

# មជ្ឈមណ្ឌលឯកសារកម្ពុជា

## **Genocide Education Project** **The Teaching of “A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979)”** **Report on First Commune Teacher Training** **April 5-11, 2010**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Documentation Center of Cambodia and the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport recently completed a seven-day training workshop for 188 history teachers from nine provinces (Kampot, Kep, Preah Sihanouk, Koh Kong, Kratie, Monduliri, Ratanakiri, Preah Vehear, and Stung Treng). From April 5 to April 11, 2010, Cambodian commune-level teachers (CLTs) met in four different regions (Kampot, Kampong Som, Stung Treng, and Kratie) to gain necessary skill-sets in order to teach Democratic Kampuchea history in Cambodian high schools. During the training, CLTs received an overview of the history of Democratic Kampuchea (DK) as well as effective teaching methodologies. The April 2010 Training Workshop revolved around Cambodian researcher Khamboly Dy’s textbook *A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979)* and Dr. Phala Chea and Christopher Dearing’s teacher’s guidebook *The Teaching of ‘A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979)’*.

The April 2010 Workshop is part of the larger Cambodian-government mandated Genocide Education Project. Partnering with the Documentation Center of Cambodia, the Cambodian Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport has required that all Cambodian high schools and institutions of higher learning implement and teach Cambodian genocide education curriculum by 2011. The mandate also prescribes that all secondary level history teachers attend one Teacher Training Seminar on DK History and Methodology in order to receive certification to teach DK history. This report details one such preparatory workshop: the commune level training seminar conducted from April 5, 2010 to April 11, 2010.

During the April 2010 workshop, commune level teachers received pedagogy and history training from Cambodian teachers who had received training in prior CGEP Teacher Training Workshops. CLTs received a packet of material that included the following materials: a DK history textbook, a Teacher’s Guidebook, a Student Workbook, a DK glossary, Khmer Rouge Tribunal Chronology, KR prison list, a DK map, a map of DK mass graves, a CD of the play *Breaking the Silence, Searching for the Truth* magazine, a booklet on Case 002 and the schedule and agenda of the training program. Apart from instruction, this training, as December and July 2009 trainings, also bore witness to individuals testifying to their memories of the DK period even when not prompted. Throughout the week, national, provincial, and commune level teachers shared stories about their experiences during Democratic Kampuchea to each other, such as Mr. Sophaly in Stung Treng who talked about his marriage under the Khmer Rouge. The reoccurrence of these impromptu testimonial sessions in all three Training Workshops points to the power of the training sessions to serve as forums for individual and collective reconciliation.

While the CGEP’s end goal is to teach students history of Democratic Kampuchea, teachers are also significantly learning. Many teachers come to the training

workshops with little, if any knowledge, of the DK period apart from their individual experiences. Consequentially, the curriculum provided survivors and children of survivors the historical knowledge to contextualize their own experiences or those of their relatives. Attentive and curious, many teachers were never hesitant to ask guest speakers and Training Team members questions to clarify or expand upon issues that were unclear. Meticulously taking notes, it quickly became evident that their interest in the subject matter was genuine as much as it was personal.

The report that follows contextualizes the April 2010 workshop, summarizes the workshop's activities, outlines the April 2010 workshop's strengths, and offers recommendations to improve subsequent trainings.

## **PRIOR ACTIVITIES**

Prior to the April 2010 training series, DC-Cam and the Ministry of Education organized two teacher-training workshops as part of the CGEP's Teacher Training Series. The first training workshop brought together 49 officials from the Ministry of Education and Documentation Center of Cambodia in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. For seven-days in July 2009, staff members received pedagogy training from international scholars, listened to lectures on DK history, and practiced teaching sample lessons from the Teacher Guidebook in small groups in order to serve as core leaders or "National Trainers" in subsequent training workshops.

