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Chapter 1:
INTRODUCTION

The SEC Revision Classes is an initiative that is held under the auspices of the Malta Youth Guarantee Project. The Youth Guarantee Project is part-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF).

The ESF is Europe’s main funding body for supporting jobs, investing in Europe’s human capital, and ensuring fairer and better job opportunities for all EU citizens. These goals are at the core of the Europe 2020 strategy to reduce youth unemployment. The current ESF fund has a programming period from 2013-2020, and has been awarded an annual budget of EUR 10 billion. Students aged 16-24 are offered the possibility to receive revision lessons in Maths, Maltese, English, Biology and Physics (the core subjects) if they have failed their SEC/Ordinary level exams, or were absent for their first sit (May).

The initiative was originally formed to provide a second opportunity to those who have failed their SEC/Ordinary level examination in May, and therefore prevent the formation of early school leavers and subsequently the establishment of NEETS (not in education, employment or training). Young people who continue studying or who at least obtain their Ordinary level examinations have greater job prospects, and are less at risk of social exclusion or becoming long-term unemployed. The SEC Revision Classes is currently in its third iteration, and has shown that students who attend said classes perform better than those who do not.

While the Youth Guarantee is very pleased with the impact that the initiative has on the students who attend, we also believe that more can be done to make the initiative a greater success, and to leave greater academic impact on the participants of the initiative. To this end, we have compiled this report which will be looking in greater depth at the different facets of the Revision Classes and listening to the perspectives of the students, teachers and coordinators of the different centres. The analysis will then be used to generate recommendations for improvement for the following year’s Revision Classes.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO OBTAINED A 4,5 MARK IN SEC RESITS 2016

While the Youth Guarantee is very pleased with the impact that the initiative has on the students who attend, we also believe that more can be done to make the initiative a greater success, and to leave greater academic impact on the participants of the initiative. To this end, we have compiled this report which will be looking in greater depth at the different facets of the Revision Classes and listening to the perspectives of the students, teachers and coordinators of the different centres. The analysis will then be used to generate recommendations for improvement for the following year’s Revision Classes.

PARTICIPANTS BY SUBJECT
Chapter 2:
RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REPORT

The aim of this report is primarily to gather and analyse insights from students, teachers and coordinators. The SEC Revision Classes involve many stakeholders at stages of implementation and delivery. Opening communication channels with all the stakeholders involved is fundamentally a matter of good practice; demonstrating a commitment to involve stakeholders throughout the process. It also has the added effect of providing the Youth Guarantee team with an understanding of the issues that need to be worked upon from one year to the next, to further address the needs of all the stakeholders and consequently improve the level of the service offered.

The secondary function of this report is to try and glean insights into the service users of the initiative, which are for the most part 16- to 17-year-old students. Understanding the needs and patterns of the respective students allows the Youth Guarantee to further refine the initiative, while additionally creating valuable data for local educators who are involved in preparing the students for the SEC Revision Classes.

This report will attempt to investigate the following points:

• The marketing of the initiative.
• The facilities and resources available in the project.
• Student proficiency in their chosen subject.
• The Youth Guarantee administration of the initiative.
• Any patterns in the various cohorts that have been through the initiative.
• Make recommendations for further follow-up in the next iteration of the initiative.

Chapter 3:
REVIEW OF MARKETING, PREMISES AND RESOURCES FROM STUDENTS’ PERSPECTIVE

MARKETING

- News: 28%
- Friends/Relatives: 26%
- Others: 3%
- Facebook: 30%
- Newspapers: 3%
- Matsec SMS: 11%
Analysis:

In this pie chart one can see what students listed as the means by which they got to know of the SEC Revision Classes. The most effective manner of marketing the classes was through the SMS sent out by MATSEC, after the SMS which is sent out to inform the students of the result. The second most effective method was Facebook, showing that digital marketing; i.e. that not involving print; is by far more effective.

Interestingly, newspapers and news scored relatively low as the means by which students got to know about the SEC Revisions Classes. This could be attributed to the fact that the majority of students were between 15-17 years old, and are therefore not the typical audience of traditional media, such as newspapers.

Despite the low statistic registered with news and newspaper media, this ought to be interpreted tentatively due to the fact that 26% of the students noted down that they got to know about the classes from friends and relatives. Unfortunately it is not possible to ascertain the manner in which the friends and relatives got to know about the SEC Revision Classes. Were the 26% spread over other media, it is possible that a significantly higher percentage would need to be allotted to the news and newspapers media.

