the questionnaires. It should be noted that five provinces do not have inspectors yet (Source: EQAD, May, 2018).

Two kinds of questionnaires were used in the research, one for regular inspectors and another for thematic inspectors. A total of 78 out of total 104 POE inspectors and 9 out of a total of 15 EQAD inspectors were involved in the research. The indicators officially used in regular inspection were used in the questionnaire for the inspectors working at inspection offices of POEs while the questionnaire for EQAD inspectors were designed in relevant to the regular inspection indicators. The questionnaires were piloted before distributing to the participants

through their Facebook messengers or telegrams. The questionnaires were required to be printed out for completion. The completed questionnaires were sent individually or through a group's representative to the authors. The questionnaires were sent and collected in April and May 2018.

The collected data and information was analyzed statistically for the quantitative data, and using Grounded Theory Method, the generation of theories from data, for the qualitative data. However, some qualitative information was grouped together and calculated as quantitative data.

4. Findings and Analysis

The result of this research is divided into four parts, the first part is about school performance based on regular inspection, the second part is about school performance based on thematic inspection, the third part is about specific school performance on science subjects, and the fourth and last part is about the systemic school inspection implementation and implication.

4.1 School Performance Found by Regular Inspection

Regular Inspection on schools is the duty of inspectors working in the inspection offices of the POEs. New inspectors with their experience from 1 to 2 years had inspected 10 primary schools, 4 lower secondary schools and 2 high schools as the average for one inspector. The inspectors who have 3 years-or-more experience of school inspection had inspected 29 primary schools, 8 lower secondary schools, and 4 high schools as the average for one inspector. Based on the experience of inspection, they evaluated school performance in a majority of inspected schools as in Table 1.

As can be seen in the table below, school directors in Cambodia are not considering much on equipment, books and other relevant materials for efficient teaching and learning, only 14% of the inspectors indicated that the majority of schools they inspected have the teaching materials they need (Table 1). The directors seemed to focus on their administrative works rather than the quality of teaching and learning. They have considered a lot on the preparing of the organizational structure with defining the responsible of vice directors and some other staff (84%), followed by the focusing more on school environment which is friendly for students (78%) and the effectively and efficiently organize the work in schools (67%) respectively (Table 1). The results indicated that there is not enough focus on technical support for teaching and learning. Only 14 percent of inspectors evaluated that the inspected schools had enough equipment, books and other relevant material for teaching and learning. And about half of inspectors evaluated the inspected schools needed to improve their pedagogical methods (47%) and improve their teaching methods (50%). From this result the MoEYS and other relevant partners should consider how to improve the school performance in Cambodia.

In the teaching and learning category, the table shows that nearly half of the inspectors evaluated the inspected schools needed to improve their pedagogical methods (47%), and they also evaluated that 50 % of schools needed to improve their teaching methods to adapt to students' needs. Teachers might not be offering variation in teaching and learning methods in relation to different lessons or different student backgrounds. Teachers might use the same teaching methods for nearly all the lessons. That is "students read the textbooks and teachers asked questions for students to pick up the answer from the textbook". About ninety percent (90%) of the inspectors evaluated that teachers teach according to the curriculum and other steering documents provided by the MoEYS and/or POE. These indicated that the teachers follow the law and other regulations of MoEYS or the government. Teachers create a good learning environment to students (86%). The good learning environment

refers mainly to teachers encouraging students to think and create a welcoming atmosphere and, not so much on teaching methods and the use of teaching materials in class. Teachers always asked for help from their colleagues about the lessons which they do not understand, and some of teachers tried to pursue their education in higher degree. These means that they continuously work to improve their teaching.

Table 1 School Performance Evaluated by Inspectors Working at POEs (% Inspectors)

School performance evaluation indicators	Positive evaluation (%)
1. Leadership and management	
1.1 There is a clear organizational structure with defined procedures and responsible persons	84
1.2 The school director effectively and efficiently organizes the work in the school	67
1.3 The school has equipment, books and other relevant material for efficient teaching and learning	14
1.4 The school has a safe and favorable environment for learning and development	78
2. Teaching and learning	
2.1 Teaching and learning is according to the curriculum and other steering documents	88
2.2 Adequate pedagogical methods are used in relation to the aim of the class/ lesson	47
2.3 Teaching is adapted to students' needs	50
2.4 The teachers create a stimulating learning environment in class	86
2.5 The teachers continuously work to improve their teaching	73
3. Students' results and achievements	
3.1 Students' results and achievements improve over time	78
3.2 The school has a functioning program to assure students' attendance	84
3.3 Assessment and grading is equitable and fair	95
4. School self-assessment	
4.1 The school has functioning system for monitoring and evaluation the work in the school	43
4.2 There is a school development plan which is based on the reports of Self-assessment results and external inspection results	53
4.3 There is good cooperation and communication with the community and other stakeholders	92