In December 2009, the National Trainers subsequently trained 180 history, morality, and civic Provincial Teachers as part of the second stage of the CGEP Teacher Training Series. Breaking out into six regional training teams, National Trainers traveled to Battambang, Phnom Penh, Kandal, Prey Veng, Kampong Cham, and Takeo. Following a similar format as the National Training, National Trainers briefed provincial teachers on the history found in all chapters from *A History of Democratic Kampuchea*, sampled model lessons from the Teacher's Guidebook, and facilitated small group interactions. Each afternoon, Provincial Teachers practiced lessons found in the Teacher's Guidebook in small group settings, working hands-on. Films, songs, games, and guest speakers were also incorporated in the training.

## **ORGANIZATION OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP**

### **A. ORIENTATION SESSION**

In January 2010, Provincial Teachers who received training in December 2009 were promoted to join National Trainers in the third stage of the CGEP's Teacher Training Series. Together, Provincial Teachers and National Trainers formed four different training teams with the objective to facilitate commune-level training workshops. To ensure quality of the training, only 25 among 39 National teachers (12 officials from the Ministry of Education and 13 DC-Cam's staff members) were selected to join the April 2010 training. Provincial and National Trainers were divided into four Training Teams, which consisted of roughly four National Teachers and five Provincial Teachers along with Dc-Cam staff. Training Teams were responsible for leading the commune teacher training seminars at Kampong Som, Preah Sihanouk, Stung Treng, and Kratie in April 2009.

Prior to the April 2010 commune-level workshop, Training Team members spent three days in Siem Reap, Cambodia to prepare for the upcoming commune-level teacher training sessions. From March 27-29, 2010, DC-Cam organized an orientation workshop at Mondial Hotel in Siem Reap. Training Teams reviewed information regarding the CGEP and listened to international and domestic scholars speak about topics related to DK history and teaching methodology. They also received certificates from Undersecretary of State for the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport, saw the poignant play *Breaking the Silence*, and visited Angkor Wat. The Khmer Rouge Tribunal's Co-prosecutor, Mr. Andrew T. Cayley, also visited the group to talk about the upcoming trial Case 002.

Mr. Christopher Dearing, co-author of the Teacher's Guidebook, also addressed the Training Teams on two points. First, he explained the importance of critical thinking skills in the Cambodian classroom over rote learning. Then, he demonstrated the feasibility of participatory learning (or group work) in the Cambodian classroom, an issue many teachers addressed in prior training seminars. Specifically, he answered the question "How do teachers encourage participatory learning and group work in large classrooms of up to 70 students?" Conducting a model lesson from Chapter 11, Lesson 4, Topic 2 from the Teacher's Guidebook, Dearing mocked the lesson as if he were teaching to the entire group of 180 teachers. His demonstration assured Trainers through example that it is possible to use creative methods in their teaching. Research methodology was also discussed at the orientation seminar. Professor and Cambodian historian Sambo Manara explained the importance of primary and secondary research materials and stressed the importance of local research initiatives. He also urged Trainers to become more involved at the village level to conduct research and petitioned the Cambodian Government to put more effort in supporting primary research endeavors.

## **B. OVERALL SCHEDULE**

The April 2010 workshop followed a similar format as the December 2009 training session. Each day, Training Teams and commune-level teachers (CLTs) met at their respective regional training centers to review the textbook *The History of Democratic Kampuchea*, model lessons from the Teacher's Guidebook, and practice teaching methodology in small groups. While schedules varied between regional training centers, Training Teams generally disseminated DK history and modeled lessons from the Teacher's Guidebook in large group sessions during the morning. In the afternoon, CLTs broke out into small groups to model lessons from the Teacher's Guidebook as if they were teaching a history lesson to high school students. After each CLT finished his/her model lesson, small group members were asked to provide feedback to the "teacher." A member of the Training Team oversaw each small group's discussion while a Dc-Cam staff member walked around the room to observe each group's progress. Films, songs, guest speakers, and games were also incorporated into the training workshop.