Facilities

NUMBER OF PUPILS IN CLASS

- Too many students
- Just the right amount
- Too few Students

NUMBER OF LESSONS PER WEEK

- Enough
- Not Enough
ROOM TEMPERATURE

1 = Lowest
5 = Highest

FACILITIES COMPARISON

1 = Lowest
5 = Highest
Analysis:

In most cases, students seemed to indicate that they were satisfied with the facilities available to them, with most rating the facilities at their disposal 4 or 5 (60% of all the respondents). The Youth Guarantee team noted that in one of the centres in which the SEC Revision classes were held, no air conditioning was available. This can be seen in the results of room temperature, where more students gave the 1, 2, or 3 rating when compared to the other factors being reviewed.

RESOURCES

HANDOUTS

INTERACTIVE WHITEBOARDS
PAST PAPERS

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

7 = Lowest
5 = Highest

RESOURCES COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Handouts</th>
<th>Interactive Whiteboards</th>
<th>Past Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AVERAGE OF STUDENT RESOURCES REVIEW

![Pie chart showing average student resource review ratings.](chart)

**Analysis:**

Students rated the resources that they utilized highly, in particular the past papers which were provided at no cost by the SEC Revision Classes initiative. In fact, 70% of all the respondents rated the resources available to them as 4 or 5.

Chapter 4:

**REVIEW OF MARKETING, PREMISES AND RESOURCES FROM TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE**

**MARKETING, RESOURCES AND PREMISES**

**TEACHER MARKETING REVIEW**

![Pie chart showing teacher marketing review ratings.](chart)
Analysis:

Most of the teachers seem to have rated the facilities and resources at their disposal favourably; however, in every statistic 40% of the teachers have given a rating of 3 or lower. More can be done in this regard, such as providing air-conditioned classrooms and free water to both teachers and students.

Teachers can also be further supported throughout the lessons by having photocopiers at their disposal. This will allow them to further support students with supplementary materials, such as handouts and notes.
Chapter 5:
COMPARISON OF PREMISES AND RESOURCES BETWEEN TEACHERS’ AND STUDENTS’ REVIEWS

COMPARISON BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENT REVIEW OF FACILITIES

Teacher
Student

RATING 1  RATING 2  RATING 3  RATING 4  RATING 5
Analysis:

If we had to compare the perceptions of the teachers vis-à-vis the students with regard to the facilities and the resources used during the 2016 SEC Revision Classes, one could decipher that the teacher’s ratings increased in a step-wise fashion, and thus the majority of the teachers rated the facilities with a rating of 5, while only 0.7% and 0% of the teachers gave a rating of 1 to the facilities and resources available respectively. Albeit this, 83.4% of all the teachers rated the facilities a 4 or 5.

On the other hand, the rating of the students with regards to both facilities and resources was more sporadic. In fact, with regards to facilities the third highest rating was given to rating 1, and in the case of the resources available, the second highest rating was given to rating 3. Notwithstanding this fact, 70.2% of the students rated both the facilities and the resources available to them a 4 or 5.
Chapter 6:
STUDENTS’ SELF-EVALUATION PRIOR TO SEC REVISION CLASSES

ENGLISH

MALTESE
Analysis:

It is interesting to note that students have rated themselves quite highly in subjects they have applied for the SEC Revision Classes, with the majority giving themselves a 3/4, with a small minority even rating themselves as 5. One would presume that students that have failed exams in particular subjects would for the most part award themselves a 1 or 2 rating, but very few rated their proficiency at a certain subject as a 1 with a larger minority rating themselves as 2.

Two possible explanations as to why students rated themselves so highly are the following: 1) students do not have a well-developed capacity to appraise their abilities and level within their subjects; and/or 2) students find it embarrassing or shameful to acknowledge their realistic level within their respective subject.

This could mean that if the first possibility is true, then schools need to help students assess themselves more realistically in order to provide them with the most effective strategies to tackle examinations. On the other hand, if the second possibility is true, then the SEC Revision Classes teacher needs to create a more nurturing environment where students understand that the first step to improvement is acknowledging the true extent of their abilities within a subject.
Chapter 7:
STUDENTS’ SELF-EVALUATION AFTER THE SEC REVISION CLASSES

ENGLISH

M的情报

MALTESE

Maltese
**COMPARISON: STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION PRE-SEC REVISION CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

From this statistical data, one can note a shift into the upper three ratings of the self-assessment which indicates that students indeed feel that they have progressed in the level of knowledge in a particular subject as a result of the SEC Revision classes. In fact in the case of Physics, the student’s pre-SEC self-assessment of the 1-3 ratings totalled 70.1%, while that of the 4 and 5 scores totalled 29.9%. However, in the self-assessment rating of the post-SEC classes, the 1-3 ratings totalled 30.3%, while that of the 4 and 5 scores add up to 70.6%.

