

PD-ABS-787

ORAVA PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Submitted by: Joanne P. Brady and Jody Spiro
Education Development Center, Inc.

Prepared for: Bureau of Europe and Eurasia
United States Agency for International Development

Conducted under the USAID-sponsored Improving Educational Quality 2 Project (IEQ 2),
implemented by a consortium of organizations:

American Institutes for Research
Education Development Center, Inc.
Academy for Educational Development
Juarez & Associates
University of Pittsburgh

December 23, 1999 (Revised January 14, 2000)

A

This report may be ordered from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse

1611 North Kent Street, Suite 200

Arlington, VA 22209

Telephone: 703-351-4006

Fax: 703-351-4039

<http://www.dec.org>

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations set forth in this document are those of the authors and do not represent the views or opinions of the USAID/E&E Bureau.

C

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

CTL	Core Teacher Leader Program (Orava)
ECP	Early Childhood Program
EDC	Education Development Center, Inc.
ELP	Educational Leadership Program (Orava)
E&E	Bureau of Europe and Eurasia formerly Europe and New Independent States (ENI)
IEQ	Improving Educational Quality Project
IMTL	Innovative Methods of Teaching and Learning Program (Orava)
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OSI	Open Society Institute
TSI	Teaching Skills Inventory
UNI	University of Northern Iowa
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First we would like to thank Patricia Bekele and Thomas Mehen of USAID, whose vision guided the design and implementation of this study. We also appreciate the contributions of USAID Mission staff, particularly Paula Goddard, Maria Mamlouk, and Ivona Fibingerova, whose thoughtful insights on the project's history in Slovakia provided an invaluable perspective. Our colleagues in the Improving Educational Quality 2 Project also deserve our appreciation for their support and assistance, especially Ron Israel at Education Development Center, Inc. and Jane Schubert at the American Institutes for Research.

We would also like to express our thanks Dr. Kurt Meredith and Dr. Jeannie Steele, Co-Directors of the Orava Project; they along with their staff provided us with critical guidance and support while we planned and conducted our site visit to Slovakia. They also graciously furnished us with a range of relevant project documents.

Finally, we want to express our special thanks to our EDC colleagues for their able and generous assistance, especially Margarita Saéz, who designed and managed the production of this report with extraordinary skill and speed. We are also indebted to the many talents of Sharon Grollman, whose gifts as a writer and editor made this a more readable document. We also wish to thank Diana Nieves DeStafano and Candy Miller who provided their research expertise to assist with the coding and analysis of data, and Michelle Stober for her care and competence in wordprocessing this report.

CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Context and Program Goals.....	2
Project Evaluations.....	5
Methodology.....	7
CHAPTER TWO: EFFECTIVENESS OF: PROGRAM CONTENT.....	11
Introduction.....	11
Training Programs.....	12
<i>Table 2.1: Guidebook Content, Time Frame, and Goals</i>	14
Comparison with Practice in the United States.....	18
Promising Methods of Program Delivery.....	19
Findings.....	19
CHAPTER THREE: EFFECTIVENESS OF DEMOCRATIC EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Effect on Participants' Attitudes Toward Democratic Principles and Practices.....	22
Comparative Data from Other Countries.....	25
<i>Table 3.1: Comparative Mean Scores Rating on Importance of Selected Education Principles (TSI)</i>	27
<i>Table 3.2: Comparative Mean Scores for Self-Rating of Selected Education Principles (TSI)</i>	28
<i>Table 3.3: Mean Scores on Frequency of Use for Orava Participants (TSI)</i>	30
Comparing Use of Methods by Orava Participants with Non-Orava Participants.....	30
<i>Table 3.4: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus Non-Orava Participants (TSI) Showing Significant, Large Meaningful Differences</i>	31
<i>Table 3.5: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus Non-Orava Participants (TSI)</i>	31
Comparing Use of Methods by Orava Participants with Teacher Trainers from Romania.....	32
<i>Table 3.6: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus Romanian Teacher Trainers (TSI)</i>	33
<i>Table 3.7: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Group A (TSI)</i>	34
<i>Table 3.8: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Group B (TSI)</i>	34
<i>Table 3.9: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use of Leture for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Groups</i>	34

Classroom Practices as Observed.....	34
<i>Table 3.10: Characteristics of the Classrooms Observed.....</i>	<i>35</i>
Findings	39
CHAPTER FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT	41
Introduction.....	41
Individual Impact	41
Formal Dissemination Mechanisms	42
<i>Table 4.1: Characteristics of First Generation CTLs.....</i>	<i>43</i>
Evidence of Informal Diffusion	46
Coordination of Dissemination Efforts	47
Findings	49
CHAPTER FIVE: SUSTAINABILITY	51
Introduction.....	51
Comenius University	51
Continuing and Sustainable Development	54
Findings	61
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS	63
Overall Conclusions	63
Specific Findings.....	64
CHAPTER SEVEN: RECOMMENDATIONS	67
Introduction.....	67
Increasing the Management Capacity of the Orava Association	70
Conclusion	71
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDICES:	
Appendix A: Respondents Interviewed	
Appendix B: Study Instruments	
Appendix C: TSI Data Analysis Tables	

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The Orava Project: A Slovak Republic/University of Northern Iowa Collaborative Educational Restructuring Program has been funded since 1994 by the USAID's Bureau for Europe and Eurasia (E&E), formerly known as the Bureau for Europe and New Independent States (ENI). In October 1999, Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC), as part of the Improving the Educational Quality 2 Project, was commissioned by E&E/USAID officials to conduct a qualitative evaluation of the project. Three essential issues guided our assessment: effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

BACKGROUND

The Orava Project was first launched in 1992, beginning as a collaborative venture among UNI, the Slovak Ministry of Education, and Comenius University, with funds from the Iowa International Development Foundation. Its overall purpose has been to introduce methods of teaching into the educational system that foster the "ethic of democracy." A multifaceted set of activities, the project has been implemented in three regions of the country, beginning with central Slovakia (Orava) and expanding to the Bratislava and Nitra regions.

