Review Report
of the
Georgian Education Development Project:

Education Support Program

July 2002

Contents:

Abbreviations:

BA	Bachelor of Arts
EDMD	Education Decentralization and Management Development Program
EDP	Education Development Program
ESP	Education Support Program
IEP	Institute for Educational Policy (defunct)
MAPA	Integrated Planning and Evaluation
MOE	The Ministry of Education
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OSGF	Open Society Georgia Foundation
PTA	Parent Teacher Associations
RSA	Reform Support Agency
SBS	Step by Step
TPP	Textbook Publishing Program
TSU	Tbilisi State University
UTTP	University Teacher Training Program

Purpose of the Review:

The purpose of the final review on the Education Development Project (EDP) is to provide the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF) with a report which will explore the major achievements and impact its programs have made, to explore the sustainability of the programs, specifically regarding how viable the chances are for the agents of these programs to survive as a constituent part of the educational environment after the EDP's end, and to help inform an exit strategy for follow-up activity after the close of the EDP.

This summative review can be a useful pointer to effect OSGF's future strategy and fundraising plans. For the Board, it may be important for accountability in relation to content and quality, and importantly, it can be used for disseminating learning and experience gleaned from EDP projects.

This review compares real project outcomes to the stated objectives in the original plans. An attempt at this was made for programs' contribution to achieving the goals of the overall EDP as well as for each individual program's ability to meet its own objectives. This review also attempts to understand some of the major obstacles to timely implementation, which may have influenced project outcomes.

Background:

An original "megaproject"[1] strategy paper contained three main components: Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Step by Step, and Textbooks and was named "Partners in Education." Actual program development began at the end of 1996 with the formation of a working group. The preparation of the first program was completed in July 1997. In

---

[1] The terms Megaproject and Education Development Project are used interchangeably.

September 1997 George Soros doubled the EDP's funding from three million to six million dollars.

In the latter part of 1997, it was mandated that all EDP strategies be rethought and revised to provide for serious systemic impact and sustainability in the countries in which they function. In May 1998, The Institute for Educational Policy (IEP) began to work closely with the foundation in driving forward a new strategy development procedure.

The Open Society Education Sub Board approved the revised EDP strategy paper in February 1999. The revised strategy still contained the original program areas, however, its newly developed program areas were based on a thorough needs assessment that constituted part of the strategy development process.

Strategy of "Partners in Education"

The strategy of the EDP was to target key areas that reflect both the needs in the system and the open society agenda. Underpinning this was to target those areas where the World Bank would not be working, or to lay the groundwork of good practice that would later leverage World Bank money when loans began disbursement.

The February 1999 approved strategy was grouped into the following main **priority areas**, which represent the strategic goals of the strategy. At the same time, all programs would have crosscutting components:

A. **Content** (curriculum, standards, textbooks, teaching materials, etc.)
B. **Methodology** (teacher training, support materials for teachers, models)
C. **Assessment** (system, schools, students, teachers)
D. **Management** (at central, regional and school levels; school/community relations)

	Policy Support	Educational Resources	Equity and Equal Opportunity	Public Information	Further Analysis
Content • Textbooks • Curriculum & Standards					
Methodology • Step by Step • Other Foundation Programs (UTTP)					
Assessment • Pilot Research • National system of assessment					
Management • School level (PTA, School Director Training) • District (Training) • MOE (Training and Policy Support					

Development of Programs:

The development of program areas took time (between March 1999 and August 2000) and the nature of the programs evolved and changed from the original strategic plan. Not all programs were developed and implemented at the same time, but rather on a rolling basis.

The reasons for this are the following:

- World Bank changes in their strategic areas early on in EDP development
- Many programs were developed as original designs, thus much consultation and thinking was necessary to shape them as originals. This took time.
- Many stakeholders were involved in developing programs: OSGF staff, Institute for Educational Policy and the OSGF Education and Executive Boards. Often times there was not consensus on the content of programs, which stalled their beginning implementation.

Implementation and phasing out of programs was not completed all at the same time.

Implementation Time Frame

EDP Programs	Date Begun	Date Completed
Step by Step	October 1997	ongoing
Parent Teacher Association	February 1998	December 2001
Textbook Publishing Program	August 1998	September 2002
Education Decentralization Management Development Program	March 2000	July 2002
Reform Support Agency	September 2000	July 2002
University Teacher Training Program	April 2000	July 2002

Review Design:

The main review instruments were document analysis, structured individual interviews, and focus group interviews (see Appendix 4). Internal evaluation outcomes undertaken by OSGF staff using the MAPA technique are also taken into consideration.

This review of PTA, TPP, RSA and UTTP was undertaken by Christina McDonald. Step by Step has not been included as this program is overseen by Children and Youth, which is assisting with review and exit strategy. The Education Decentralization Management Program was externally evaluated by a group from Columbia University, OSGF and the Education Support Program. Their results and recommendations are included in this final review.

Sample Size: Due to time limitations and human resources limitations, the review was limited in the number of stakeholders it included. Thus, the sample is quite small, relative to the scale of the programs. Each program profile section will describe the scope of the program and the sample size.

Limitations of the Review:

This review could not:

Parent Teacher Associations Program:
- Measure the degree of schools' improvement with a control set of schools.
- Measure improvement in students learning outcomes in participating schools.
- Measure the level of satisfaction of schools, parents, teachers, and students with PTAs.

Textbooks:
- Measure larger impact of public opinion of procedures and transparency of textbook publishing.
- Measure the quality of textbooks, both content and cosmetics, created.
- Measure the extent to which the program has contributed to the percent of children in Georgia with textbooks
- Measure how textbooks contributed to changing teaching practice and methodology in the classroom

Reform Support Agency:
- Evaluate the quality of the products (policy paper, analysis instrument) created.
- Evaluate the quality of the services delivered by technical assistance.

University Teacher Training Program:
- Evaluate the quality of the courses and activities developed through the grant program.
- Evaluate the quality of the services delivered by technical assistance.

Education Decentralization and Management Program
- Evaluate the quality of the courses and activities delivered by the core team.
- Evaluate the quality of the services delivered by technical assistance.

Review Questions:

- *Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP?*
- *Was your program able to achieve its objectives stated in the implementation plan?*
- *What were the major achievements (outcomes and effects), of your program over the course of its life?[2]*
- *What is the potential sustainable impact of the project and implications for nationwide implementation?[3]*

---

[2]**Outcomes** of the project include competencies, skills and knowledge of the target group, changed attitudes, modified behaviors, and/or improved status of the target group which was achieved as a result of the project. **Effects** of the project mean those changes that will happen in as a result of the project intervention.

Questions to Inform Exit Strategy and Future Planning

- *What has not occurred, but needs to happen to ensure this project's initial work and impact is enhanced/sustained in the future?*

<u>Findings by Program</u>

Parent Teacher Associations (PTA)

The PTA program was developed to promote civic involvement and responsibility in the education reform effort, and to change the culture and process of educational decision making into a more democratic one. Ultimately it works toward creating an overall system that will promote and increase true quality in education and benefit children everywhere in Georgia. The program worked towards this aim by involving parents into the life of the school and into decision-making procedures, by opening up the school to the community and stakeholders. The PTA program developed sites, trained members of various disciplines, emphasized fund-raising and self-sustainability of the PTA organizations, promoted information exchange, and public debate. A National PTA was established containing representatives of local PTA organizations and other partners to protect needs and interests of children nation-wide. It acts as a voice to all local associations, and expresses their aspirations and needs on national level.