If we had to iterate this process for all the subjects, we would note that the student’s pre-SEC self-assessment for the subjects; Maths, Maltese and English rated their knowledge 1, 2 or 3, totalled 78.2%, 66.7% and 66% respectively. Moreover, the pre-SEC self-assessment for these same subjects rated their knowledge in the same subjects as 4 or 5 resulted in 21.8%, 33.3% and 34% respectively.

Additionally the self-assessment rating of the post-SEC classes in the case of the above three subjects are:

For the first three ratings (1 through 3): 34.1%, 27.2% and 21% respectively. While the percentage of students who rated their knowledge as 4 and 5 resulted in: 65.9%, 72.9% and 79% respectively.
A curious issue when considering the above results is the fact that the percentage scores of the pre-sec self assessment for the 1-3 ratings nearly results as the total percentage of both the 4 and 5 ratings of the post-SEC self-assessment results. This clearly indicates that the perception of the students of their knowledge with respect to all four subjects increased considerably.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF ASSESSMENT SCORES OF 1, 2 AND 3</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF ASSESSMENT SCORES OF 4 AND 5</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF ASSESSMENT SCORES OF 1, 2 AND 3</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF ASSESSMENT SCORES OF 4 AND 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 8: STUDENTS’ SELF-EVALUATION - PREPAREDNESS FOR SEC RESIT EXAMINATIONS

ENGLISH

MALTESE

Maltese
Once again, one can note that students have shown a marked improvement in their self-assessment when comparing it to that which took place prior to the SEC Revision Classes, and their respective levels of preparation for the exam.
Chapter 9:
COMPARISON OF STUDENTS’ SELF-EVALUATION PRE-SEC REVISION CLASSES, POST-SEC REVISION CLASSES, AND PREPAREDNESS FOR SEC RESIT EXAMINATIONS

ENGLISH

MALTESE
COMPARISON OF STUDENTS’ SELF-EVALUATION PRE-SEC REVISION CLASSES, POST-SEC REVISION CLASSES, AND LEVELS OF PREPARATION FOR SEC RESIT EXAMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MALTESE</th>
<th>MATHS</th>
<th>PHYSICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating 5</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 4</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 3</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 2</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis:

One thing that stands out in this particular statistic is that most students rated themselves higher in the post-SEC Revision Classes’ statistic than they did in the exam preparation statistic. The entire purpose of the SEC Revision Classes is to prepare students for the September sessions of the SEC examinations. While it is certainly desirable that students feel that their knowledge has improved in the subjects they attended revision classes of, it is interesting that they still do not feel as prepared for the SEC September sessions.

This could indicate that despite the fact students may have made improvements in their particular subjects; even marked ones at times; they still feel a lack of confidence. Perhaps a part of the SEC Revision Classes could address this self-esteem deficit by helping students believe in themselves, not merely help them become technically more proficient in their subject.

In fact the table below depicts a realistic picture, whereby it is visible that a shift in scores from negative to positive is visible when students compared their knowledge on the respective subject pre-SEC versus post-SEC. However the self-assessment decreased slightly when students rated how prepared they were for the SEC resits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF-ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 1, 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>PRE-SEC SELF-ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>POST-SEC SELF-ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 1, 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>POST-SEC SELF-ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>EXAM PREPAREDNESS SELF ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 1, 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>EXAM PREPAREDNESS SELF ASSESSMENT - SCORES OF 4 &amp; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 10.1:  
TEACHERS’ EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL PRIOR TO SEC REVISION CLASSES

ENGLISH

MALTESE
MATHS

Physics

Maths

Physics
TEACHER EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL PRIOR TO SEC REVISION CLASSES

Analysis:

In this statistic, most teachers have indicated that many students were to be rated 3, with the curious exception of English. The majority of English teachers felt that most of the students were to be given a rating of 2.