Through this project, USAID has made a significant investment in educational reform in Slovakia.¹ For the past five years, program staff have worked collaboratively with the Mission to address one of the E&E Bureau's primary strategic objectives, Strategic Objective 2.1, which relates to conducting activities that lead to "increased, better informed citizens' participation in community, political, and economic decision-making."²

One assumption underlying USAID's support to the Orava Project is that such programs can help establish new social and political norms that value an active and informed citizenry necessary for the transition to a stable democracy. Therefore, the Mission has valued the project's efforts "to

¹ We have been unable obtain budget information from USAID.

² FY2001 Results Review, USAID Slovakia, March 1999, p. 13.

institutionalize its democratic pedagogical practices to educate future generations of Slovaks in the types of behaviors and attitudes they will need to be responsible members of a democratic society.”³

CONTEXT AND PROGRAM GOALS

Context

During most of the twentieth century, education in countries under the Soviet sphere of influence was aimed at transmitting knowledge, methods, and skills in the service of spreading the ideology of the State. The purpose was to create good citizens for a Communist society by indoctrinating students with certain “truths” that they would follow in their daily lives and by preparing them for a State-determined profession.

In this system, the roles of students and teachers were rigidly defined. Students believed that the responsibility for learning rested with teachers, who “knew everything.” Students did not look to their teachers as sources of knowledge and learning, but as people who could tell them what was “right.” In turn, teachers believed that the responsibility for teaching and learning rested elsewhere, usually with those of greater authority, such as the Ministry of Education and the authors of textbooks.

Teachers, who were State employees, viewed their job as disseminating information contained in the standard textbooks, demonstrating methods and skills, and evaluating students’ performances as measured by examinations that required students to restate information from the textbook. Strategies used to transmit knowledge were rote memorization, drill, and practice. This authoritarian system yielded near universal literacy; at the same time, it actively discouraged and punished independent thinking.

Since its independence, Slovakia realized that “they must resurrect democracy as rapidly as possible in an effort to avoid the turmoil that has engulfed neighboring territories. To this end,

³ Ibid.

the Orava Project [was] designed to help the Slovaks restructure their indigenous educational system, not only to reflect their commitment to new democratic processes, but also to prepare new ‘citizens’ for participation in them.”⁴

Slovakia’s transition to democracy has faced setbacks and substantial challenges. Planning for this project began while the Ministry of Education was in favor of education reform, but with the subsequent change in government, UNI’s original partner was replaced by an unreceptive administration. Before elections in 1998, the project was conducted under a repressive regime that thwarted reform.

Maintaining the project during difficult times has been a major accomplishment for UNI and a credit to the project’s leadership. As a means of dealing with the political context, project staff adopted a grassroots approach to program implementation. They recruited motivated and interested individuals who were willing to volunteer their time and energy to change their own practice—whether they were working in kindergartens, basic schools (grades 1-9), or the university. The complex components of the Orava Project were developed within this network of committed individuals.

Program Goals

Conceived as a seven-year “systematic school restructuring program” scheduled to complete its work in 2002, this multilevel education reform effort is now in its dissemination phase and has sought to effect change at three levels:

- the Ministry of Education, focusing on the teacher certification and recertification processes
- the university, developing an exemplary teacher training program at both the in-service and pre-service levels
- the school practitioners, providing staff development programs for teachers and school administrators. These efforts have been implemented for kindergartens and for grades 1-4 and 5-9 in basic schools. Work in secondary schools has recently begun.

⁴ The Orava Project: A Slovak Republic/ University of Northern Iowa Collaborative National Education Restructuring Program, University of Northern Iowa/ Iowa International Development Foundation, 1993, p. 2.

UNI's original overall goal was described in its proposal as follows: "to infuse democratic concepts and procedures into the Slovak educational system." Related sub-goals were:

- "To establish within the Ministry of Education a support structure for educational reform to be initiated throughout Slovakia.
- To establish a model program for the preparation of teachers and school leaders at Comenius University and to disseminate this model to other teacher preparation programs throughout Slovakia.
- To establish a model school program at the basic level in the Orava region of Slovakia and to disseminate this model to schools throughout Slovakia."⁵

The project evolved as it responded to the changing political context. Its recent literature states that its overall purpose is "to inculturate schools with democratically-based instructional practices." These instructional reforms are intended to introduce pedagogical practices that promote:

- independent thinking and opinion formation
- collaboration and cooperative work
- concepts of intellectual and personal responsibility
- creative problem-solving
- tolerance and respect for alternative ideas and opinions⁶

These behaviors are essential for developing and maintaining a democracy. The heart of the project involves effecting changes in classroom environments by reconfiguring the relationships between teachers and students and between teachers and parents. It also seeks to build collaborative relationships—teacher-to-teacher, teacher-to-administrator, and student-to-student.

In order to accomplish these overarching goals, the Orava Project designed and implemented ten project components.⁷

⁵ The Orava Project: A Slovak Republic/University of Northern Iowa Collaboration National Education Restructuring Program, University of Northern Iowa/Iowa International Development Foundation, 1993, p. 11.

⁶ Orava Project Summary 1999.