Total Budget Spent: **$410,261**
Time Frame: **3 years 9 months** (February 1998 – December 2001)
Communities Involved: Total **50 schools** in **7** major **cities** in **all regions** of Georgia
Target group[4]: **100**
Stakeholder[5] Involvement: **500+**

Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP? **Yes.**

The PTA program was one of the main programs that contributed to the **Management** priority area (vertical axis) of the original strategy. The PTA also contributed several **crosscutting components** reflected in the strategy of the EDP.

The PTA program, though having a strong impact on school-level management, has <u>not been able to make major national policy changes</u> due to several factors: there has been little interest from government for its work and consequently no demand from the Ministry of Education. A demand from schools, however, from outside the immediate network has begun to grow. The demand for PTA results

---

[3] **Sustainable impact** refers to the achievement of effective systemic change in an education system such that the costs for change are absorbed by the system itself and that the impetus for further positive changes comes from within the system.

[4] By target group we mean those people directly targeted by program activities.

[5] By stakeholders we mean those persons who were indirectly involved by program activities.

from the fact that schools involved in PTA have demonstrated an increase in school attendance as a result of the changes they were implementing.[6] A school has interest in increasing its enrolment rates, since schools that do not have enough students are likely to be closed. The Ministry of Education issued a communication to schools that they "should pay attention to parents' needs." This is most likely the result of shifts in students wanting to attend PTA schools.

Through its network of eight operating resource centers in five regions of Georgia, the PTA program has built a **resource base** available to all its members. It provides access to foreign literature on specific PTA issues, computer-aided information services, round-table discussions, consultations and training in the areas of concern. These resource centers facilitate PTA communication and contacts with different organizations and institutions in Georgia and other countries. In addition to resource centers, the program has contributed by publishing several books and brochures on how to successfully run PTAs.

In its various activities and first of all in choosing PTA sites, the program has considered the participation of schools from remote, economically underdeveloped, ethnically and culturally diverse rayons, communities and neighborhoods. **Equity and equal opportunity issues** have always been given special attention. Today in its independent NGO form, this program supports the education of poor children and street children through bidding on government contracts.

Through its publications (PTA presentation booklet, Guidebook and Newsletter), conferences and contacts with media (radio broadcast), the PTA program has contributed to **Public Information** on educational reform, community and parent involvement in school life, and advanced methods of teaching and parenting. There have been twelve articles written on the achievements of the program.

Did the program achieve its objectives stated in the implementation plan? **Yes.**

The objectives in the original implementation plan are:
- To involve parents into the life of the school and into decision-making procedures.
- To open up the school to the community and stakeholders.
- To support PTAs and create conditions for their network which will promote information exchange, professional development, public debate, and a pressure group on state policy-making decisions in education.
- To support teachers' professional development.
- To help parents get involved in the learning process of their children.
- To create an environment in schools to be open to child-centered methodologies.

---

[6] One school cited a change in enrolment from 750 to 900 students, another from 1,385 to 1,700 students.

The biggest achievement of this program is making concrete positive changes in the functioning of schools and the teaching and learning that happens in schools. This program has heavily contributed to **instilling civic responsibility** and **open management** of schools in Georgia.

Some observable differences that focus group participants discussed were actual physical changes in schools. PTA groups became more **pro-active** and began searching for resources to bring into the school. The communities of participating schools took initiative to beautify grounds, paint walls, and even in some cases, build and develop micro-enterprises that helped bring resources to the school (schools cited buffets, canteens, hair salon, bakery and a laundry as their enterprise activities) and to provide services to the community. Acting upon a sense of civic responsibility, some participating schools used the canteen or buffet as a way to engage and involve community members who were either retired or unemployed. The community members worked on a voluntary basis. At the same time, the food service provided meals for poor children.

The open management of schools has helped to involve parents, and **change attitudes toward school**. Parents are now less resistant to change, have expressed a new **trust** toward the school, all because their views are taken into consideration for decisions that immediately affect the school and communities.

Both civic involvement and open management of schools have impacted the practice that takes place in the classroom. **Teachers have more freedom** to experiment with pedagogical techniques, and may rearrange their classrooms accordingly. Teachers expressed that they are happier working in this "flat" management style. The children also benefit from the transformation of these schools. Teachers and school directors have notice a **decrease in absenteeism** and even **less tension** among students. School has become a place to get kids off the street.

The program has spun-off into a separate NGO beginning in January 2002 in partnership with the Critical Thinking Program and is named the "Association of School, Family and Society." The NGO has been quite successful in negotiating free space, with room for offices, and public training facilities, has been able to raise funds through government bids and will seek funding for major projects through donors other than OSGF.

A legacy of experienced trainers, active PTAs, and resource centers could be drawn upon for expertise and training once decentralisation begins in Georgia. The position of "methodologists," that in the previous education system provided support to schools, has

been abolished in 2000. Thus, if schools receive autonomy, there will need to be a service provider to help them with new roles and responsibilities. The issue of whether decentralisation will occur, however, currently remains unknown (see EDMD program).

There has begun to be a visible demand from schools and communities across Georgia for the skills and improvements that occur as a result of including PTAs in schools.

What has not occurred, but needs to happen to ensure this project's initial work and impact is enhanced/sustained in the future?

This program has achieved its goals, and seems to have a solid base upon which to function. The human and physical resources created in this project should be used for training and capacity building through future educational work supported through OSGF, or through government sponsored initiatives.

Textbook Publishing Program (TPP)

The Textbook Publishing Program focused primarily on creating a transparent mechanism for textbook creation. In addition, it also published and printed a discreet number of books. A Textbook Competition Committee oversees the selection of Evaluation Expert Groups in different subject areas on the basis of selection criteria. Clear criteria for book selection exist, which were developed in a participatory manner by many stakeholders, and originally with the assistance of external experts. An appeals process exists, which helps to assure transparency of the process, and monitor the quality of the evaluation committee experts. Publishers work directly with authors, and teachers are involved in the textbook creation process.

Projected Total Expenditures by 9/02**: $321,258**
Time frame: **4 years** (August 1998 – September 2002)
Competitions Supported: **5**
Professional Development Seminars: **18** (Appendix 1)
Total Number Books Printed: **10,000**
Subjects of Books: **All curricula subjects**
Target Group**: 200**
Stakeholder Involvement: **500+**

Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP? **Yes.**

The Textbook Publishing Program **(TPP)** was the major program that contributed to the **Content** priority area (vertical axis) of the original strategy.

In terms of cross-cutting areas, the TPP was also very strong. It contributed directly to **policy support** in Georgia by piloting an absolutely new and transparent process and mechanisms for open and transparent textbook creation and selection in Georgia. The legal framework for open competitions was established as a direct result of the project's activities. It became a decree by the Ministry of Education, approved by the Ministry of

Justice, and passed by Parliament. Such a procedure began the breakup of monopoly influence in textbook selection and production.