Maltese teachers seemed to have rated their students the highest, while English teachers rated their students the lowest. Maths and Physics have received very similar ratings.
Chapter 10.2:
TEACHERS’ EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL AFTER THE SEC REVISION CLASSES

ENGLISH

MALTESE

Chapter 10.2:
TEACHERS’ EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL AFTER THE SEC REVISION CLASSES

ENGLISH

MALTESE
TEACHER EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL AFTER SEC REVISION CLASSES

Analysis:

Here it can be noted that there has been a move towards a higher rating across all subjects, with teachers feeling that most students have moved from a rating of 3 to 4.
Chapter 11:
COMPARISON OF TEACHERS’ EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL BEFORE AND AFTER THE SEC REVISION CLASSES

COMPARISON OF TEACHER EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEVEL BEFORE AND AFTER THE SEC REVISION CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:
As stated previously, most teachers in Maths, Maltese and Physics saw an improvement in their students which meant an improvement from rating 3 to rating 4. In the case of English, most teachers felt that students are almost equally divided between 3 and 4, as opposed to other subjects where a marked majority rated most students at 4.
Chapter 12:
COMPARISON BETWEEN TEACHERS AND STUDENTS PRIOR TO AND POST-SEC REVISION CLASSES ASSESSMENTS

COMPARISON BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENT PRE-SEC REVISION CLASSES ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Rating 5</th>
<th>Rating 4</th>
<th>Rating 3</th>
<th>Rating 2</th>
<th>Rating 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparision between Teacher and Student Post-SEC Revision Classes Assessments

Analysis:
In the case of the assessments, most of the perceptions of the teachers and students prior to the SEC Revision Classes are highly comparable, with the exception of rating 4, wherein this was more frequently chosen by students to rate themselves. On the other hand, teachers tended to concentrate more on rating 3, and many teachers opted to give a rating of 1 and 2.

In the case of assessments of perceptions, with regard to the level of proficiency of students, one can note that the discrepancy is greater. The majority of teachers gave most students a rating of 4 (with the exception of English teachers). Students were, on the other hand, more generous in their self-perception and rated themselves more highly. This can be seen in rating 5, where there are significant discrepancies with more students awarding themselves a 5, as opposed to teachers who were more reluctant to award a 5 to students.
Chapter 13:

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS’ PERFORMANCE

USE OF IT RESOURCES

1 12%
2 14%
3 24%
4 14%
5 36%

1 = Lowest
5 = Highest

VERBAL FEEDBACK FROM TEACHERS

1 46%
2 16%
3 33%
4 2%
5 3%

1 = Lowest
5 = Highest

WRITTEN FEEDBACK FROM TEACHERS

1 34%
2 21%
3 34%
4 8%
5 3%

1 = Lowest
5 = Highest
### Comparison of Students' Evaluation of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of IT</th>
<th>Verbal feedback from teachers</th>
<th>Written feedback from teachers</th>
<th>Handouts and printed notes</th>
<th>Class Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating 5</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 4</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 3</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 2</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 1</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Analysis:

Students have rated their teachers' performance rather highly, with the majority of students giving a rating of either a 4 or 5 across all criteria. The only exception is the use of IT, where students were more reticent to award higher ratings. However, one must note that IT resources were not equally available across all centres, and certain technical issues could not always be addressed during the same day. These issues are most likely reflected in the rating.
Chapter 14:
TEACHER EVALUATION OF YOUTH GUARANTEE’S PERFORMANCE

USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION MEETING

APPLICATION PROCESS
INTERACTION WITH YOUTH GUARANTEE TEAM

2 = Lowest
5 = Highest

PERFORMANCE OF CENTRE COORDINATOR

3 = Lowest
5 = Highest

REVIEWS OF SEC REVISION CLASSES EXPERIENCE BY TEACHERS

3 = Lowest
5 = Highest
Analysis:

The ratings of the interactions with the Youth Guarantee team seem for the most part on the high side, but there is naturally still room for improvement. The last statistic demonstrated in this chapter shows a range of issues that teachers felt that the Youth Guarantee team could improve on.

Starting off from the Information Meeting, teachers claimed that this could be better advertised, as well as providing more precise information with regard to VAT obligations that teachers have. This feedback is closely linked with the way the application process operated, and how classes were allotted. Teachers felt that the application method and their ranking could have been communicated more clearly throughout the recruitment period. This would contribute to greater clarification as to who received an opportunity to teach more than one class and who didn’t.

Some teachers felt that more resources could have been devoted to the lessons; particularly higher quality markers and erasers, as well as better IT support in order to be able to use the interactive whiteboard more effectively. Others noted that certain lessons were difficult to deliver both for themselves as well as the students due to the fact that the classrooms were too hot.