⁷ The ten program components listed by UNI are teacher in-service training, teacher pre-service training, school/university partnerships, educational leadership, library and resource management, conflict resolution,

PROJECT EVALUATIONS

Since its inception, there have been three previous efforts to assess the Orava Project. The 1995 evaluation was conducted by Dr. Charles Temple, six months after the USAID grant began. The June 1999 evaluation was commissioned by the UNI project staff and performed by the Slovak organization Partners for Democratic Change. The August 1999 evaluation by USAID/E&E Bureau consultant Peter Pelham provides a descriptive picture of the program and its accomplishments. His study focused on management issues and the resulting report includes recommendations for program planners and for EDC's second-phase evaluation.⁸

This EDC evaluation, which is a follow-on study to the one undertaken by Dr. Pelham, focused on the educational practices of the Orava Project. Specifically, we:

- examined educational issues and practice
- conducted direct observations of classrooms
- collected data from key stakeholders from the Ministry of Education, Methods Centers, and Comenius University through interviews and surveys
- performed a comparative analysis of program results with similar programs in the region through administration of EDC's Teaching Skills Inventory
- reviewed records and evaluations of training programs kept in the Orava Association offices in Bratislava

In these ways we have attempted to add to previous assessments and provide USAID with additional evaluative information as it reviews the Orava Project and its current sponsoring agency, the newly established Orava Association.

civic education, special education, early childhood education, and parent/school relations. Orava Project Summary 1999.

⁸ Evaluation of the Orava Project Phase I, Dr. Peter Pelham, June 1999. Available through CDIE, Attn: Document Acquisitions, 611 N. Kent Street, Suite 600, Arlington, VA 22209-21111, www.dec.org; telephone: 703-351-4006 or fax: 703-351-4039.

Limitations of time and resources for this evaluation allowed us to focus on five of the key program components. We chose those which most critically affect educational practices. They include:

- Teacher in-service training, which includes the Core Teacher Leader (CLT) program, designed to bring changes in pedagogy to the classroom level in basic schools. These programs are supplemented by a range of workshops on topics such as conflict resolution, parent involvement, and innovative methods used to teach different subjects.
- Teacher pre-service training, which engages faculty from Comenius University and other institutions of higher education in infusing democratic practices in teacher preparation programs in early childhood, basic education, civic education, and other departments.
- School/university partnerships, which pair teachers with faculty to provide in-service training to schools and kindergartens.
- The Educational Leadership Program, which provides an 11-session course to school administrators on a range of school management and development issues, including school law, policy development, and leadership.
- Early Childhood Programs, which provide 240 hours of in-service training and on-site assistance to teachers in kindergartens that serve preschool children.

Research Questions

Our qualitative evaluation addressed the following eight research questions identified by the E&E/USAID officials who commissioned this study.

Questions related to the effectiveness of the program include:

- Has the Orava Project made progress toward reforming the educational system to incorporate democratic practices?
- What evidence exists that the Orava Project has influenced participants' teaching practices in classrooms?
- Does the UNI program for Slovakia represent an important adaptation and/or innovation to what is known in the U.S. as best practices in education?
- Do the UNI program teaching guides and training materials incorporate the known, best pedagogical approaches?

Questions related to program impact include:

- What evidence is there that the Orava Project is being disseminated?
- What evidence is there that the project was able to bring about a well-coordinated effort that is mutually reinforcing?

Questions related to sustainability include:

- What changes have been made in Comenius University and other pre-service institutions as a result of UNI's efforts?
- Is UNI likely to produce continuing and sustainable development impacts after USAID funding has stopped? Through policies of the Ministry of Education? Through the Methods Centers? Through the establishment of an NGO and its current personnel?

METHODOLOGY

Methods and Data Collection

In conducting this qualitative program evaluation, we employed a range of methods. Our first step involved reviewing program documentation, including past evaluations, UNI proposals, selected training materials, and quarterly reports submitted to USAID. This document analysis informed all subsequent data collection. Prior to our site visit to Slovakia, we attended a meeting with the UNI project co-directors and key USAID leadership to clarify questions raised by our document review.

In preparation for the site visit, we identified key respondents and designed the instrumentation and processes. These included the design of interview protocols, focus group prompts, survey instruments, and school and classroom observation protocols. Key data were gathered from Orava Project participants and non-participants.

During our eight-day site visit, we traveled to the key implementation sites of Dolny Kubin, Banska Bystrica, Nitra, and Bratislava. There we conducted interviews and focus groups with 32 educators, including school administrators, teachers, university faculty, officials from the Ministry of Education, an official from the State Pedagogic Institute, and a coordinator from the

Western Slovakia Methods Center. We also interviewed NGO staff in all three offices in Slovakia and conducted briefings with officials in the USAID Mission in Bratislava. (Appendix A lists all evaluation respondents.)

During our visit, we also conducted eight classroom observations, five in classrooms of participating teachers and three in non-participating classrooms. These observations provided an opportunity to gather firsthand data on the application of innovative methods and their effectiveness. Observations were typically followed by interviews with classroom teachers and school administrators to determine the extent of the respondents' participation in the program, the teachers' intent for the lessons observed, and the demographics of the school community.

Instrumentation

We deliberately built redundancy into all instruments in order to obtain multiple perspectives on critical data elements. Since the two survey instruments were essential for our initial site visit activities, we translated them into the Slovak language prior to our travel to Slovakia. The instruments we developed included:

- Interview schedule for university faculty obtains information about selection criteria for the Orava Project, participation in events and activities sponsored by the Orava Project, and the impact of the project on teaching practices.
- Interview schedule for the Ministry of Education obtains information on school system statistics, the type of education administered, coordination between teachers and schools, and receptiveness to and impressions of the Orava Project as an external provider of teacher training.
- Interview schedule for NGO staff addresses the purpose and mission of the organization, staff development, personnel and program evaluation, budgeting and record-keeping systems, program implementation, and capacity-sustaining mechanisms.
- Interview schedule for Methods Center officials addresses the function of the centers, the types of courses offered, staffing and their relationship with the Ministry of Education, pedagogical faculties in universities, and the State Pedagogic Institute.
- School/classroom observation guide examines the extent to which goals/instructional objectives are clear, students are thinking critically, and teachers are using methods that enhance critical thinking and democratic classroom practices.
- Participant survey gathers information about the extent of individuals' involvement and satisfaction with the program as well as their assessment of its current and future impact.