## **ACTIVITIES OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP**

### **A. HISTORY LESSONS**

Each morning, a member of the Training Team presented approximately two chapters from the history textbook to the CLTs. Their methods varied depending on the presenter's familiarity with DK history. Some Trainers, such as Professor Sambo

Manara, used their own knowledge of DK to teach various chapters while other DK survivors often supplemented the textbook lessons with their own anecdotes from the time period. However, many Trainers had little expertise on DK history and followed lessons in the Teacher's Guidebook to disseminate DK history during the history forum.

After the history forum presentations, CLTs were given the opportunity to ask questions to the Trainer. CLTs took advantage of this time to clarify any questions they had. They asked a variety of questions that ranged from nuanced historical minutia to larger concepts concerning the effects of the tribunal, reconciliation, and the differences between victims and perpetrators.

Similar to questions asked in the July 2009 and December 2009 training seminars, CLTs also wanted to know more about DK's international relations. A series of questions revolved around DK's diplomacy with China, DK's war with Vietnam, and United Nations' lack of involvement during the Khmer Rouge. They also asked questions that occurred outside the "official" DK era. For instance, one participant in Stung Treng asked "why did the United Nations ignore the presence of North Vietnamese soldiers living inside Cambodia during the Vietnam War?" CLTs also asked questions relating to DK's domestic policies, such as the contents of DK constitution, the goals of collectivization, and the purpose of the Four Year Plan.

## **B. LARGE GROUP MODEL LESSONS**

After the history forum segment of the program, Trainers then modeled lessons from the Teacher's Guidebook in the large group setting. Many Trainers demonstrated "Actively Reading the Lesson", especially towards the first few days of the seminar. After some complaints, Trainers began to vary their own teaching methodology and introduced more novel teaching methods incorporated in the Teacher's Guidebook, such as the lessons on Interview Techniques, the Survival Box, K-W-L, the Jigsaw Exercise, and the lesson on the differences between victims versus perpetrators.

Below is an excerpt of one large group model lesson using "Actively Reading the Chapter" methodology. As evidenced in the body of this report, many of these types of lessons appear frequently in the large group modeling sessions and are typical of the lessons modeled to large groups. Noticeably, these lessons require little critical thinking and introduce very few new techniques to the CLTs, an issue which will be discussed further in the conclusion of this report.

### **CHAPTER 3, Lesson 1, BY Meu Simak (Kratie)**

Mr. Meu Simak began his lesson by going over the objectives of the lessons to the students. Then he reviewed the lesson from yesterday's class. To review the previous chapter, Mr. Simak posed two questions to "students:" Why did the Cambodian communist and Vietnamese communist groups work together? and "What was the name of a front formed in April 1950 in Kampot?" The CLTs read from their textbook in order to answer the questions.

Then, Mr. Simak moved to model the lesson from Chapter 3, Lesson 1. He first had students read the textbook and asked them to look for difficult terms. He told the participants to come to the whiteboard to write down the terms and then asked the

students for answers. He then told the participants to divide into groups and read. Then, he asked questions to the students.

Some Trainers modeled different lessons, but asked quite basic, if not irrelevant questions, such as Mr. Kong Sam On in Kampot.

### **CHAPTER 7, LESSON 3 Mr Kong Sam On (Kampot)**

Mr. Kong conducted a mock lesson on Chapter 7 lesson 3: Interview, Survivor's story. He placed on the whiteboard a piece of paper that had the title of the chapter, the lesson title, and the objectives of the lesson. He asked the trainees to open the Teacher's Guidebook and asked if they knew the definition of an interview. Then he had students get into pairs to conduct interviews for 15 minutes and each group must write down the interview questions on a piece of paper. After collecting the papers from the students, he selected a few of the collected papers to read aloud to the class. Then, he asked if the class recognized to whom the interview belonged? He gave an explanation on when to conduct interviews and reflected on the teaching style and reviewed the objective of the lesson He asked if the participants had any questions, and then continued with Chapter 8, Lesson 1.

Finally, some Trainers, such as Mr. Hak Huor in Stung Treng demonstrated the logistics of group work, drawing upon Mr. Dearing's presentation during the Orientation Session.