A set of teachers felt that students should be streamed according to the result that they obtained during their exams, as this would enable them to better cater for the level of the class they are teaching. A frequent issue that came up throughout the feedback was the lack of attendance during lessons and the high level of student dropouts throughout the programme, with some suggesting measures such as setting a token pecuniary charge for the lessons.

The Youth Guarantee notes with great satisfaction that the majority of feedback has however been positive, with many teachers looking forward to future iterations of the initiative. With regard to the suggestions listed in this section, these will be further discussed in greater detail within the recommendations section of this report.
Chapter 15:
**PATTERNS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS IN 2016 COHORT**

**ENGLISH TEACHERS’ FEEDBACK ON 2016 COHORT**

- Streaming students: 7%
- Student lack of commitment: 22%
- Lack of reading: 26%
- Better preparation throughout the scholastic year: 45%

**MALTESE TEACHERS’ FEEDBACK ON 2016 COHORT**

- Students need to practice reading and writing from before: 15%
- Better preparation throughout the scholastic year: 23%
- Students not motivated enough: 46%
- Streaming: 16%

**MATHEMATICS TEACHERS’ FEEDBACK ON 2016 COHORT**

- Syllabus is too difficult: 9%
- Students lacked motivation: 5%
- Better preparation throughout the scholastic years: 36%
- Introduce streaming in sec revision classes: 50%
PHYSICS TEACHERS’ FEEDBACK ON 2016 COHORT

- Lack of motivation in students: 45%
- Better preparation throughout the Scholastic year: 36%
- Streaming should be introduced into the SEC Revision Classes: 9%
- Syllabus too vast: 5%
- Lack command of English: 5%

Analysis:

The analysis undertaken from this point onwards needs to be interpreted tentatively if one adopts a quantitative point of view, since the data obtained to create these statistics was obtained through open-ended questions. This means that a deeper discussion is required, as opposed to a merely numerical comparative exercise.

The common thread running through all feedback received from teachers of every subject is that students lacked the motivation and commitment to make the most of the SEC Revision classes. The reasons for this vary from the fact that the classes take place during the summer months, when it is harder to concentrate and focus on academic studies; due to the fact that students are demotivated because they feel let down and even because they rely too much on what they can learn and achieve by attending the lessons instead of following up with assigned homework and extra study at home.

The next common thread is the fact students are not sufficiently prepared throughout the preceding scholastic years. Some teachers felt that students were taught technical knowledge of the subject with not enough exam preparation, with many students encountering an exam paper for the first time during the SEC examination, and having inadequate skills to complete the paper. Other teachers felt that students did not take Form 3 seriously enough, and therefore wasted a year that could have helped them consolidate the basis of the subjects they would eventually sit for at SEC level. Some suggestions included creating an after-school class during which course content will be revised, and maybe the students would be offered help with regards to their homework.

Many teachers mentioned the fact that SEC Revision Classes should be streamed so as to be able to help students at their level rather than trying to cater for mixed abilities. A greater discussion concerning this topic will be tackled in the Recommendations chapter.

Both Maltese and English complained about the lack of reading and how this subsequently impacted the students’ writing skills. Many teachers complained that certain skills were to be developed over three years through effort at school, as well as alone. They felt that it was difficult to impart certain linguistic skills within the five-week timeframe available to them.

As for Maths and Physics, it is interesting to note that teachers from both subjects complained that the syllabus was either too vast or too difficult for students to grasp. An interesting insight came from a group of Physics teachers that felt that the students’ lack of proficiency in the English language jeopardised their chances of success in their subject. This particular opinion poses an interesting argument on the interconnectivity of subjects at least at a core level, particularly when linguistic skills are concerned. This assertion that weak linguistic skills could impact proficiency in other subjects is an interesting assertion and deserves further study.
Chapter 16:
COMPARISON BETWEEN PREVIOUS AND CURRENT COHORTS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS

ENGLISH TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE:
STUDENT COMPARISON OVER THE YEAR

- Similar to last year: 34%
- Worse than last year: 23%
- Better than last year: 20%
- Can’t Compare: 14%
- First year: 3%
- No reply: 6%

MALTESE TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE:
STUDENT COMPARISON OVER THE YEARS

- Similar to last year: 52%
- Worse than last year: 14%
- Better than last year: 10%
- Can’t Compare: 10%
- First year: 7%
- No reply: 7%
MATHEMATICS TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE:
STUDENT COMPARISON OVER THE YEARS