TPP contributed to offering new **educational resources** to Georgia, which was in dire need of new books. Instead of paying to just print and distribute books, however, this program only paid for small print runs (500 of winning books) that could be piloted in schools for appropriateness. This was a strategic but necessary use of funds. Those books "griffed"[7] as a result of the program will have a life of five years.

This program **did not explicitly target equity** and equal opportunities issues, though in Georgia where most students are deprived of basic educational materials, providing the opportunity for some students to obtain textbooks was a step in the right direction.

It was recommended by David Lambert as early as September 2000 to conduct a **public relations campaign** to help overcome widespread reported 'public indifference' to education reform in general and textbook change in particular. The TPP launched a PR spot to inform the public about the benefits of purchasing authentic textbooks as opposed to black market textbooks. This was part of a series of three textbook bookfairs held in different cities. This contributed toward opening up a legal distribution system.

TPP contributed to **further analysis** by supporting a small pre-pilot rental scheme, which illustrated extremely important structural matters that need to be addressed in advance of national policy implementation and the World Bank Project. This research was shared with the World Bank in order to help inform their policies.

Did the program achieve its objectives stated in the implementation plan? **Yes.**

The program has achieved its original objectives that were stated in the program's original implementation plan:

- Creating of a new mechanism for evaluation and selection of new textbooks
- Support a team of publishers and authors in textbook publishing
- Capacity building of decision makers, subject experts and teachers using new textbooks
- Publishing nine new textbooks by September 1999
- Publishing new textbooks in 18 subject-grade area by September 2000
- Publishing 3 new textbooks based on reformed curricula by September 2001

Delays in implementation were due, primarily, to internal political reasons, oftentimes the result of communication problems between the Ministry of Education and Parliament.

What were the major achievements (outcomes and effects) of the program over the course of its life?

The significance of the TPP in **supporting principled entrepreneurial activity** in

---

[7] Approved for use in schools by the Ministry of Education

relation to textbook publishing should not be underestimated: the textbook competitions are supremely important in this respect, **helping establish quality standards**.[8]

The TPP has been successful in opening up informed debate about the *place of textbooks* in the school system, and **quality criteria** in relation to content design, curriculum planning and pedagogy. The criteria for textbook selection have been developed through a process, and there is still room for improvement. Some have said that the general quality of books has increased as much as 50%.

Though stakeholders recognise a shortage of 'qualified professionals' at every level: authors, evaluators, designers, editors and publishers, the TPP is nevertheless widely acknowledged for providing **valued training for both authors and evaluators**. There is now an emerging body of professionals, primarily authors and publishers, who are engaged in a new process for textbook creation. Many cite new skills as better knowledge of distribution techniques, management skills for publishers, etc. As one stakeholder said, "young authors have appeared, and old ones have disappeared," perhaps as much as 40% increase in new authors.

One unexpected outcome was an increase in those becoming interested in publishing in general. Just as there has been an increase in authors, the number of applicants to the center for publishing studies at Tbilisi State University has increased by 50% over the last two and a half years.

There is widespread stakeholder agreement that the TPP has had **significant and positive impact on MOE thinking**. The TPP has been referred to as the 'think tank' of curriculum change, 'engine for change', and a key part of the 'process of renewal', providing the basis for a 'new culture' and 'new momentum'. The TPP has, according to many, been instrumental in raising the level of awareness among the MOE and others of the need for strategic thinking and planning structures and mechanisms to enable change.[9]

> *What is the potential sustainable impact of the project and implications for nationwide implementation?*

There are a multitude of issues which can be thought of as obstacles to ensuring quality textbooks for all children in Georgia. Some of these echo the fundamental economic/financial problems in Georgia and others are of a more specific nature. Textbook developments form one of the six components of the WB Project. It is hoped that when the WB loan begins, the practices begun by OSGF will automatically be continued by the MOE which plans to introduce new national curriculum standards (grades 1 – 4) from 2003.

The MOE has verbally promised to continue this open process starting from September 2002. There is, however, still wide scepticism among stakeholders that they indeed will keep their promise.

---

[8] David Lambert (September 2000) Formative Evaluation of the OSGF Textbook Publishing Program
[9] taken from David Lambert, 2000.

Georgian capacity has been developed and some experts have been able to share their experience internationally by consulting on a similar project in Kazakhstan.

There will be no need to continue activity in this program after its projected end in September 2002. It has been suggested that the program co-ordinator write up the program's experience as a **Case Study** to be shared with other Foundations and countries.

Reform Support Agency (RSA)

> The Reform Support Agency consists of two principal strands: building individual capacity for policy analysis and creating demand in Georgia for education reform through the use of analyses created by an established and accepted RSA. The RSA acts as an analytical agency, assessing the current state of affairs in education and working out possible solutions for the direction of the education reform. At the same time an RSA acts as an information disbursement agency on reform issues and monitors education reform in a country. To assist reform to happen, an RSA can mobilize the education community for involvement in education reform. To accomplish these goals, the RSA program invested in 4 highly qualified Georgians who were to engage in a series of technical, strategic, and communication tasks for the support of education reform in Georgia.
>
> Total Budget Spent: **$367,991**
> Time frame: **1 year, 10 months** (September 2000 – June 2002)
> Target Group: **4**
> Stakeholder Involvement: **300**

Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP? **Yes.**

The RSA developed as the last program of the EDP, and was not included in the original strategy. The RSA proved to be a necessary and critical component of the overall mission of the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF) to promote democratic deliberation as part of the public policy process. Thus, unlike other program areas, this primarily represents a crosscutting area of **policy support,** which was to reflect upon the work of the other EDP programs representing the vertical axis of the strategy.

Did the program achieve its objectives stated in the implementation plan? **No.**

By the official end of the EDP in June 2002, the program was only partially able to meet its original objectives, which were to:

1. Act as an analytical agency, assessing the current state of affairs in education and working out possible solution for the direction of the education reform and ad-hoc interventions,
2. Act as an information disbursement agency on reform issues,

3. Monitor education reform in the country,
4. Mobilize the education community for involvement in education reform
5. Provide technical expertise upon government request
6. Offer capacity building in various educational aspects

It was expected that the RSA would develop the capacity and credibility necessary to attract further support in order to expand its role in support of education reform.

What were the major achievements (outcomes and effects) of the program over the course of its life?

One of the major achievements of the RSA has been to complete a policy analytical tool— the *Georgia Education System Projection Model*. The RSA has also succeeded in creating drafts of three policy papers: teacher supply and demand, education finance and fiscal transfers, scaling-up good practice. Lastly, the program built capacity in a core team of experts who were trained to conduct policy analysis and communicate ideas of reform to a larger stakeholder audience. Despite these achievements, the overall objectives have not been met.

What is the potential sustainable impact of the project and implications for nation-wide implementation?