In addition, we used EDC's Teaching Skills Inventory to assess participants' and non-participants' understanding and use of innovative methods linked to critical thinking and active learning. Developed by EDC with experts in innovative teaching methods from the U.S. and internationally, this survey instrument assesses respondents' attitudes, self-ratings, and classroom practices that reflect recognized educational principles and innovative methods. More than 3,000 educators from 20 countries in Eastern Europe and the New Independent States have completed this instrument, and control groups from this database have been composed for the present analysis.

inculturate schools with democratically based instructional practices.”¹ Central to UNI’s approach in addressing this goal has been the design and delivery of training programs that promote critical thinking, active learning, creative problem solving, tolerance, collaboration, and cooperation among participants and the students they teach.

In this section, we examine the content of the project’s key programs to determine the degree to which the training and supporting materials represent what is known about best practices. We specifically address the following evaluation questions:

Does the UNI program for Slovakia represent an important adaptation and/or innovation to what is known in the U.S. as best practices in education?

Do UNI’s teaching guides and training materials incorporate the known, best pedagogical practices?

The three training programs reviewed below include:

- Core Teacher Leader/Innovative Methods of Teaching and Learning (CTL/IMTL) programs, a multi-session training for basic school teachers and pedagogical faculty in universities
- Early Childhood Program for kindergarten teachers serving preschool children
- Educational Leadership Program (ELP), an 11-session university course for school administrators

It is important to note that a number of supplementary workshops were offered to participants involved in the above-mentioned programs. Since we were unable to review leaders’ guides or materials for such sessions, we are unable to comment on their content and the extent to which these workshops reflected effective practice.

¹ Orava Project Summary 1999, p.1.

To analyze the content of the three training programs we drew from a number of data sources, including an extensive review of program descriptions, leaders' guides and other training material, course syllabi, sample evaluations of workshops, and staff and consultant reports. We supplemented our document review with an analysis of responses to EDC's Teaching Skills Inventory (TSI) and interviews conducted with program participants.

Below we discuss our analyses of these three programs, noting key features and how they compare with U.S. programs.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

Core Teacher Leader and Innovative Methods for Teaching and Learning Program

One major component of the Orava Project is the Core Teacher Leader program. This training program has been a cornerstone of the project for teachers in basic schools (grades 1-9) and has been delivered to university faculty under the title Innovative Methods for Teaching and Learning. The overarching goal of the CTL/IMTL program is to teach strategies that promote critical thinking. The CTL/IMTL program consists of eight guidebooks that lay out a 14- to 16-day training designed to be implemented over the course of a year. These guidebooks were developed with support from the Open Society Institute.

Our analysis reveals that these materials provide a well-accepted and established approach to promoting critical thinking in classrooms (Mangieri & Block, 1994; Anders & Guzzetti, 1996). As a training curriculum, the CTL/IMTL program offers teachers and faculty theoretical and concrete strategies that:

- provide participants with experience in designing authentic tasks
- model the use of skills such as reflection, exploration of new questions, and metacognition to cultivate student learning and promote generative thinking (Prawat, 1992; Purpel, 1989)
- promote problem solving in students while encouraging the analytic and metacognitive knowledge necessary to develop a deep understanding of content
- help students examine their own thinking processes by challenging their constructions

As Table 2.1 shows, the guidebooks provide considerable breadth; the scope and sequence of the training appears to cover the key issues related to promoting critical thinking among students,

especially in regard to reading and writing. Overall, there is a congruency between goals set and training experiences offered.

Workshops build on one another in a logical manner. Participants are presented with the framework for critical thinking first, then are introduced to specific methods to promote critical thinking. These strategies are augmented with teaching techniques that encourage students to reason cooperatively and support their own conclusions. Strategies to promote cooperative learning as well as approaches to lesson planning and assessment are covered and include ways for teachers to analyze how and when to use such strategies.

An analysis of each session reveals a cycle, beginning with the theoretical framework, exploration of the concepts, application to classroom practice, and reflection on ways to integrate these new ideas into the classroom. In essence, each workshop models approaches to promoting critical thinking while also requiring that participants actively engage in the learning process. The use of discussion and cooperative learning experiences underscores the fact that powerful learning is drawn from both the teacher and other participants. This characteristic of the Orava training sessions was repeatedly recognized by participants in the four focus groups we conducted. As one participant noted, “There is interaction among the instructor and all the participants and learning happens in

Table 2.1: Guidebook Content, Time Frame, and Goals

Title	Course Content	Time Frame	Goals
Guidebook 1: A Framework for Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum	Three phases of the framework (the Evocation Stage, the Realization of Meaning Stage, and the Reflection Stage) are introduced.	1 day (estimated)	<p>At the conclusion participants will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand and describe the three stages of the framework for teaching and learning • be able to place various teaching strategies in the appropriate stage of the framework • be able to prepare classroom lessons based on the framework, using their present curriculum and available materials • be able to introduce the various teaching strategies in their classrooms
Guidebook 2: Methods for Promoting Critical Thinking	Teacher questioning as a means to stimulate critical thinking is examined.	1 day (estimated)	<p>At the conclusion participants will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand the relationship between questioning and critical thinking • understand the importance of teacher questioning for promoting critical thinking • understand the relationship between critical thinking, decision-making, problem solving, and the thinking process • be able to present a narrative text to a class using the Evocation/Realization of Meaning/ Reflection (ERR) framework • engage a class in guided inquiry using multiple question format • understand the value of questioning students at various levels • understand the thought processes associated with various question levels • be able to conduct a course on questioning and critical thinking for other educators
Guidebook 3: Reading, Writing, & Discussion in Every Discipline	Elaboration of teaching methods to enhance each stage of the framework.	<p>Scheduled to run 10 to 12 hours or longer</p> <p>(May be presented with Guidebook 4 in a session lasting 4 to 5 days)</p>	<p>At the conclusion participants will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • become comfortably adept at teaching with the ERR model • acquire a broad repertoire of strategies that may be used to encourage learning at every phase of the model, so that they will be able to adapt the model for different lessons and for children at different maturity levels • form concrete plans to try the methods practiced in the workshop in their own teaching
Guidebook 4: Further Strategies for Promoting Critical Thinking	Guided practice in the use of additional strategies to promote critical thinking.	<p>Scheduled to run 10 to 12 hours or longer</p> <p>(May be presented with Guidebook 3 in a session lasting 4 to 5 days)</p>	<p>At the conclusion participants will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage students to form original opinions • enable students to follow extensions of arguments in order to challenge premises • help students reason with others to make meaning • empower students to support their own conclusions in debates with others