- Similar to last year: 27%
- Worse than last year: 21%
- Better than last year: 4%
- Can't Compare: 10%
- First year: 23%
- No reply: 15%

MATHEMATICS TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE:
STUDENT COMPARISON OVER THE YEARS

- Similar to last year: 26%
- Worse than last year: 29%
- Better than last year: 6%
- Can't Compare: 15%
- First year: 15%
- No reply: 15%
Analysis:

The first interesting aspect of this particular statistic is the fact that a large number of teachers felt that they could not compare students between cohorts, or avoided answering the question altogether. The statistical salience of those who did not reply is quite high, and while one can infer and give educated guesses as to why they chose not to reply, it is a pity they chose not to do so as their lack of response has impacted the result by compromising the sample.

Looking at the teachers who chose to answer this question, however, one can see that the majority of the teachers claimed that the students were either of last year’s level, or indeed better. A very small minority claimed that the students were worse than those of the previous year. If one allows the statistic claiming that this year’s students were worse than last year to cancel the one claiming that this year’s students were better than last year as a mere random probability - wherein one year could be slightly better and one year slightly worse - there still remains a significant number claiming that the level is similar to last year’s.

This is significant because this cohort of students was the first cohort to not be subjected to the common entrance exam. While a cautious approach is always warranted, particularly due to the fact that a statistically salient number of teachers did not respond the question, it seems that there have been no major fluctuations in the level of students.
Chapter 17:  
PATTERNS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS IN LAST THREE COHORTS (2014-2016)

ENGLISH TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE: 
PATTERNS IDENTIFIED BETWEEN DIFFERENT COHORTS

- Dropped out: 3%
- Course too short: 3%
- Student had too many subjects to study: 60%
- Lack of motivation: 3%
- More motivated: 14%
- No patterns: 0%
- Not prepared enough: 11%
- Did not respond: 6%
MATHEMATICS TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE:
PATTERNS IDENTIFIED BETWEEN DIFFERENT COHORTS

- Absenteeism: 49%
- Dropped out: 4%
- Lack of motivation: 2%
- More motivated: 17%
- No patterns: 19%
- Not prepared enough: 2%
- Did not respond: 3%

PHYSICS TEACHERS’ PERSPECTIVE:
PATTERNS IDENTIFIED BETWEEN DIFFERENT COHORTS

- Absenteeism: 46%
- Dropped out: 3%
- Students had too many subjects to study: 6%
- Lack of motivation: 11%
- More motivated: 3%
- No patterns: 23%
- Not prepared enough: 3%
- Did not respond: 5%
### Analysis:

Once again, in this statistic it is highly conspicuous that most of the teachers did not respond to this question or felt that there were no patterns. This raises the issue whether such questions are too broad in scope to ask in questionnaires, and require more in-depth investigation in order to determine the possibility of patterns.

The rest of the issues mentioned by the teachers mostly relate to the fact that students were de-motivated, had frequent absenteeism, and dropped out throughout the course. Ways in which student engagement is to be increased needs to be looked into in order to develop the initiative further.

One of the reasons why student engagement is low is the possibility that students were allowed to attend lessons for up to three subjects. This could prove to be a particularly overwhelming experience which would include 18 hours of lessons - not including the hours spent on preparation and homework. Such a taxing experience may be too difficult for weaker students, and students would be better served if there was a capping of two subjects that they could apply for. In this way, students could focus more of their time and energy on fewer subjects which would hopefully result in better lesson engagement.
Chapter 18: OVERALL ANALYSIS

This report has brought to light several issues which are of great interest and which merit further investigation. The first issue is that students rate themselves more highly than their teachers. This does not come as a big surprise as few people would be inclined to give themselves a low rating, however it might be indicative of a deeper issue, namely the students’ lack of ability to appraise themselves accurately. The students’ inability to accurately assess their proficiency in a subject could lead to their lack of commitment throughout the school year because they would be overestimating their ability, underestimating the difficulty of the content, or doing both when preparing for an exam. Tackling this inability will prove a challenge for all educators involved in the students’ preparation for the exam.

An ancillary issue that emerged from the research undertaken is the lack of commitment of the students. A high rate of dropouts and low attendance impeded students from making the most of the SEC Revision classes. The reasons for the following can be connected to the fact the revision classes take place during the summer, when the fact that their peers could be enjoying their vacation time could significantly impact their motivation.