A general analysis of the context in Georgia revealed that there is no real capacity or infrastructure outside of OSGF at the moment to take on the work of the RSA, or to pay for the work of the RSA. On the other hand, the work of the RSA could be a major contributor to helping reforms continue in education after the end of the EDP and at the beginning of the World Bank Loan's disbursement. In particular, the RSA could work as a consultant to the newly developed Ministry's Information and Management Systems unit, which was recently established.

What has not occurred, but needs to happen to ensure this project's initial work and impact is enhanced/sustained in the future?

A vital component of the RSA program was to create a "reform support network," to help generate demand for reform in the country. This was to be achieved through a series of reform support workshops, which were to spur demand for additional analysis and policy options by different education actors (government, donors, the general public, specific education stakeholders – parents, teachers, etc.) and that would establish the RSA's credibility in Georgia.

In December 2001, OSGF management decided that before the RSA should get involved in supporting the development of a Reform Support Network, core team members should have completed analytical outputs. The finalisation of policy papers, however, was not achieved because of stalled EDP activity from January 1, 2002, which OSGF management requested so they could better plan their exit strategy. Moreover, though capacity was developed in an original core team of reform support agents, many of the original members of the team left for better opportunities and were employed elsewhere.

Thus, the majority of the key activities, which were to constitute a core part of the program, were never completed, and the program itself was left with few core team members with whom to finalize and carry on work.

Despite its difficult past, the RSA still has potential to meet its original objectives if it is allowed to finalize the activities that it originally set out to achieve. OSGF should stand by its original commitments to the RSA program that it endorsed when the RSA strategy was approved (July 2000). If these activities are not carried out, the original financial investments that OSGF put into the program will have been in vain. There is still chance, however, to capitalize on that original investment and to ensure the program's impact.

RSA should remain an integral component of OSGF's future education activities. It should be integrated into any activity planned with a policy focus, a criteria which George Soros put for three year education strategies to begin in 2003.

University Teacher Training Program (UTTP)

The University Teacher Training Program was complex and operated on two levels: Capacity building through institutional development (grants) and professional development workshops; Policy impact through stakeholder discussion and dissemination of information. Since the grants reached numerous universities and consisted of various projects, it is not possible to characterize this program in a homogenous manner. The projects supported ranged from course development, pedagogical center development to introducing new credit system in pre-service education.

Total Budget Spent: **$308,021**
Time Frame: **2 years 2 months** (April 2000 – June 2002)
Tenders Announced: **2**; **17** Projects awarded to **9** institutions; **20** state and private institutions involved (Appendix 2)
Target Group: **100**
Stakeholder Involvement: **400**

Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP? **Yes.**

The University Teacher Training Program **(UTTP)** was the major program that contributed to the **Methodology** priority area (vertical axis) of the original strategy.

In terms of cross-cutting areas, the UTTP has <u>not yet been able to contribute to policy changes on the national level</u>. It is envisioned that this will be the primary component of follow-up work. At the **institutional level**, however, the program has already contributed to major **policy changes** that could potentially be scaled-up.

At Tbilisi State University (as well as its branches in the regions (Akhaltsikhe, Signagi, Zugdidi, Marneuli, Akhalkalaki, Sukhumi, a **new credit system**, **new curriculum** and a **model of pre-service teacher education** and **teacher accreditation** will have been

introduced. The new model implies non-compulsory teaching of pedagogical disciplines for students and their free choice to become teachers.[10] This is, "totally revolutionary for Georgia," according to one teacher, and gives students more freedom. To support this new framework, a new teacher education center at Tbilisi State University will provide a two-year post-bachelor's course on pedagogy and award a certificate for teacher qualification upon completion. The course will be provided free of charge to TSU Bachelor graduates if taken within the first two years after completing their BA. After expiry of this period the pedagogical courses will be charged. Twenty-five teachers of economics for secondary schools were first trained in Georgia in the center at Tbilisi State University.

The UTTP has been able to involve the Rectors of university, which form a significant legitimate power base in Georgia for the current government. The Council of Rectors has probably the highest authority in the matters of higher education - including teacher education. The Rectors have not only allowed the piloting of courses, but already **allowed changes to already be recognized and integrated into the next years' program**. As one stakeholder put it, "Rectors and administrators expressed a desire to change, and this project has begun something and changes have begun."

This program directly contributed to improving **educational resources**, as many of the proposals supported were for pedagogical centers or laboratories. Grantees were able to purchase necessary equipment and books to improve their practice.

The project contributed to **equity and equal opportunity** by allowing a second tender to be announced specifically for those pre-service institutions, which are in the regions. For a country such as Georgia, where most activity and support is focused in Tbilisi, this choice was very important. The UTTP supports two centers outside of Tbilisi that support pedagogical change and linking teaching with secondary schools. One center in Akhaltsikhe supports training of non-Georgian (Russian and Armenian) school teachers to teach Georgian language and literature in Armenian schools. The center also promotes the relationships between Armenian, Russian, Georgian and Greek students and teachers, and between Armenian schools and Georgian universities. Another center, the Center of Pedagogical Innovations of Tskhinvali State University promotes the relationship between Georgian and Osetian students, teachers and schools. These above centers facilitate **multicultural education.**

Public information - Discussions and negotiations with the pedagogical community have been underway since January 2000. An initial planning workshop with engaged stakeholders took place in April 2000, which resulted in the final implementation plan and budget of the program (later improved in December, 2000). Regular meetings have been held with the representatives of the management of higher education institutions.

Further analysis – This program has contributed with a preliminary analysis of the teacher education system in Georgia by Dr. Nino Javakhishvili of Tbilisi State

---

[10] Under the previous system, undergraduate students were forced to take pedagogy and become teachers, even if they had no interest in teaching.

University. This analysis was performed in the framework of a comparative teacher education overview project initiated by the Institute for Educational Policy, Open Society Institute – Budapest. Though it was a good beginning, a more thorough and follow up research is needed to inform policy change.

The overall goal of the UTTP was to contribute to the development and restructuring of the current system of teacher education to provide knowledge and skills for prospective teachers, which will meet the needs of the education system expected to be reformed by 2004. Objectives set out in order to achieve this goal were to:

- Introduce content and teaching methods enabling prospective teachers for applying modern teaching practices (i.e. interactive teaching, classroom management, problem-solving, creative and critical thinking, social-communicative skills required for efficient class management, complex instruction, etc.);
- Contribute to the innovation of the assessment and qualification system of prospective teachers;
- Develop and model an efficient, professional teacher education system capable to generate sustainable changes in teaching practices in schools;
- Foster public discussion for creating a supportive context for sustained teacher professional development, which will be a cross cutting goal through all activities and involve a broad range of stakeholders
- Create a professional group in Georgia which can handle future teacher education developments and ensure continuous actions in the realm of professionalisation of the teaching force and teacher education;
- Foster the understanding of teacher training as situated in the context of educational reform closely linked to curriculum development, authentic assessment, textbook support and quality-driven efficient school management

What were the major achievements (outcomes and effects) of the program over the course of its life?

The design of the program proposed, from the outset, to **make systemic changes** by targeting existing institutions in pre-service education. The program design is unique in the Soros network, and could be used as a model elsewhere. Those changes that result from this program will certainly remain in the system as transition continues.