Table 2.1: Guidebook Content, Time Frame, and Goals (continued)

Title	Course Content	Time Frame	Goals
Guidebook 5: Cooperative Learning	Strategies to promote cooperative learning are introduced.	If all activities are included, this course will take 20 to 22 hours to complete (approx. 3 days)	At the conclusion participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand what is meant by an environment for thinking • be able to plan and implement a number of cooperative learning strategies in their classrooms • be able to identify what stage or stages of the framework the various strategies include
Guidebook 6: Lesson Planning & Assessment	Strategies for lesson planning and assessment are introduced.	2 days (May be combined with Guidebook 5 in a 4 to 5 day time frame)	At the conclusion participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan a lesson of one period's length or longer that incorporates activities to encourage ERR • plan a lesson that encourages higher order thinking while deepening knowledge of subject matter • plan and manage an interdisciplinary thematic unit on a topic • plan and use a range of qualitative assessment strategies that are appropriate for monitoring and assessing active learning and critical thinking
Guidebook 7: Writing Workshop: From Self-Expression to Written Arguments	Strategies for supporting student writing (rehearsing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing) are explored.	Scheduled to run 12 to 18 hours (approx. 2-3 days)	At the conclusion participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a repertoire of strategies for encouraging students' writing at each phase, including rehearsing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing • have strategies available to encourage students to write for different purposes and for different audiences, including personal writing and academic writing • take pleasure in their own writing and begin to think of themselves as models for their students
Guidebook 8: Creating Thoughtful Readers	Discussion of a thoughtful reading process and content area application.	12 hours	At the conclusion participants will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand the role of reading as a tool for thinking and learning • be able to implement a readers' workshop in the classroom • apply the reading process to content area studies • be able to implement Questioning the Author and Literature Circles in the classroom

Early Childhood Program

The second major training program is designed for kindergarten teachers who typically serve children from two to six years old. More intensive than the CTL/IMTL program, it consists of a 240-hour program that is delivered over a two-year period through a combination of courses,

seminars, and workshops in kindergartens as well as on-site assistance.² The Early Childhood Program (ECP) blends the conceptual framework of the constructivist approach developed by Rheta DeVries at UNI with elements of the CTL training described above. The work of DeVries and other constructivists³ emphasizes the socio-moral development of children and promotes the adoption of a learning environment that recognizes the iterative process of how children construct meaning through experience (DeVries & Kohlberg, 1987).

To analyze the content of the program, we reviewed a notebook containing samples of workshop materials available in the Bratislava office as well as reports prepared by Orava staff. Workshop materials specifically developed for the ECP addressed a total of 27 topics, including:

- characteristics of the constructivist approach to early childhood, with emphasis on the roles of teachers and children
- socio-moral atmosphere and its principles, highlighting the value of cooperation versus coercion
- physical learning activities
- group games that foster socio-moral development
- rule making and voting and their appropriate uses with young children

Because these materials were not in the form of leaders' guides, it was not possible to determine the exact intended sequence of learning experiences or the time allotted for each session. However, the materials indicated a pattern similar to that described for the CTL/IMTL sessions, with an introduction of theory and concepts followed by interactive activities that help participants explore and practice the concepts presented. Supplementary workshop materials, designed to reinforce learning, included the use of videos from actual preschool classrooms that use the constructivist approach, transcripts of child-to-child interactions, sample lesson plans, and instructions for teachers on how to create their own games and materials that foster active learning. Our review of sample workshop evaluations reveals that the videotape supplements to the above-mentioned sessions helped participants experience the qualitative difference in a constructivist classroom.

Other project records indicate that these tailored early childhood workshops were combined with adapted sessions of the CTL/IMTL program, focusing on such topics as the use of the ERR model,

² From Summary Report: Early Childhood Program (1994-1999), Orava Foundation (no date).

³ See also Kohlberg, Kamii.

planning and assessment strategies, supporting critical thinking in the preschool child, and emergent literacy.

Educational Leadership Program

We reviewed sample material and syllabi of the Educational Leadership Program (ELP), a training program consisting of 10 modules, each of which is a six-day workshop. Unlike the CTL/IMTL guidebooks described above, there are no handbooks for the ELP. However, in reviewing the material provided, we found that the content of modules is similar to most educational leadership programs in the U.S.

ELP modules include:

- Introduction to Leadership and Management
- Politics and the Principal
- The Principal as Leader and Manager
- School Law and Policy Development
- Clinical Supervision and Teaching Practice
- Implementing Curriculum for Basic Schools
- Leading and Learning with Computer Technology
- School Improvement Planning for Democratic Schools
- Marketing at School
- Administrative Applications in Field Settings

The ELP readings are cutting-edge and reflect best practices, similar to readings widely used in such programs as Benis, Fisher, the National Association of Elementary Schools, the American Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Gorton and Snowden, and Patterson.