### **Mr. Hak Huor (Stung Treng)**

Mr. Hak Huor divided trainees into five groups counting each person off from one to five. Then, he told each person who had the same number to create a team. He assigned each team with one country who had also experienced genocide. They were given 30 minutes to talk about their country in small groups. After the discussion period was over, one representative from each team presented to the large group on the country they discussed.

## **C. SMALL GROUP MODEL LESSONS**

During the afternoon, CLTs broke out into small groups to practice modeling lessons. Each group was composed of approximately five to ten participants. During modeling lessons, one CLT assumed the "teacher" role while other CLTs in the group became the "students." Members of the Training Team served as group facilitators while DC-Cam staff walked from groups to monitor lessons. After each model lesson, participants were instructed to give feedback to the "teacher," although this did not always happen. Quantity and quality of feedback varied group-by-group.

Some sample mock lessons included:

### **Chapter 11, Lesson 3, Mr. Pang Chhoeung Kampot**

Mr. Choeung started the lesson by reviewing information from the previous lesson. He then showed the students a few photographs of Liberation Day and asked the students a few questions: "From your observation, how did people feel after liberation day?" "How did people feel on their journey back to their homes?" He then explained the objectives of the lesson to the class and asked them more questions. "How was the food portion after the Khmer Rouge regime collapsed?"



What are the effects of poor food nutrition?" What are the countries that have a lot of malnutrition?" Then, he divided the students into three groups. He assigned one group to explain the photograph on page 62, another group was responsible for the photographs on pages 63 and 64, while the third group had to explain the photograph on page 65 in the teacher's guidebook. Mr. Pen had the students read their answers aloud and show the differences between the images on pages 62, 63, 64, and 65. He then told the group the differences between clean, hygienic food and the non-hygienic food as illustrated in the photographs.

Sometimes, trainees did not prepare their lessons before teaching, as with Mr. Keon Ron from Kampong Som.

### **Chapter 3 The Khmer Rouge Come to Power Lesson 2(Keon Ron) from Preah Sihanouk**

He began his lesson by stating the lesson's objectives to the students. Then, he reviewed the previous lesson by asking students a series of questions. Then, he showed students' pictures of the evacuated people from the city and asked the students what they thought the photographs meant. Then, Mr. Ron divided students into two groups and asked each student to answer questions in the student workbook after looking at the photographs. After finishing the discussion in their groups, students shared their answers with the class.

According to the reviewer, Mr. Ron's teaching was not prepared well, stating that Mr. Ron did not provide enough information to the students.

## **D. VISUAL ACTIVITIES AND GUEST SPEAKERS**

As in the December and June 2009 training, films and songs were also incorporated into the training workshops and were followed by seminar-format discussions. The films *Tuol Sleng after 1979*, *Baset and Prey Veng Prisons*, *The Liberated Zone of Kampong Cham 1973* and *Behind the Walls of S-21* were all shown at the four training centers. The first three silent films provided interesting visual representations of the periods before the Khmer Rouge came to power and after the Vietnamese entered Cambodia. *Behind the Walls of S-21* juxtaposed the narratives of S-21 prison guards and victims, engendering dialogue about the debatable classifications of "perpetrator" and "victim."

Guest Speakers were also integrated into the training process. Youk Chhang, Director of the Documentation Center of Cambodia, visited each training site to reiterate the overall purpose of the training program. He also covered topics concerning the project's goals of national reconciliation and tolerance. Participants warmly received Chhang in all of the regional workshops. Furthermore, Andrew T. Carry, newly appointed Co-Prosecutor of the ECCC visited some of the regional training centers as well. He gave a brief overview of his past work at the international courts of Yugoslavia and talked to the CLTs about the upcoming trial of the four top senior Khmer Rouge leaders.

## **STRENGTHS**

**Attitude of Commune-Teacher Trainers:** Similar to the December 2009 Provincial-level Teacher Training, April 2010 teachers eagerly welcomed DK history. For the

most part, CLTs were active participants in large and small group sessions, asking informative questions related to DK history and teaching methodology. As one member of Stung Treng's Training Team observed, "trainees were very curious to learn about DK history." The participants' enthusiastic attitudes to learn about this history demonstrate the importance and significance of this project.