Inspectors evaluated high on school performance in the students' results and achievements category, from 78 to 95% (Table 1). This is a good indicator to show that education quality is improving gradually. The students' results have improved gradually in comparison to previous years. Many schools have a functioning program to assure students' attendance and identify the reasons for students' absence and why some students drop out of school. The assessment and grading section indicated that assessment and grading is equitable and fair for all students with providing the reasons for their certain grade points. This will encourage students to learn because their result can be reflected to their knowledge and their learning efforts.

In the school self-assessment category, the results show that the inspected schools have good cooperation and communication with the community and other stakeholders (95%) (Table 1). This indicates that schools have good cooperation with community people, local authority, students' parents, and other relevant stakeholder which is a good chance to develop the education in their schools. However, schools are not yet good in the areas of effectively management to improve work in school (43%) and the development plan which is based on the report of self-assessment results and external inspection results (54%) (Table 1). This means that the management teams of the school do not yet use the inspection result, especially school-self assessment, as a means to develop their schools.

School performances found by the regular inspection indicated several areas that MoEYS and other relevant partners need to consider in order to raise school performance in Cambodia. They could take the right intervention to improve the school performance in certain areas based on the priority and risk indicated by regular inspection reports.

4.2 School Performance Found by Thematic Inspection

Thematic inspection is conducted by EQAD inspectors in the whole country while regular inspection is conducted by the inspectors working at POEs in their province. According to EQAD inspectors, 7 topics were chosen for thematic inspection in the whole country from 2016 to 2018: (1) 12th grade teaching and learning, (2) 12th grade physics teaching and learning, (3) 9th grade teaching and learning, (4) 6th grade writing, (5) 6th grade completion rate, (6) 4th grade English teaching and learning, and (7) pre-school teaching and learning.

Based on these thematic inspections, inspectors evaluated school performance related to the majority findings as follows. Only 11% of the inspectors have agreed that the students' result on the inspected topics have improved over time and that schools have an effective apparatus and teaching materials to teach the topics inspected (Table 2). This indicates that the quality of education in the inspected topics are not strong enough, and that schools do not yet have enough teaching materials to assist students in understanding the lesson content related to the topics inspected. This result confirms the results from regular inspection-that there is a lack of relevant teaching materials in order to support positive student achievement. Table 2 also indicates that only 33% of the inspectors have agreed that schools have a functioning program to encourage students to study and have a development plan to raise the quality of education in their schools. Only 44% of inspectors evaluated that teachers have adequate teaching methods to teach their students. These results also confirm to the findings found by regular inspection. Teachers created a good and stimulated environment for students to study are found by both regular and thematic inspection (86%) & (89%) respectively (Tables 1 & 2). Thematic and regular inspections can thereby be seen as complementary to evaluate school performances.

Table 2 School Performance Evaluated by Inspectors Working at EQAD (% Inspectors)

School performance evaluation indicators	Positive evaluation (%)
1. Students' results on the inspected topics improved over time (from 80%)	11
2. Schools have functioning program to encourage students to study on the topics inspected	33
3. Schools have effective apparatus and teaching materials to teach the topics inspected	11
4. Teachers have adequated pedagogy methods to teach the topics inspected	44
5. Teachers created a good enviroment to encourage students to study the topics inspected	89
6. Schools have functioning system to monitor and evaluate the educational quality on the topics inspected	22
7. Schools have development plan to improve educational quality on the topics inspected	33

Through the thematic inspection, inspectors can diagnose the specific problem related to the topic selected. For example, in the inspection on 12th grade physics teaching and learning, the inspectors could see the critical and specific problem related to the teaching and learning in relation to students' result in this subject. This result can be sent to schools and to other relevant partners in order to take relevant action to develop that specific area as part of raising the school performance for improving the quality of education.