While the ELP course content is rich, there are other courses which might be considered to augment the program in the for future. An example of such a course is “The Principal as Change Agent” which is offered at Columbia University Teachers College, New York University, and the School of Education of the College of New Rochelle among others. This course is especially appropriate for

school administrators in countries undergoing transition. It provides coverage of key issues such as the nature of change: a history of education reform; structural redesign of schools; the management of school culture; strategies to facilitate readiness for change; collaborative planning; the anticipation and reduction of resistance to change; and teachers' management of change in the classroom. The works of Michael Fullen, Lee Bolman, and Terrence Deal are particularly useful in this field. A second is "Communication Skills," a course that is designed to enhance interpersonal, presentational, and listening skills.

In addition, we hope that future ELP modules will be adapted to include writings and examples generated by program alumni.

COMPARISON WITH PRACTICE IN THE UNITED STATES

Orava participants who completed EDC's *Teaching Skills Inventory* demonstrated that they were familiar with the meaning of best educational principles and practices. This was apparent from our observations of participants as they completed the instrument and from the questions they asked while doing so.

In analyzing mean scores, the Orava participants have been compared with a comparable group from Yonkers, New York, who took the TSI as a post-test one year after interventions with similar goals to the Orava Project. The mean scores for the Orava participants are remarkably similar to those in the Yonkers' sample. In fact, where there are discrepancies, it is the Orava participants who usually scored higher.

When comparing the ratings of non-Orava participants in Slovakia with the mean pre-test scores of three New York State school districts prior to their involvement with a similar intervention, non-Orava participants scored decidedly lower than their U.S. counterparts in their frequency of use of every innovative method. While the sample selection and size make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions, this finding may indicate that the Orava training programs initially encountered more entrenched traditional practices. If this were the case, then Orava's participants' understanding and reported use of innovative methods would be all the more noteworthy.

PROMISING METHODS OF PROGRAM DELIVERY

One particularly effective element of the ECP training design is the expectation that participants will try out new approaches in their own classrooms between their regular training sessions. Their difficulties and successes in applying new concepts and strategies appear to have been a feature of many follow-up sessions. Such deliberate attempts to incorporate participants' actual experiences are important because this technique acknowledges the complexity of changing classroom practice and offers a forum for problem solving. The built-in link to actual classroom experience can reinforce participants' successive approximations, which are necessary to implement complex innovative practices; it can also help to sustain teachers' motivation to change. As one participant in the ECP noted, "I have experienced a breakthrough, especially with respect to the new role of the teacher in preschool education. The cycle of workshops and teaching confirms the correctness of this approach."

Another effective element of other Orava Project training programs is the use of the "home groups" that cluster participants outside of class to promote their working together on follow-up assignments and classroom implementation. In addition to the value of relating theory to practice, this strategy promotes networking, helping to eliminate the isolation so commonly felt by teachers, especially those attempting to change their practice. As one participant noted, "I had never thought of being a teacher leader in spite of working in this group . . . However, membership in this brought me a new view of teaching."

FINDINGS

Our main findings regarding the effectiveness of program content are:

- The content taught in the key Orava training programs reviewed reflects best practice when compared with similar programs in the U.S. and in the Eastern Europe and the New Independent States. This includes content in areas such as critical thinking; theory and frameworks; teacher questioning methods; lesson planning; cooperative learning; the use of reading and writing for critical thinking; early childhood education; and school improvement.
- Effective, well-accepted methods for training participants are evident in the training materials reviewed.

- Orava participants who completed the EDC's Teaching Skills Inventory demonstrated that they were familiar with the meaning of best educational principles and practices. This suggests that the training that was delivered reflected the best practices contained in the materials.
- Both the use of home groups and the model for delivering the Early Childhood Program appear to support the adaption of complex, innovative practices promoted by the Orava Project.

CHAPTER THREE: EFFECTIVENESS OF DEMOCRATIC EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

INTRODUCTION

The principles that guide Orava Project activities directly counter the key characteristics of an educational system under the Soviet sphere of influence. These characteristics described in detail in Chapter One, paint a portrait of authoritarian classrooms designed to spread the ideology of the state. In contrast, the Orava Project addresses several areas believed to be critical elements in developing more democratic classrooms. The underlying assumption is that such classroom communities can be a significant way to prepare students to assume active roles in a democratic society. These critical elements include:

- Increased opportunities to develop critical thinking skills by altering the types of activities, assignments, and discourse about topics
- A more developed partnership between students and teachers that offers more student choice and responsibility and requires more flexibility and facilitation of learning on the part of teachers
- Increased focus on inquiry and discovery and less on rote memorization and traditional methods of drill and practice
- New and “authentic” approaches to evaluating student learning that measure the more complex aspects of learning such as conceptual understanding and writing for different purposes

We found a great deal of evidence that the Orava Project has been effective in developing a community of educators with shared educational values that are reflected in their classroom teaching. This conclusion was reached after analyzing data from the following sources: interviews with 32 Slovak educators; surveys of 11 Orava participants; observations of 8 classrooms (5 taught by Orava participants and 3 by non-participants); a review of workshop evaluations and an Orava Association follow-up survey; and comparative analyses of EDC’s *Teaching Skills Inventory* (TSI) for 22 Orava participants, 10 non-Orava participants, and control groups from 10 countries in the region and three school districts in New York State. The data were analyzed for (1) participant attitudes toward democratic principles and practices, (2) classroom practices as surveyed, and (3) classroom practices as observed.

The first question we addressed was:

Has the Orava Project made progress toward reforming the educational system to incorporate democratic educational practices?

Except for the past six months, the Orava Project has operated in a political climate that opposed systemic education reform. The program therefore developed a grassroots approach, engaging interested educators, capitalizing on their initial interest, and developing them into enthusiastic advocates. When addressing this question, we therefore emphasize the progress made despite difficult conditions.

EFFECT ON PARTICIPANTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

All 11 respondents who completed our participant survey rated their experiences with the Orava Project as "excellent," the highest rating, stating that the program was highly effective in communicating the democratic educational principles it taught.