**Historical Knowledge and Teaching Methodology Gained:** Many CLTs came into the April 2010 workshop knowing only what their relatives have told them regarding the Khmer Rouge regime. After the workshop was completed, all Training Teams noted that CLTs learned a great deal about DK history and teaching methodology. Kampong Som's report lists things CLTs said they learned during the closing session on April 11, 2010 and are worth repeating:

- 1) How to divide students into group.
- 2) Group work "Jigsaw":
- 3) Question method
- 4) Interview method
- 5) Showing film screening
- 6) Observing method
- 7) Presentation method
- 8) Research method
- 9) Comparison method
- 10) KWL method
- 11) Role play
- 12) Actively Reading (Read and answer the question)

**CGEP Team Leaders' Confronted Problems and Encouraged Discussion:** When the CGEP's Training Team Leader witnessed problems during regional training workshops, Team Leaders confronted the problems at hand. For instance, in Stung Treng, Mr. Dara P Vanthan observed that the CLTs were having difficulty understanding the differences between the textbook, teacher's guidebook, and student workbook. Rather than ignoring the problem, he brought the group back together to clarify the differences between the texts and ensure that CLTs understood ways to utilize all resources given to them. In Kampot, Team Leaders noticed after the second day that many CLTs were modeling lessons only from "Actively Reading the Chapter." Rasy and Professor Manara met with all members of the Training Team to re-divide lessons and chapters for model lessons. Team Leaders also generated discussion when CLTs were hesitant to respond. For example, in Kampot, Professor Sambo Manara generated discussion after noticing that CLTs were quiet after watching footage from Prey Veng, Tuol Sleng, and Baset prisons. He asked simple questions to begin, such as "What and who did they see?," which were then followed by more complex questions such as "How do we teach KR history to victims' and perpetrators' children?" Finally, Savina Sirik in Preah Sihanouk helped to quiet any concerns raised by participants. For example, one teacher raised an issue regarding the feasibility of inviting guest speakers to the classroom. Drawing upon her own personal experiences, Savina assured CLTs that it may not be as difficult as one thinks to invite KR survivors to the classroom. If they had any problems, she also told the CLTs to contact DC-Cam.

**Guest Speakers, Films, and Songs:** Various guest speakers created a more engaging environment for the CLTs and broke up the monotony of the programming. CLTs appeared attentive to survivors' first-hand accounts, the film *Behind the Wall of S-21*, and other guest speakers. In Stung Treng, one CLT asked a Training Team member if he could play DK's Anthem. After the song was played, many participants asked for the song to be "Bluetoothed" to their cell phones. Visits by Director of the Documentation Center of Cambodia, Mr. Youk Chhang and ECCC Co-Prosecutor aided in legitimizing the project. Their speeches also reinforced the importance and relevance of learning and teaching this history in the present-day.

**Emphasis on Reconciliation:** CGEP emphasized the importance of reconciliation throughout the training seminar. Mr. Youk Chhang's visit at the regional training center also covered the concepts of reconciliation. After showing the film "behind the wall of S-21," Mr. Chhang stressed that reconciliation is individual and that "no third person could decide."

**Encouragement to Continue Learning:** For instance, Mr. Siv Thuong, a member of Stung Treng's Training Team encouraged CLTs to "read many books" as they could in order to understand more about DK history. He also encouraged CLTs to interview survivors, thus emphasizing the importance of primary research. Mr. Thuong also stressed that like the CLTs he is also using books to learn more about the regime. Such statements from a higher authority demonstrate interest in the period and set a positive example to the CLTs.