Another benefit of targeting pre-service institutions was the ability to **include and spread the good practice of other OSI programs**. This program introduced the practice of Debate, Step by Step and Critical Thinking to a broader array of people who may continue the practice in their pre-service institutions.

Though the UTTP was originally conceived as a pre-service program, many of the proposals accepted **also target in-service education**. The need for reform in in-service training was so high, that participants proposed joint projects that approach teacher

education holistically. Thus, an unexpected but beneficial outcome is that the good practice begun and supported through the UTTP is also happening in the in-service sector.

The program directly supported educators in institutions who have gained a range of new skills from techniques from new methods of teaching, to concepts in education, to project writing skills. The introduction of new ideas (see **Appendix 3** for list of capacity building seminars), and the possibility for teacher educators to realize them in their institutions is a great achievement. **Empowering these educators is where real change can begin.** Seventeen projects are being piloted in 9 state and 11 private higher education institutions. Eight new courses and curricula have been designed, six new disciplines have been included, and 6 new didactic centers have been created in pre-service teacher training institutions. 65 professional educators changed their teaching practices and obtained **new professional skills.** Lastly, two brochures were published in psychology: "Research on psychological barriers of future teachers and training to overcome them"; "Psychology of Education: a curriculum for university students."

The project also contributed to **active student involvement** in the process of ongoing changes in pre-service teacher education. The UTTP supported a student center at TSU. As a result of this center students are actively involved in the teaching process, and in the process of the identification of and solution to students' problems.

What is the potential sustainable impact of the project and implications for nation-wide implementation?

The institutional pilot initiatives have already had an **impact at the institutional level**, but not on the national level. Potentially, this good practice could reach a wider number of institutions and help inform a larger country strategy for teacher education reform. In order to help achieve that goal, it is necessary to consolidate the vision of system-wide change in teacher education in Georgia through a **conceptual framework** that will connect the necessary reform of teacher education to overall education reform.

Furthermore, spreading practice more widely will need systematic and consistent implementation. It would be strategic to form a basis for this by creating possibilities for **professional support** to **further institutional developments.**

What has not occurred, but needs to happen to ensure this project's initial work and impact is enhanced/sustained in the future?

To capitalize on the substantial investments already made by UTTP activities in 2000 and 2001, and in order to provide for a systemic impact on teacher education in Georgia, **policy** and **implementation support** should be supported in OSGF's educational strategy for 2003.

Education Decentralization Management Development (EDMD)

The proposed core strategy of the project was intended to develop management and governance competence at various levels throughout the system, including the EDMD Core Team, regional, rayon and municipal education authorities, and within state schools allowing for the implementation and adoption of the new management and governance model.

Total Budget Spent: **$ 315, 366**
Time Frame: **2 years 3 months** (March 2000 – June 2002)
Number of pilot schools: **31**
Stakeholder Involvement: **665**

Did the program contribute to achieving the overall strategic goals of the EDP? **Yes.**

The EDMD program was one of the main programs that contributed to the **Management** priority area (vertical axis) of the original strategy.

The project contributed to strengthening the management capacity of 31 pilot schools in four regions: Kvemo Kartli (Rustavi city and near by villages), Imereti region (Kutaisi city and near by villages), Tbilisi and Adjara (Kobuleti, Batumi city and near by villages) and established democratically elected Boards of Teachers and Trustees in these schools.

Did the program achieve its objectives stated in the implementation plan? **Yes.**

The project contributed to its stated goals of:

- Building capacity at the regional, rayon, municipal, and school level to support decentralization and democratization within Georgian schools.
- Improving management and governance of schools to reflect democratic and decentralization principles.

All of the objectives stated below were reached except the last two, which are in the process of completion. The objectives of the project were the following:

- Prepare Mini Decentralization Decree to be promulgated in 31 pilot schools of the EDMD project
- Assist schools in establishing a Board of Trustees, Teachers, and a Stakeholders' Forum (Stakeholder's Forum could not be established because of the legal standing of schools)
- Carry out training for the education authorities at the regional, rayon, and school level
- Prepare 30 trainers to support the decentralization process in the country
- Prepare recommendations for revisions of the Draft Decentralization Decree to be promulgated nationally at the end of the project (in process).
- Prepare recommendations for revisions to the Law of Georgia on Education (not an initial objective of the project) (in process).

The following main outputs were achieved as a result of the project (some outputs are being finalized):

- Mini Decentralization Decree is developed
- Training program for all levels is developed
- 30 trainers are prepared
- School charters are developed in 32 schools
- Elections are held
- Boards of Trustees, Teachers are established in pilot schools
- Common and specific indicators for evaluation of school effectiveness are developed,
- Schools developed strategies in curriculum, human resource and financial planning
- Competencies are developed at the regional, rayon and school level to improve management and governance of schools
- A workable model of a decentralized-democratic educational management and governance is developed (in process).
- Recommendations for revisions of the Draft Decentralization Decree are prepared to promulgate nationally at the end of the project (in process).
- Amendments to the current law of Georgia on education and other relevant laws are prepared -not envisaged initially but prepared in case the MOE will request it (in process).
- Project report is prepared at the end of the project to OSGF and the MOE on results of the project and possibility of scaling-up model/s of educational decentralization-democratization.-to be done

What is the potential sustainability of the project and implications for the nationwide implementation of decentralisation?

In April 2002 a project evaluation was conducted by a team of internal and external evaluators within the framework of the evaluation course offered by Columbia University Teacher's College in partnership with the Education Support Program, OSI (full report will be available from ESP/OSI or OSGF). Within the framework of the EDMD project, the evaluation findings indicate that the project was successful in achieving its directive. However, the interviews conducted reveal certain deficiencies that need to be addressed in order for the full dream of bringing democracy into schools through the decentralization process to be realized

The data from the field shows that:

1. The main project outcomes were improved skills, knowledge, changed attitudes, modified behaviors, and an improved status for the target groups. All this was achieved as a result of the training component, which was mainly carried out by the EDMD core team and project trainers.

2. As a result of the project intervention, changes in school management occurred, and democratic principles of management were introduced. This affected the school environment, and in particular an atmosphere of trust, peace and openness evolved in

most of the pilot schools. Before this project, team spirit was not a widely known phenomenon within schools, but after the trainings an overall belief and hope was embraced by administrators, teachers, and parents within particular communities.

3. The project achieved a level of systemic change. All interviewees confirmed the importance of the operation of the established Boards, even if overarching decentralization reforms were stalled due to legal ambiguity and financial instability. Project results are currently being absorbed into the system, however; in order for decentralization to advance and introduce further positive changes in effective school management and improved participation of the civil society, further financial and informational support need to be offered to the pilot schools.

4. The evaluation yielded important recommendations for the decentralization model, which demonstrate that without similar support as received by the pilot schools, it will be impossible for the system to initiate changes. Another implication for the reform is the willingness of the school management to embrace change. All interviewees firmly believed that decentralization would survive and thrive only through democratic oriented school management structures. However, not everyone is prepared to relinquish the power and influence accorded within the insulated pockets present in the current centralized system.

What has not occurred, but needs to happen to ensure this project's initial work and impact is enhanced/sustained in the future?