According to the same survey, the following democratic values and principles were the most important ones that respondents learned through the Orava Project:

- facilitating students' active learning/critical thinking (n=7)
- fostering cooperation by and with students (n=4)
- respecting students as individuals (n=5)

Seven respondents reported that their attitudes toward these democratic principles and values has changed as a result of the Orava Project. Nearly all respondents believe that these democratic principles are applicable for Slovakia today and that they are being implemented.

One-third of respondents noted that a potential impediment to implementation was that "old ways of thinking" limit implementation of these principles. As one wrote: "Each change is painful and people are somehow resistant to anything new; it is not enough to just declare the need for change, but to *want* to change."

Program Development Process

In addition to teaching about these democratic practices, the Orava Project has *modeled* these practices in its program. Participants often praised UNI's collaborative approach to program development. Based on client needs, this approach emphasized consensus building, negotiation, and co-authorship with Slovak participants. One Orava participant, Maria Dudakova, described the process as mutual cooperation. Emil Revaj, an elementary school principal who participated in the Orava Project's Educational Leadership Program, similarly wrote in his evaluation:

A good point is that [the programs] are prepared after discussions with elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, officials from school administration, the advising centers, and the faculty of education at Comenius University.

As Dr. Mistrik, Vice Dean of the Pedagogical Faculty at Comenius University, reported, "Kurt [Meredith] and Jeannie [Steele] model what they teach."

School System Reform

The Ministry of Education is now in the process of making legislative recommendations for systemic education reform. The process they have chosen to use is one in which expert groups are writing "white papers", and making recommendations for public consideration and debate. Using such a democratic process is noteworthy, and may have come about as a result of their participation in the Orava Project although we are unable to make a direct statement of cause and effect. At the least, the Orava participants indicated that the program will influence the recommendations through Orava alumni's involvement in the process.

Higher Education Reform

One critical component of the educational system is higher education, particularly the pedagogical faculties, which are responsible for teacher preparation. From the outset, the Orava Project has engaged universities in the design and delivery of the project, and currently the project has a relationship with pedagogical faculties in a total of five universities. Of the five, the evaluation team had the opportunity to conduct focus groups with faculty members from three: Comenius University in Bratislava (n=6), Matej Bel University in Banska Bystrica (n=3), and Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra (n=3).

Change, especially within complex systems such as institutions of higher education, must begin with a respect for the assets and capacities that are already resident. We also found here the same admired democratic process of program development. The Orava Project did not impose a U.S. model on Slovakia, but evidenced an appreciation of local initiative and stimulated local development.

The progress made toward reform can best be seen in Comenius University, which has had an ongoing and multifaceted relationship with the Orava Project prior to the project's receiving USAID funding in 1994. More detail about the program's effect on higher education appears in Chapter Five.

Participants' Attitudes About Teaching

The next question we addressed was:

What evidence exists that the Orava Project has influenced participants' teaching practices in classrooms (e.g., with respect to the roles of teachers and students, the nature of their interactions, and active learning methods of instruction)?

We have been able to determine the attitudes of Orava participants, and to compare them with those of other educators in the region who have been similarly trained during the past year. We have also been able to compare these attitudes with those of educators from New York State.

Orava participants reflect shared values in their attitudes about teaching. We base this conclusion on the analysis of the responses of 17 Orava participants who completed EDC's *Teaching Skills Inventory* in its entirety in November 1999. We also found corroborating data in the Orava Association's follow-up survey of the 62 first-generation CTL participants and in participants' anonymous workshop evaluations.

According to participants' responses on the *Teaching Skills Inventory*, six educational principles were valued at the highest levels (receiving mean scores of at least 4.8 on a scale where 5 is the highest rating). They include:

- establishing a classroom environment that encourages and supports critical thinking and problemsolving
- encouraging students' active participation

- using interdisciplinary instruction
- giving students the opportunity to apply what they have learned
- using effective questioning techniques
- providing regular feedback to students on their classroom achievement

Orava participants also indicated, by a mean score of 4.9, that they believe teachers should read educational publications to keep abreast of the field. A complete set of analysis tables appears in Appendix C.

COMPARATIVE DATA FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

It is important to put these data in a context. Since we do not have pre-test data from Orava participants, which would enable us to gauge changes in attitudes, we have selected four comparison groups from the TSI database. This method enables us to assess the attitudes of Orava participants relative to groups in similar teacher training programs. Control groups represent comparable teacher trainers as follows:

- Group 1: A representative sample of teacher trainers from EDC's teacher training reform project in Romania (1998-99)
- Group 2: A representative sample of educators from seven countries in the region who have been trained as trainers for the International Economic Exchange Program during 1998-99
- Group 3: A second representative sample of educators from seven countries in the region who have been trained as trainers for the International Education Exchange Program during 1998-99
- Group 4: A group of 666 teachers from three school districts in New York State who took the TSI in 1998-99

The comparison group from Romania has been trained as "National Trainers," by EDC as part of the teacher training system reform project of the Ministry of Education under the auspices of the World Bank. During 1998-99, the National Trainers completed a year-long series of six workshops in innovative methods, curriculum reform, conflict resolution, differentiating instruction, and alternative assessment methods.

Those educators from countries in the region who compose two control groups are teacher trainer participants in the International Education Exchange Program, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. The program has been developed and conducted by the National Council on Economic Education. EDC serves as the evaluation agency. The emphasis of this program is to train educators from a variety of disciplines to teach economics, using innovative methods such as cooperative learning groups, questioning, discussion, simulations, and the use of technology. Those selected for the control groups represent educators who were taught to be trainers through a four-workshop series (192 hours) throughout 1998-99. They have been matched for discipline and grade level taught with the Orava participants in our sample.