4.3 Specific School Performance on Science Subjects Found by Systemic School Inspection

Science subjects are common and essential for general education worldwide. We, therefore, conducted further investigation on school performance in science subjects in addition to general school performance found

by the systemic school inspection. Table 3 indicates that the result in science subjects did not improve much yearly, only 47% of POE inspectors and 56% of EQAD inspectors had agreed that the students' result on science subjects have improved over time. It seems that science lessons are not interesting to students or they are difficult for students to study. Most inspectors, 88% of POE inspectors and 100% of EQAD inspectors, evaluated that one of the reasons could be that schools did not teach experiments to their students which they found out as a part of their inspection at schools (Table 3).

Table 3 School Performance on Science Experiment and Materials (%)

Question for inspectors	Positive evaluation by POE inspectors (%)	Positive evaluation by EQAD inspectors (%)
Did students' result on science subject improve over time on the schools you inspected?	47	56
Did you see any teacher teach experimental science to students during your inspection period?	12	0

The inspectors provided different reasons, based on their ideas, that teachers did not use experiment as a method to teach their students. However, the most common reasons indicated by inspectors are as following. Most of the inspectors (62%) said that teachers did not use experiment to teach their students because the schools do not have experimental apparatuses and materials, and followed by 30% of them gave the reasons that teachers do not have enough knowledge to use experiments as a teaching method or schools do not have a laboratory while only 6% mentioned that teachers do not have enough time to prepare experiments. Teaching materials and teachers' competent knowledge on experiments are essential for teaching experiments at schools. Even though, science laboratory is required to conduct most of science experiments but some science experiments in general education can be conducted in a classroom by using simple experimental materials. All inspectors think that science experimental apparatus is essential for developing science education in Cambodia. Nearly half of inspectors (47%) mentioned about the teaching materials related to curriculum and textbooks at schools and 41% of the inspectors mentioned about the simple, easy to be used, and/or low-cost materials are required to teach science experiments in general education at schools in Cambodia in the present time. And 31% of those inspectors said that high-quality-standard teaching materials are required to provide to school at the present time.

This investigation reveals that teaching materials and experimental apparatuses are essential for teacher to use experiment as a method to teach science. Experimental apparatuses produced by industrial company are needed, but since most of the science teachers in Cambodia are not yet familiar to use experiment in science teaching, simple and low-cost experimental apparatuses should be considered in order to encourage teachers to use experiment as a means to teach science.

4.4 Systemic School Inspection Implementation and Implication

Systemic school inspection is expected to be implemented well to strengthen and improve the quality of education in Cambodia because it is the main focus of educational reform. It is also confirmed in this research that educational leaders at all levels are supporting the inspection work. Through the questionnaire, 78% of the POE inspectors indicated that POE directors of their province have strong support to implement the inspection in their province through allocation inspection budget, follow up inspection plan, nomination to conduct inspection while 100% of EQAD inspectors said that they received strong support from the MoEYS in order to conduct thematic inspections in the whole country. Moreover, both regular and thematic inspections are well recognized by relevant partners including school directors, teachers, and students' parents. Through the questionnaire, 95% of POE

inspectors and 89% of EQAD inspectors said that the relevant partners have cooperated with them well during their inspection at schools. However, inspectors in Cambodia have no power or authority to put sanctions or rewards to schools. This is the limitation of inspection to improve school performance because the findings through inspection are not considered or taken action on by the schools and inspectors cannot put sanctions to those schools. One inspector suggested to the MoEYS to provide authority to inspectors to punish teachers or school directors who did not commit their task well, and to provide rewards or praising certificate to good performance teachers or directors. Some inspectors have suggested that the problems found through inspection should be considered and taken actions by the schools and/or relevant partners in order to provide the value to inspection work and also to make schools trust the inspection. The inspectors will be appreciated by school director and teachers if the problem found and reported by the inspectors are solved by POE, MoEYS and/or relevant development partners. If the inspection is reliable and valuable, it will serve as a key to ensure quality of education. The inspection reports are important for policy makers and the public in considering the improvement of educational quality.