**Increased Packet Material:** During the December 2009 training, Provincial Trainers requested that DC-Cam provide more material rather than the DK history textbook, Teacher's guidebook, and Student Workbook. Answering the request, DC-Cam provided CLTs with a DK glossary, ECCC Chronology, a Khmer Rouge prison list, a DK Map, maps of DK mass graves, a CD of the play *Breaking the Silence*, DC-Cam's monthly magazine *Searching for the Truth*, and a Case 002 booklet. Such additional material was welcomed and appeased local demands for more teaching material.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Creation of a Public Relations Chairperson:** International and local press attended the opening ceremony in Siem Reap, Cambodia, yet the CGEP had no staff to attend to public relations queries. Since media publicity is important for the project, CGEP should create a position for a staff member to specifically facilitate media relations.

**More Detailed Review During Day One of Commune-Level Workshop:** In the majority of training centers, CLTs were confused regarding the purpose of the workshop and other logistical matters, such as the differences between the textbook, guidebook, and student workbook. Rather than assuming the CLTs understand the use of the books, Training Teams should devote half an hour on the first day of subsequent lessons to go over more logistical matters of the material at hand.

**Detailed Review of Agenda, Schedule, and Responsibilities Prior to Training Workshop:** During the Orientation Session, CGEP gave an informative overview of theoretical underpinnings of the project: Both Cambodian and international speakers



discussed the Project's goals and objectives, the importance of the Khmer Rouge Tribunals, and the research process. Chris Dearing also conducted a model lesson to demonstrate the ways the Teacher's Guidebook and Student Textbook could be used in large classrooms. However, the Orientation Session did not disseminate much practical information, such as a review of roles and responsibilities, local training expectations, and agenda for the first round of the local teacher-training program. Failure to provide clear expectations, guidelines, responsibilities, and overview resulted in all training groups facing difficulty during the first few days of the training. For instance, in Kampong Som, Mrs. Mom Met conducted the "Large Group History Lesson" as if she were teaching history to high school students using the lessons set forth in the Teacher's Guidebook. Her strategies became repetitive when Mr. Phouk Sokhan presented the Teacher's Guidebook during the "Large-Group Model Lesson" using similar techniques that Mrs. Mom Met had just employed. There was also confusion in Kampot. Rather than demonstrating a variety of lessons to the village trainees during "Large Group model Lessons" Mr. Pen Bong, a Provincial Trainer, conducted two "Large Group Model Lessons" based on "Actively Reading the Chapter." Like in Kampong Som, the Kampot training group grew frustrated with the repetition. Hadeach Training Team met prior to the village training to review roles and responsibilities, these repetitions would not have occurred. Moving forward, each Training Team should ensure they meet a day before the Training Session to review challenges faced at the April 2010 workshop, discuss ways to improve, and ensure that each person of the Training Team understands their roles and responsibilities.

**Training Teams Must be More Prepared:** In many training centers, some National and Provincial Trainers were not well-prepared. For instance, in Preah Sihanouk, it became evident that Training Teams did not have an in-depth meeting prior to the start of the workshop training when Mrs. Mom Met, the history forum presenter, and Mr. Phouk Sokhoun, the teacher's guidebook presenter, basically repeated each other's method for the morning sessions. Mrs. Mom Met, presented Chapters 1-4 following lessons set forth in the Teacher's Guidebook rather than presenting the chapters through lecture format. These strategies would have been fine had the Team met prior to the training to discuss all logistical matters. However, they did not. When it became Mr. Phouk Sokhoun's turn to introduce the Teacher's Guidebook, he repeated the same techniques Mrs. Mom Met had just explained. Such repetition would not have occurred had proper preparation taken place. In my experience in Cambodia, preparatory meetings are often overlooked either because Trainers arrive the day the workshop begins or because Organizers feel these meetings are not necessary. Yet, these meetings are essential to ensure that the workshop runs smoothly and also go over logistical details of points each Trainer will discuss.