Chapter 19: RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Provide classrooms with better amenities when possible, particularly air-conditioning.

In most cases, students seemed to indicate that they were satisfied with the facilities available to them with most rating the facilities at their disposal 4 or 5. However in one of the centres in which the SEC Revision classes were held, no air conditioners were available. This can be seen in the results concerning room temperature, where more students gave the 1, 2, 3 rating when compared to the other factors being reviewed.

2. Supply teachers with more resources; such as photocopiers, drinking water, and better interactive whiteboard troubleshooting support.

Most of the teachers have given favourable ratings of the facilities and resources at hand, however in every statistic 40% of the teachers have given a rating of 3 or lower. More can be done in this regard, such as by providing air-conditioned classrooms and supplying free water to the teachers. Teachers can also be further supported throughout the lessons by putting photocopiers at the disposal of teachers. This will allow teachers to further support students by providing supplementary handouts and notes.

3. Nurture an environment where students feel more comfortable evaluating their proficiency more realistically.

SEC Revision Classes’ teachers need to create a nurturing environment where students understand that the first step to improvement is acknowledging the true extent of their abilities within a subject.

4. Give more detailed and transparent information meetings for teachers.

The Information Meeting needs to be more precise with regards to VAT obligations that teachers have, as well as how the ranking mechanism would work. This would lead to greater clarity as to how classes were allotted to the teachers, particularly when a second one was set.

5. Put in place systems to reduce the amount of absenteeism throughout the Revision Classes.

A frequent issue that surfaced in the feedback was the lack of attendance during lessons, and the high level of student dropouts throughout the programme. While some teachers suggested measures, such as setting a token pecuniary charge for the lessons, other measures will need to be investigated.
6. Create a system of streaming for student-based results achieved. This will not be implemented.

Many teachers mentioned the fact that SEC Revision Classes should be streamed so as to be able to help students at their level rather than trying to cater for mixed abilities. While on an administrative level this would be impossible because to cater for grade, choice of subject/s and locality would require much more expenditure than the budget currently allowed by the project, there are also other issues which need to be addressed. While teaching mixed ability classes can be a demanding and sometimes near impossible feat; as some of the teachers have noted in the questionnaires; there are also advantages as the stronger students can serve as motivation for the weaker students.

7. Conduct research on certain sensitive issues by using more qualitative approaches which allow you to capture the nuances of each situation.

In a number of questions, teachers either did not respond to the question or felt that there was nothing they needed to add. This raises the issue whether certain questions are too broad in scope to ask in questionnaires, and require more in-depth, personalized investigation in order to determine the possibility of patterns.

Chapter 20:
CONCLUSION

In this report, an attempt has been made to try to analyse the different aspects that comprise the SEC Revision Classes initiative. While in many instances a variety of positive remarks were made about the various aspects of the initiative, there is still more work to be done to provide more comfort for the students, as well as give them more support during the revision lessons. There is also more work that can be done to provide teachers with more tools and resources so that they can better support the students in their classes as well as to ensure that they remain motivated and committed to the initiative. Finally more research and investigation needs to take place but which will have a more qualitative approach so that more insights can be uncovered about how to improve the teaching process for both the students and the teachers as a whole.
Annex 1

TEACHER’S ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

For each item identified below, use the rating scale to select the quality number. (1 means that you were unhappy with service or material; 5 means you were very happy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Questionnaire</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The information meeting was useful.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There were adequate resources (e.g. past papers, whiteboard, interactive whiteboard, markers, dusters).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The application process was straightforward.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The SEC Revision Classes were well advertised for teachers and students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you speak to, or correspond with, a Youth Guarantee Officer?</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If yes, how would you rate your interaction?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The classroom and premises were comfortable and clean.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Centre Coordinator was helpful, organized and available.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The SEC Revision Classes were overall a positive experience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you have any recommendations on what can be improved in the SEC Revision classes (These might be related to the issues mentioned in the questionnaire, or any other issue).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER’S STUDENT EVALUATION

Please indicate the subject taught:

For each item identified below, use the rating scale to select the quality number. (1 means that you were unhappy with service or material, 5 means you were very happy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Student Evaluation</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In your opinion, were the students attending your class in possession of all skills relevant to the SEC examination?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you speak to, or correspond with, a Youth Guarantee Officer?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please suggest what can be improved:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. a. If you have already taught within the SEC Revision Classes initiative, do you think you can compare this year’s students’ knowledge with that of previous years?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

b. Have there been any changes or patterns that could be identified?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. How do you rate the students’ skills development process from the first week to date?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Student Questionnaire / Kwestjonarju Tal-istudent