The Core team worked on the preparation of the final Model of Decentralized School Education System in which representatives from the Ministry of Education, Economy, Finance, Property Management, Justice and Social Welfare were involved. After this work was finalized a round table with key representatives of various ministries took place in June 2002 to conclude the work on the model. It is hoped that the model will be approved by the MOE. In the case the MOE agrees to implement the decentralization reform as defined in the Model, the EDMD staff will work on amendments to the Education Law and other relevant laws, and will introduce respective changes into the full version of the Decentralization decree. This policy work is expected to continue to until the end of 2002.

It was relayed by Vladimir Sanadze, the Deputy Minister, during a meeting with the evaluation team that the MOE would like to start implementation of decentralization reform on the national level. In light of poor management capacity of the system, it is planned to start with a limited number of schools as a first scaling up phase of the reform. However there are no definite plans drawn by the Ministry.

The EDMD project yielded a number of policy recommendations, which could have direct implications for the design of the education strategy 2003.

- *Nation-wide implementation of educational decentralization reform*. According to the findings, schools and communities have responded positively regarding the opportunities and changes that decentralization presents. However, the process of

decentralization at the national scale will take place gradually. The process will be long and complex requiring all stakeholders in the school community to fundamentally change in terms of how they adjust to their new roles and responsibilities; and how they regard and interact with other stakeholders.

- ***Involve all stakeholders.*** Rayon level education departments, principals, teachers, parents, and students should be consulted and involved in the planning, training, and implementation of decentralization. The more the key stakeholders are involved, the more the empowerment and ownership of the process can manifest in the schools and communities.

- ***Utilize current resources prepared by the project.*** As a result of the two-year pilot, certain capacity was built during the implementation of the project. Therefore, the trainings and resources developed by the project should be used to commence and support the nation-wide decentralization reform.

- ***Offer more training based on the local context.*** Stakeholders need time to grasp and understand the new terms/concepts regarding the theories and implications behind decentralization. The trainings should be based more on the reality that communities are confronted with on a daily basis. The trainings need to be more than prescriptive, that is information based on rights/responsibilities, duties, etc. The trainings should also provide the support and skills to handle and engage in new rights and responsibilities.

  In order to establish an effective participatory democratic environment, new skills needed are leadership skills, critical thinking, problem solving, management skills, strategic planning and finance/budgeting skills. Trainings should take into consideration the local experiences, culture, and historical legacies (Communism).

- ***Secure financial support***. More funding support must be extended to schools and teachers. The current financial inequalities are extremely high. There are practically no finances available to fix the physical infrastructure of buildings and purchase learning materials and equipment. Working and learning conditions in many schools impede school personnel to implement and maintain decentralization policies. Funding should cover the following expenditures: maintenance of school buildings; local services and utilities; purchasing learning materials and equipment; teachers salaries, and professional development of teachers.

- ***Built in continuous support***. Decentralization will be a slow process; the country would have to become adjusted to new changes and awareness of their freedoms/rights. Support from the Ministry and respective NGO is critical. Local communities will need assistance in developing a deeper understanding of their rights and responsibilities in order to create a democratic participatory school environment. Sharing experiences and information with other schools in the regions is highly recommended.

- ***Establish legal basis of schools.*** The legal status of schools needs to be established and confirmed in order to ensure that decentralization is a success. School personnel and communities will not feel comfortable establishing democratic structures and make final decisions if they feel that they have no legitimacy or will not be recognized by education authorities.

- ***Ensure access to information.*** Schools will require information concerning the status and progress of decentralization reform processes in the country. Also, information regarding the experiences of other countries undergoing decentralization reforms would serve as a useful resource.

- ***Ensure school autonomy***. School personnel welcomes greater autonomy and new decision-making roles. Little interference from local and regional departments of education is recommended.

- ***Invest in professional development of current and future administration***. The success of decentralization in an individual school depends largely on the competencies and motivation of a principal. The job of a principal is extremely important for the success of decentralization. School principals play a key role in ascertaining main aspects of decentralization, such as shared governance, administration, conflict resolution, and decision-making, which guide the work of the Boards of Teachers and Trustees. Proactive and competent leadership is essential for the success of the decentralization reform.

- ***Invest in professional development of teachers***. Teacher education courses should be available to prepare teachers for new roles in schools. Such courses could focus on developing school based curriculum, creative writing, critical thinking skills, knowledge in legal issues, civics, leadership, strategic planning, school management and conflict resolution.

- ***Build partnership/cooperation*** between the Ministry, respective NGOs, and schools. All levels of government should be committed and capable of implementing and supporting the decentralization reform.

- ***Provide more community involvement.*** Parents and other community members should be able to be involved in the schooling of their children. Participation should be defined and adapted by local communities.

- ***Allow for creation of board of students***. Students should learn at an early age their rights and responsibilities. Creating students' school boards can serve as a mechanism to involve them more in school life and inculcate civic values.

- ***Create mechanisms to monitor reform status and outcomes.*** In order to have a clear picture of what is taking place in schools, what successes and problems they are experiencing, monitoring mechanisms should be developed to assess the status

of the decentralization reform. Results should be comparable on the national level.

- ***Organize national publicity*** to raise awareness of the importance of the community support and involvement in school management. Therefore, the state should intervene to promote, build motivation, and encourage such involvement.

- ***Develop a training manual/guide to support decentralization process.*** The Core team of the project and project trainers should put together a manual which will help new schools entering decentralization process to receive an information on decentralization notions, legal rights of schools, laws related to the decentralization reform, practical guides for development of charters, election rules, process of conducting elections, school strategies on curriculum, finance, and human resources issues with samples of all these documents, case studies of some schools, and contact information of trainers and pilot schools which could assist in this process. This manual/resource pack could be a critical tool to ensure access to information on lessons learned by the pilot schools. Also, this information could be offered to other Foundations that are involved in similar projects.

- ***Develop a network of schools and professionals.*** During last 5 years of Soros presence in the country an extensive resource of the education expertise was prepared by various projects that operated in the country. It would be important to establish a network of expertise, which could be drawn upon by local and international organizations. This network could become a driving force of reforms.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The Georgian Educational Development Project was a large, complex and ambitious project. Its impact is tangible, and positive changes have begun to occur, as demonstrated through this review. The long term sustainability of these changes, considering the larger political and economical context needed to help sustain these beginnings of change, is, however, still in question and lies outside the realm of influence of OSGF.

The reviewers believe that OSGF has contributed significantly to education reform by modeling open and transparent processes, by strategically contributing to those areas in the educational sector which were not targeted by other donors, and by offering a high level of technical professionalism in all areas where they acted.

OSGF did face some difficulties managing such a large-scale project, particularly in the area of timely implementation, which was often delayed or stopped altogether for several reasons: crucial management decisions were often not taken in a timely manner; management often reconsidered implementation plans that had already been approved, or

even reneged approval of program plans altogether. Furthermore, quality assurance of program areas could have been more closely monitored by program staff. This would have helped ensure that technical assistance delivered on all of their agreed terms of reference, and also to assure the quality of deliverables on the ground. The overall quality of the services rendered through EDP program areas, including tangible physical deliverables, thus, could have been higher had program areas been more efficiently managed. Tangible physical deliverables such as training manuals, papers, documentation, case studies, human resources, may prove to be an important element for leveraging further change and sustainability of program areas.