Even after Team Leaders encouraged Trainers to vary their lesson plans, Training Team members neglected to follow Team Leaders' requests. As suggested in Kampot's report, some of the members of the Training Team refused to put in a concerted effort and either presented the lesson that required minimal work or presented a lesson that was poorly executed and ill-prepared. For instance, Mrs. Seng Piseth Neary, a National Trainer, after completing two rounds of training, was still unsure of the basic components of teaching methodology and the basic steps of

lessons in each chapter. It is the Training Team's responsibility to be well-prepared and knowledgeable on such issues. Such is the definition of a leader. The CGEP should encourage trainers to come to subsequent workshops better prepared and remove any Trainers who repeatedly are unprepared.

**Must Encourage Small Group Feedback:** In many small group model lessons, very few CLTs gave feedback to the teacher. When CLTs did offer suggestions, their comments were very basic. It is the small group leader's responsibility to encourage CLTs to respond to the model lesson. A good way to ensure response is to go around in a circle and ask all CLTs to offer one negative and one positive comment to the model lesson. Training Team Leaders should also take the time to stress this responsibility prior to the workshop's start.

**Insist that Training Teams and Trainees Practice and Demonstrate a Variety of Methods Before Training Begins:** In all training locations, Training Teams consistently demonstrated "Actively Reading the Chapter" for their "Large Group Mock Lessons" while CLTs consistently practiced Actively Reading the Chapter in their small groups. While these lessons are most certainly comfortable (and easy), CLTs and Training Teams must move away from presenting and practicing lessons based only on this approach. CLTs even requested on the next to last day in Preah Sihanouk for Trainers to demonstrate more methods other than Actively Reading the Lesson. Organizers must encourage all participants to step outside their comfort zones and use the workshop as an opportunity to test new methods found in the Teacher's Guidebook.

First, Organizers need to stop Trainers from conducting only these types of lessons. For instance, in Preah Sihanouk, Mr. Phouk Sokhan conducted four lessons in a row that were either taken from the "Actively Reading the Chapter" section or other lesson plans that were just as rudimentary. It comes as no surprise then that CLTs followed the lead and also practiced Actively Reading the Chapter during their turn in small group modeling. The observation found in Kampot's report on the second day of training further illustrates this point. Prior to CLTs modeling lessons in small groups, one Trainer demonstrated Actively Reading the Chapter for two lessons the morning of the second day of training. As a result, "The CLTs did not seem to understand the concept of mocking or modeling lessons. They instead taught the chapter in the history textbook and used only the methodology in lesson 1 of Reading in each chapter. They did not follow the teacher guidebook. Some trainees used only the first lesson which about reading chapter."

There are a few ways to combat this problem. First, CGEP workshop organizers should encourage Training Teams to conduct lessons other than Actively Reading the Chapter during "Large Group Model Lessons." Savina Sirik, CGEP Team Leader in Preah Sihanouk, already began to address this problem through using this method. Meeting with Trainers on Training Day 4 April 8, 2010, she insisted that Trainers demonstrate clear methods and try to model lessons in large groups other than the Reading lesson. Indeed she took correct measures to fix this problem. However, the trainings would be even more efficient if Organizers communicate this information to Trainers before the first day of the training.

If encouragement does not work alone, Organizers can also assign Trainers with specific lessons to model, picking more complex lessons for Trainers to demonstrate. Organizers can also assign each CLT with a specific lesson prior to the beginning of the workshop. For instance, in the Provincial Training in December 2009 in Battambang province, Team Leaders created nametags for all participants that appropriated specific lessons to trainees to model, thus eliminating the opportunity for trainees to stick with that which is familiar.

**Historical Review at One Large Teacher Sessions:** One main concern is that CLTs have received inconsistent historical background on Democratic Kampuchean history. In some training centers, Training Teams were equipped with Cambodian historians, such as Professor Sambo Manara, while other training teams did not have this resource, such as in Kratie. In order to ensure that CLTs receive a consistent historical background, I would recommend that, at the end of all Commune Teacher Training Sessions, the CGEP should organize an intensive three-day history seminar for all 3000 teachers in the same location. CGEP could invite International and local scholars to lecture on various historical aspects of relevant Democratic Kampuchean history, much like the first National Teacher Training Workshop in July 2009. This proposed workshop would also allow the opportunity for all teachers to ask questions to knowledgeable experts in the field and clear any confusion they may have regarding historical background.