Inspectors have some comments and suggestions in order to make the systemic school inspection become functioning and valuable. Some inspectors mean they need to be independent from the POE in order to report the real problems occurring in schools are under the administration of the POE to the MoEYS or the schools. Some inspectors suggested more training on systemic school inspection is needed for school directors, DTMTs, and the inspectors themselves. Other suggestions were related to the provision of budget, transportation means, and other materials that serve the inspection work were also requested.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Systemic school inspection, recognized as the new inspection system in Cambodia, is a good means to measure school quality, the same as school inspection in other countries which has been concluded in earlier research (Janssens F. & Gonnée H. W. C. H., 2008; Aysun E. & Baris A., 2009; Gaertner H. & Pant H. A., 2011; Gustafsson J. E. et al., 2015). Both regular and thematic school inspections indicate the strong and weak points of school performances and they are complementary. Regular school inspection indicates the overall school performance while specific problems can be targeted through thematic school inspections. The inspections point out the main weaknesses of the schools which this article on systemic inspection in Cambodia shows is material, teacher competence and leading pedagogical development. The main problem shown by the inspections is that many schools lack enough competence as well as relevant material and resources to give high quality education. To improve the science education for example, the regular and thematic inspections show that there is a need for experimental equipment in schools as well as teachers competence development when it comes to using experiments as a teaching method in teaching science. In order to raise school quality and student performance there is a need for political decision in order to give better conditions for school directors and teachers to improve the quality of the schools. According to Marielle C. J. L. Klerks (2012), inspection only will not improve school quality, good interaction characteristics of inspection and school lead to school improvement. This article shows that systemic school inspection in Cambodia is a good approach to find out the problems — but additional measures need to be taken in order to solve the problems. Therefore, based on the research findings presented in this article MoEYS as well as development partners should consider how to raise the knowledge of teaching as well as how to supply schools with relevant learning and teaching materials and equipment as a basic priority in

order to enhance the quality of education in the Cambodian schools. MoEYS and other technical departments should focus on helping schools to produce teaching materials related to the curriculum and easy to be used for present situation in Cambodia and then gradually use the high quality teaching materials produced by industrial company.

There are also place for improvements when it comes to implementing systemic school inspection in Cambodia. Today there is a lack of inspectors, inspectors do not have authority on schools, and school inspection is not yet highly appreciated by teachers and schools. Some researches revealed that inspection alone did not make change at schools, good interaction between inspectors and schools, and sanction on schools was required in order to improve quality of education at schools (Marielle C. J. L. Klerks, 2012; Gustafsson J. E. et al., 2015). POEs, MoEYS and schools should take actions to improve the poor performance in schools indicated in the inspection reports in order to make sure the inspection work has a function to contribute to raising school performance. In Sweden, inspection is highly appreciated by school actors and inspection report is considered as positive support for changes at schools (Segerholm C. & Hult A., 2018). On the other hand, inspectors should strengthen the capacity of the inspections in order to be appreciated by schools and other relevant partners, and they also need to develop an inspection plan in order to receive budget from the government.

Even though, the Swedish Schools Inspectorate has terminated the project to support inspection in Cambodia, NIE and EQAD should work closely with UNICEF to build the capacity in inspection. UNICEF in Phnom Penh might be able to contribute in both budget and technical support in inspection work. Cambodia has done a lot and succeeded in raising the quality of the schools but there are still many challenges. And the solutions to these challenges must be met by political decisions and in collaboration with national and international help of different kind.

References

- Aysun E. and Baris A. (2009). "School administrators' opinions about competencies of inspectors of primary school", *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 1, pp.1425-1430.
- Gaertner H. and Pant H. A. (2011). "How valid are school inspection? Problem and strategies for validating processes and results", *Study in Educational Evaluation*, pp.85-93.
- Gustafsson J. E. et al. (2015). "From inspection to quality: Way in which school inspection influence change in school", *Study in Educational Evaluation*, Vol. 47, pp. 15-23.
- Janssens F. and Gonnig H. W. C. H. (2008). "School self-evaluation and school inspection in Europe: An exploratory study", *Study in Educational Evaluation*, Vol. 34, pp. 47-57.
- Lindström L. and Perdahl S. (2014). "The Swedish inspectorate's view of Swedish schools", *Journal of Education and Learning*, Vol. 3, pp. 15-32.
- Mam et al. (2017). "Educational officers' perspectives on systemic school inspection", *National Institute of Education Newsletter*, pp. 1-9.
- Marielle C. J. L. Klerks (2012). "The effect of school inspections: A systematic review", *Inspectorate for Youth Care*, p. 33.
- MoEYS (2015a). "Concept of quality assurance in preschool and general education in Cambodia", *Phnom Penh*, p. 32.
- MoEYS (2015b). "School inspection handbook", *Phnom Penh*, p. 55.
- Segerholm C. and Hult A. (2018). "Learning from and reacting to school inspection — Two Swedish case narratives", *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 62, pp. 125-139.
- Shaeffer S. and Kreng H. (2016). "Joint formative evaluation of child-friendly school policy implementation in Cambodia", *Unicef-Phnom Penh*, p. 94.