As previously stated, the original EDP strategy specifically meant to prepare a high quality base of education services which would later leverage World Bank funds when the WB loan strategy began implementation. Moreover, human capacity developed through the EDP's activities could also be used to help deliver education reform work funded by the World Bank loan. Though there is evidence that this leverage has begun[11], and OSGF has achieved this overall goal, it was neither the focus nor within the feasible scope of this review to analyze the degree to which this has happened, or will happen. The reviewers feel this would be a valuable follow-up analysis to undertake.

By the end of the EDP, the total expenditures in the programs described above will have equaled approximately $1,722,897.00 or almost 30% of the total EDP six million dollar budget. Step by Step, SSSP, ISSEP and other EDP costs represent the rest of the expenditures.

Recommendations:

This section will focus on lessons learned as a result of the review and the implications for OSGF Education Strategy 2003+.

It is recommended for 2003 and beyond that OSGF continue to make reasonable investment in **policy work**, which could influence further education reform, and which could leverage more impact from the investments that OSGF has already made in education.

A good basis upon which to develop this strategic focus is through the continuation of the work begun in the Reform Support Agency program. Firstly, it is recommended that OSGF complete some of the originally proposed RSA activities, such as the creation of a Reform Support Network. Once established, The Reform Support Network may identify problems that can be further elaborated on in the policy analysis process. The network may act as a "watchdog", seeing what the tendencies are and bringing it into public discussion. Dissemination of the policy work may take the shape in publishing, printing and dissemination seminars.

---

[11] For example, those schools that participated in either the PTA or EDMD programs are more equipped to prepare a quality school development plan and to compete for funds offered through the WB's School Improvement Program, which has already begun. Furthermore, one of the EDMD core team members has been invited by the World Bank to act as an expert to assess one of their projects.

A newly created policy unit may drive and develop the policy issues that are connected to other phased-out EDP programs. Specifically, regarding the work begun in the University Teacher Training Program, it is recommended that an **Inter-University Center on Teacher Education** be established. This center will act as driving force for reforms in pre-service teacher education. It could develop contemporary theory and practice in teacher education and implement this in pedagogical centers of Georgia, help active teachers and professors in implementing systemic/institutional changes at the University level, raise academic skills of students by supporting courses for students such as writing, reading, note-taking, time management, etc. Such a center could also drive the development process of **Green** (analysis of state of pre service teacher education) and **White** (recommendations and reform strategy) **papers** that are necessary to continue change. The development of these papers is important because changes in teacher education can support other directions of a complex school reform.

It is also recommended that OSGF continue work in **capacity-building,** using its network of resources to implement this work. OSGF may consider to link reforms in pre-service teaching institutions to influencing teaching practices in schools, and at the same time, working with schools for self-improvement. The array of resources OSGF already has (RWCT, PTA, EDMD, SBS, etc.) may be used to drive this agenda forward.

Another area, which OSGF should consider in its future educational programming, is to consolidate its resources and information. An area of weakness that was identified during this review was the lack of information and lack of access to information for the average school. OSGF has already a large network of trainers, materials, manuals, procedures, etc. that could be made accessible to a larger public. Furthermore, OSGF should invest in creating case studies and learning materials from the successful work it has already completed. The strategic challenge will be how best to make all of this information available for the larger educational community in Georgia. One option would to consider a web-based archive and information portal.

It is recommended that OSGF develop a comprehensive strategy which would integrate the above elements, rather than running separate, discrete programs, such as was the case during the EDP. It is also recommended that OSGF create this comprehensive strategy as an operational program, which would complement any grant-giving national education program OSGF may want to continue. A full education strategy should be developed and submitted in accordance with OSI procedures by October 1, 2002.

Additional documents and internal notes consulted for this review

OSGF (February 1999) Partners in Education EDP Strategy

Keti Elizbarashvili (May 2002) Mega Overall Budget Status of May 2002

Parent Teacher Association

OSGF (February1998) Original Parent Teacher Association Program Description

OSGF (November 2001) Evaluation Results of the Mapa workshop

Textbook Publishing Program

David Lambert (September 2000) Formative Evaluation of the OSGF Textbook Publishing Program

OSGF/IEP (September & December 2000) Formative Evaluation Results of the Mapa workshop

OSGF (February1999) Original Textbook Publishing Program Description

Reform Support Agency

Research Triangle Institute (July 2000) The Reform Support Agency Final Proposal

Research Triangle Institute (March 2002) RSA Final Activities Proposal

OSGF (November 2001) Evaluation Results of the Mapa workshop

University Teacher Training Program

Tsira Chickvaidze (February 2002) Report on the Teacher Training Program for July 2000 - February 2002

Tsira Chickvaidze & Hannes Voolma (July 2001) OSGF Megaproject Teacher Education Project Exit Strategy

Tsira Chickvaidze (August 2001) Outcomes of the Mapa Workshop for formative evaluation and program planning

Education Decentralization Management Program

OSGF (March 2000) EDMD Project Strategy

OSGF (March 2000) <u>EDMD Implementation Plan</u>

OSGF (February 2001) <u>EDMD Training Overview</u>

OSGF (2001) <u>Project Annual Report</u>

OSGF& MOE (2001) <u>Memorandum of Understanding on Project Implementation</u>

Appendix 1: Textbook Publishing Program Capacity Building Seminars/Workshops

- March 1999 - Textbook evaluation criteria

- November 1998 - Textbook selection and evaluation

- April 1999 - Textbook distribution:

- June 1999 - Textbook design and layout

- July 1999 - Textbook analysis and evaluation

- July 1999 - Seminar concerning textbook market

- May 15 –16, 2000 - Evaluation Criteria and Textbook Structure

- September, 2000 - Relationship between "teaching and learning" "curriculum" and "curriculum planning" and the role of textbooks

- September, 2000 – Planning workshop

- November, 2000 - Seminar on Subject Criteria

- December, 2001 - Planning workshop

- March, 2002 - Seminar on Subject Criteria

Result: authors, evaluators, publishers, designers, subject experts, Minister of Education, Ministry of Education Representatives, Textbook Competition Committee members, etc. – were very interested and actively participated during discussions and when working in small groups.