1. I got to know about the revision classes through / Sirt naf dwar il-klassijiet ta’ reviżjoni mill-

   a. The news (TV and radio) / L-ahbarijiet (fuq it-TV u r-radju)
   
   b. Facebook™
   
   c. The newspapers / Gazetti
   
   d. An SMS from Matsec board / SMS mill-bord tal-MATSEC
   
   e. Friends or relatives / Hbieb u qropa

   f. Other / Ohrajn

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indicate which subject/s you applied for / Indika ghal liema suqgetto/i applikajt

   a. English / Ingliż
   
   b. Maltese / Malti
   
   c. Maths / Matematika
   
   d. Physics / Fizika

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How would you rate your level of knowledge in the subject area/s you have applied for before the revision classes? / Kif tahseb li l-livell tieghek fis-suqgett/i li applikajt ghalih/om qabel il-kors tar- Reviżjoni? (1 hazin/poor; 5 excellent/excellent)

   a. English / Ingliż
   
   b. Maltese / Malti
   
   c. Maths / Matematika
   
   d. Physics / Fizika

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How important do you think each of the following factors is for a lesson? / Kemm huma importanti dawn il-fatturi għall-lezzjoni?
(1 - least important and 5 - most important / 1 - l-inqas importanti u 5 - l-aktar importanti)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Use of IT / L-użu tal-IT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Verbal feedback from teachers regarding my work / Tagħrif mill-ġhalliema bil-kliem dwar ix-xogħol tiegħi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Written feedback from teachers regarding my work / Tagħrif mill-ġhalliema bil-miktub dwar ix-xogħol tiegħi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Handouts and printed notes / Handouts u noti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Class discipline / Dīxxplina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you rate your level of knowledge in the subject area/s you have applied for after the revision classes? / Kif tahseb li hu l-livell tiegħek fis-suġġett/i li aplikajt għallom wara il-kors tar-Reviżjoni? (1 hazin/poor; 5 excellent/ eccellenti)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. English / Ingliż</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maltese / Malti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maths / Matematika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Physics / Fizika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In your opinion the number of students in class was / Fi-opinjoni tiegħek in-numru ta’ studenti fil-klassi kien

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Too much / Hafna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Just the right amount / Kif ghandu jkun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Too low / Baxx hafna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In your opinion was the number of lessons per week enough? / Fl-opinjoni tieghek kien biżżejjied in-numru tal-lezzjonijiet fil-gimgha?

a. Yes / Iva
b. No / Le

If no, what can be done about this? / Jekk le, x’tahseb li ghandu jsir dwar dan?

8. There was enough individual support throughout the revision classes. / Kien hemm biżżejjied attenzjoni individwali matul il-kors ta’ reviżjoni.
(1 - ma naqbilx hafna/strongly disagree; 5 naqbel hafna/strongly agree)

1 2 3 4 5

9. How satisfactory were the facilities for the purpose of the training? / Kemm kienu sodisfačenti l-faqilitajiet għat-taħrig?
(1 - least satisfactory and 5 - most satisfactory / 1 - l-inqas sodisfačenti u 5 - l-aktar sodisfačenti)

a. Classroom environment / L-ambjent tal-klassi
b. Cleanliness / L-indafa
c. Seating / Il-post fejn qghad t’bliqegħda
d. Size of room / Il-kobor tal-kamra
e. Lighting / Id-dawl
f. Room temperature / It-temperatura tal-kamra
10. How satisfactory were the training aids and resources used during the course? Mark where applicable only. / Kemm kienu sodisfaċenti ir-risorsi u żati matul il-kors? Immarka fejn applikabbli biss. (1 - least satisfactory and 5 most satisfactory / 1 l-inqas sodisfaċenti u 5 - l-aktar sodisfaċenti)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Interactive whiteboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Past papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Pictures / Stampi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Flashcards / Karti bil-kliem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How well prepared do you feel for the resit exam? / Kemm thossok ippreparat ghal-eżami tar-resit? (1 - is very unprepared and 5 - is very prepared / 1 - m’jien ippreparat xejn u 5 - ippreparat hafna)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. English / Ingliz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maltese / Malti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maths / Matematika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Physics / Fizika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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