**Ministry of Education Youth and Sport Must Improve Their Methodology for Inviting Teachers:** The Ministry of Education Youth and Sport and their various branches must do a better job to ensure that they invite all proper teachers to the training. In every regional school district, invitations were carried out either carelessly or not at all. For instance, in Kratie, one teacher commented that there were more history teachers in her school than the Ministry invited. In Stung Treng, teachers from Ratanakiri did not show up on the first day of training. Ratanakiri's education department claimed that they did not know that teachers had been invited to attend the workshop. When they did send teachers, they sent the wrong ones: two biology and math teachers showed up at the training. In Kampot, some teachers came in late and the next day because the school director had just informed the teachers they needed to go to the training. It is recommended that The Ministry and DC-Cam communicate more frequently with the Provincial Offices before the date of the training.

**Field Trips:** The Provincial and National Trainers in prior trainings found field trips to Tuol Sleng and Choeng Ek to be very beneficial to their understanding of the Khmer Rouge regime (See December 2009 Project Report). For instance, one teacher commented X. These field trips continue to affect the Provincial and National Trainers, incorporating their personal experiences into their lesson plans and teaching methodology. For instance, in Kampong Som Mr. Samrith Y drew from his personal experiences visiting Tuol Sleng Prison in December 2009 to speak to the CLTs about the security system. As such, the CGEP should organize similar field trips to Choeng Ek and Tuol Sleng for all CLTs once all commune-level trainings are complete, perhaps during the same time as the proposed history forum. These field trips are undoubtedly important resources teachers can draw upon in their teaching.

Confusion With the Guidebook: In all three training seminars (July 2009, December 2009, and April 2010) Trainees have requested that DC-Cam produce a “lesson plan guidebook” apart from the Teacher’s Guidebook. This particular request is repeatedly asked because two US citizens not as familiar with the Cambodian education system authored the Teacher’s Guidebook. As a result, they did not present lesson plans according to the formula Cambodian teachers must use (and are most accustomed to using) when preparing their lessons, which is the Cambodian government mandated five-step, three-column lesson plan. Theoretically, teachers can still use the Teacher’s Guidebook and adapt the particular lesson plans into the three-step, five columns approach themselves. However, many Cambodian teachers may not take the initiative to do this and may feel that the Guidebook is not a useful document. CGEP may want to think about publishing a second edition of the Teacher’s Guidebook that is most useful to the Cambodian teachers, which will ensure uniformity among Cambodian teachers. A new Guidebook may also improve training sessions. Many critiques in small group model sessions focus on whether or not Cambodian teachers missed “steps” in the five-step approach. It is very rare that Cambodian teachers critique lessons that move beyond this “checklist.” Trainers could even lead in this endeavor, converting the more “Western” lessons in the Teacher’s Guidebook into a Cambodian context with the three-step, five-step model. Clearly, a new Teacher’s Guidebook would take some time to produce. For the time being, Organizers should recognize this criticism of the Guidebook on the very first day of training and stress that the Guidebook can still be used in the five-step, three-column approach. Mom Meth in Preah Sihanouk began to give a compelling comparison of the similarities between the Guidebook and the five-step, three-column approach. However, she stopped her explanation precisely at the point where she could have made concrete comparisons on ways to adapt the Teacher’s Guidebook into the five-step, three-column approach. Furthermore, Organizers should recognize these concerns of the Guidebook and explain ways to adapt the Guidebook into the five step; three step approach at the beginning of the seminar, not on the last day, which is generally the case in regional training centers, such as in Kampong Som (See April 11, 2010 Preah Sihanouk Part A).

- 1) Conflict among the national trainer and provincial trainers still occurred when the national trainer came in the group to intervene during the evaluation. This created a negative image in front of the participants.
- 2) The national trainer continues telling CLTs to strictly follow the step in guidebook. This is not the initial objective of the guidebook.