Appendix 2: UTTP - Universities Involved

Tbilisi

1. Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
2. Sulkhan-Saba orbeliani Tbilisi State Pedagogical University
3. Grigol Robakisze University
4. Ilia Chavchavadze Tbilisi University of Foreign Languages and Culture (partner)
5. Ilia Chavchavadze Tbilisi Institute (partner)
6. Industrial-Pedagogical Institute (partner)
7. Tbilisi Teacher Training Institute (partner)
8. Teacher Training Institute of Georgia (partner)

Regions:

1. Tsxinvali State University
2. Telavi State University
3. Akaki Tsereteli Kutaisi State University
4. Kutaisi National Pedagogical Institute
5. Tbilisi State University Branch in Akhaltsikhe
6. Tbilisi State University Branch in Sukhumi
7. Tbilisi State University Branch in Ozurgeti (partner)
8. Kutaisi University of Arts and Pedagogy (partner)
9. Kutaisi Multiple Profile Institute (partner)
10. Tskaltubo Humanitarian-Economical Institute (partner)
11. Gori State University (partner)
12. Teacher Training Institute in Kutaisi (partner)

Other Partners:

1. "Sharl Aznaur" Union for Cultural and Economical Development of Akhaltsikhe
2. "Greeks Union in Akhaltsikhe"
3. "Ganatleba XXI" – Teachers' Association in Shida Kartli
4. Tbilisi secondary school #161 (project of Elga Tskitishvili)
5. Tbilisi secondary school #56 (project of Elga Tskitishvili)
6. Tbilisi school-gymnasium "Ritori" (project of Maia Tsereteli)

Appendix 3: UTTP Capacity Building Seminars/Workshops

- September 26-28, 2000 - "Teacher Education in OECD /European Union member states: Current state-problems -key issue of recent reforms"

- November 29, 2000 - "Teaching Methods"

- December 9-12, 2000 -"Student - Teacher Practice; Accreditation and Licensing"

- January 24-26, 2001 - "Curriculum Development"

- February 7-9, 2001 -"Teacher Research"

- April 11-13, 2001 – "Teambuilding and Project monitoring"

- May 16-19, 2001 – "Assessment of Student Learning"

- June 7-9, 2002 -"Teacher education: Broadening the scope of new ideas"

- July 6-10, 2001 – "Teambuilding and Project monitoring"

- October 6-12, 2001 - "Assessment of TTP through MAPA"

- January 18-19, 2002 – "Assessment of TTP through MAPA"

Result: 80-85 university teachers/professors of 17 state and private universities of Georgia use modern pedagogy teaching and learning methods and have new professional skills.

Appendix 4: Interviews and Focus Groups undertaken for this Review

Monday, March 18

09:30   Meeting with Tsira Chikvaidze – TTP Academic Assistant

11:00   Meeting with Vakhtang Sartania, Rector of Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani Tbilisi State Pedagogical University

11:30   Meeting with TTP grantees at Pedagogical University: a) Vice- Rectors - Prof.Maia Tevzadze and Prof. Daniel Jibladze; Prof. Natela Imedadze – Chair, Dep. of Psychology;
b) Authors, directors and members of 5 projects of TTP from Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani Tbilisi State Pedagogical University: Associate Prof. Nino Tomadze – Dep. of Psychology, Associate Prof. Marina Japarizde - Dep. of Psychology , Prof. Elga Tskitishvili- Dean, Faculty. of Primary Education, Prof. Vano Kaladze –Chair, Dep. of Primary Education , Associate Prof. Janeta Vardzelashvili- Dean, Faculty. of Slavistic, Associate Prof. Maia Tsereteli - Dep. of Psychology, Associate Prof. Elene Taboridze - Dep. of Georgian Language and Literature, Associate Prof. Lia Pataraia – Dean, Dep. of Teaching Methods of Slavistic, Prof. Lamara Chikvaidze - Dept. of Primary Education.

15:00   Meeting with TTP essential stakeholders at Tbilisi State University: Nugzar Skhirtladze- Head, Dep. Teaching Methodology, Tbilisi State University; Jemal Sologhashvili – Head, Dep. for Structure and Content of Master Course, Tbilisi State University; Prof.Natela Imedadze – Chair, Dep. of Psychology; Associate Prof. Ketevan Chkuaseli - Dep. of Pedagogy, Tbilisi State University; Associate Prof. Tamaz Karanadze- Head, Dep.of Pedagogy, Gia Nozadze- a Scientific Director, Central Institute of Teacher Training; Prof. Bela Gomelauri – Grogol Robakidze University.

16:30   Meeting at Tbilisi State University - Teimuraz Khurodze, Vice-rector of Tbilisi State University and Nugzar Skhirtladze - Head, Dep. Teaching Methodology, Tbilisi State University

Tuesday, March 19

09:30   Meeting with Tako Mishveladze, RSA Program Coordinator

11:00   Meeting with Dato Gochashvili, head of Policy and Strategy Unit at MOE/WB

13:00   Meeting with TTP grantees at Tbilisi State University - Authors, directors and members of 6 projects of TTP from Tbilisi State University: Prof. Akaki Baindurashvili - Dep. of Psychology, Associate Prof. Ketevan Osiashvili – Tbilisi Teacher Training Institute, Nino Japaridze - Dep. for Structure and Content of Master Course, Associate Prof. Tamaz Karanadze – Head, Dep. of Pedagogy, Jemal Sologhashvili - Head, Dep. for Structure and Content of Master Course, Associate Prof.   Nino Chaduneli - Dep. of Pedagogy, Associate Prof. Marina Natsvaladze - Dep. of Economics, Associate Prof.   Maia Gonashvili - Dep. of Economics, Irakli Vacharadse – Student, Faculty of History, Tbilisi State University, Tamina Klibadze - – Student, Faculty of Psychology, Tbilisi State University.

16:00   Meeting with Gia Shervashidze, head of EMIS department at MOE/WB

Wednesday, March 20

09:30   Meeting with Paata, PTA Program Coordinator

11:00   Meeting with Goka Gabasvili, Textbooks Program Coordinator

14:00   Meeting with Textbook Publishers

16:00   Meeting with Textbook Competition Committee

Thursday, March 21

12:30   "Open Lesson" in Economics at Tbilisi secondary school #141, grade 10.

Meeting with the members of the "Center for Preparation of Teachers of Economics for Secondary Schools" (Tbilisi   State University): Associate professor, Eter Kharaishvili, Deputy Dean, Faculty of Economics , Associate professor Marina Natsvaladze, Associate professor Maia Gonashvili; teacher of Economics- Laura Bidzinashvili, Director of the School - Rusudan Kurshavishvili, teachers of Economics from: a) Tbilisi secondary schools ## 1st Experimental, 31,51,54,68,164, and b) regions: Rustavi #17 secondary school   and 2 secondary   schools from Ozurgeti. Directors of the secondary schools ##51 and 164: Rozeta Asatiani and Demur Beria; a member of the Parliament of Georgia – Merab Samadashvili.

15:00   Meeting with Nana Subadze and George Tarkhanmouravi at the Institute for Policy Studies

17:00   Meeting at Central Institute of Teacher Training: Gia Nizadze- Scientific Director, Associate professor Gogi Kvantaliani- Iakob Gogebashvili Pedagogical Institute, Shalva Dundua –MEGA, OSGF.

Friday, March 22

11:00   Meeting with Niko Melikadze, Center for Strategic Research and Development

12:00   Meeting Valeri Melikidze, Shalva Dundua, Tako Mishveladze

14:00   Work with Shalva Dundua

Saturday, March 22

10:00   Meeting with representatives of PTA network

13:00   Work with Shalva Dundua

Monday, March 22

12:00   Meeting with Misha Chachkhunasvili, Executive Director OSGF

13:00   Meeting with Nika Kavelashvili, future Executive Director of OSGF