The fourth control group drew teachers from three districts in New York State, who participated in EDC's active learning programs and other staff development interventions in 1998-99. As Table 3.1 illustrates, Orava participants' mean scores on six of the TSI's democratic educational principles are the same or higher when compared with those in all control groups.

This finding was corroborated by the results of an October 1999 follow-up attitude survey of 62 "first generation" core teacher leaders, which was conducted by the Orava Association. According to all 62 respondents, their attitudes toward teaching have changed, with 40 percent rating the change as "substantial."

A change in attitude was also reflected in participants' workshop evaluations. As one person indicated:

There was a change in my personality as a teacher. There was a change in my relationship to my students and a change in my expectations of children. I became more open, more tolerant.

Table 3.1: Comparative Mean Scores Rating on Importance of Selected Education Principles (TSI)

Education Principle	Orava Participants (n=17)	Group 1: Romania Teacher-Trainers (n=34)	Group 2: ENI (n=17)	Group 3: ENI (n=17)	Group 4: NYC District 1 (n=131)	Group 4: NYC District 3 (n=208)	Group 4: NYS Yonkers (n=327)
Establishing a classroom environment that encourages and supports critical thinking and problem solving	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.6
Encouraging students' active participation	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.6
Using interdisciplinary instruction	4.8	4.7	N/A	N/A	4.3	4.3	4.1
Giving students the opportunity to apply what they have learned	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6
Using effective questioning techniques	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Providing regular feedback to students on their classroom achievement	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6

Participants' Self-Ratings of Their Teaching Skills

On the TSI, the Orava participants rated themselves highly for their skill in using these methods. All were 4.0 or above except those listed below. Here their self-ratings were the lowest, and all were lower than their Romanian counterparts. These areas might be considered by Orava Project planners as subjects for further workshops:

- ability to analyze the readiness level of your classes (Mean=3.8)
- ability to match instructional strategies to the readiness of your classes (Mean=3.9)
- diagnosing the learning needs of your students (Mean=3.8)

- listening in ways that enable others to move from highly conflictual to constructive states (Mean=3.8)
- teaching all children to care (Mean=3.9)
- having students share their writing (Mean=3.4)

Comparative mean scores are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Comparative Mean Scores for Self-Rating of Selected Education Principles (TSI)

Education Principle	Orava Participants (n=17)	Group 1: Romania Teacher-Trainers (n=34)	Group 2: ENI (n=17)	Group 3: ENI (n=17)	Group 4: NYC District 1 (n=131)	Group 4: NYC District 3 (n=208)	Group 4: NYS Yonkers (n=327)
Ability to analyze the readiness level of your classes	3.8	4.2	N/A	N/A	3.9	4.0	4.1
Ability to match instructional strategies to the readiness of your classes	3.9	4.5	N/A	N/A	3.8	3.7	4.0
Diagnosing the learning needs of your students	3.8	4.4	4.5	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.1
Listening in ways that enable others to move from highly conflictual to constructive states	3.8	4.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teaching all children to care	3.9	4.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Having students share their writing	3.4	4.2	N/A	N/A	3.6	3.7	3.2

Classroom Practices as Surveyed

Our analysis of responses to “Frequency of Use” in the TSI, completed by 22 Orava participants in November 1999, indicates that they *use* innovative teaching methods in their classrooms often.

We have made paired t-test comparisons between the Orava participants and four groups that received similar treatment over a comparable period of time. *T-tests* were used to determine if the results are attributable to the program, and *effect sizes* have been calculated to determine if “significant” changes are meaningful. T-tests with p-values at the .05 level and below are considered statistically significant. Effect sizes of .3 and above are considered to be indicative of a meaningful difference (with those of .8 and above considered to be *large* meaningful differences).

Among the methods participants most frequently used (at least once per week) were the following:

- class discussions
- questioning for analysis
- questioning for synthesis
- questioning for evaluation
- drill and practice
- cooperative learning/small group work
- brainstorming

The mean scores for frequency of use for those methods used at least “once or twice per month” are listed in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Mean Scores on Frequency of Use for Orava Participants (TSI)*Scale: 1 = rarely/never; 2 = 2-3 times per month; 3 = once per week;**4 = 2-3 times per week; 5 = every day (most lessons)*

Teaching Method	Mean Score of Orava Participants (n=22)
Class Discussions	3.9
Questioning for Analysis	3.9
Questioning for Synthesis	3.9
Questioning for Evaluation	3.9
Drill and Practice	3.8
Cooperative Learning: Small Group Work	3.7
Brainstorming	3.6
Demonstration	3.5
Problem-Solving	3.4
Team Teaching	3.1
Integrating standards, students' needs, curriculum, methods, and assessment	3.1
Role Plays	3.1
Heterogeneous Groups	3.0

An additional interesting finding is that lecture is used only twice or three times per month (a Mean of 2.2). This might indicate that Orava participants have curtailed their use of direct instruction to a large extent.

It is, again, important to put these data in a context. In this case, we have comparison groups: the same four control groups described in an earlier section of the chapter, plus a sample of 10 non-Orava participants from Slovakia who completed the "Frequency of Use" section of the TSI in November 1999.

COMPARING USE OF METHODS BY ORAVA PARTICIPANTS WITH NON-ORAVA PARTICIPANTS

There were 10 non-Orava participants who completed the "Frequency of Use" questions on the TSI. When analyzing their responses with a comparable sample of 10 Orava participants, we found that the results demonstrate significant differences in the use of teaching methods between

the two groups. As Table 3.4 illustrates, the Orava sample used class discussions, small group work, and brainstorming more frequently than their non-Orava colleagues. The difference between groups is statistically significant and the effect sizes are large and meaningful.

Table 3.4: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus Non-Orava Participants (TSI)

Teaching Method	Orava	Non-Orava	Diff.	T-Test p-value	Effect Size
Class Discussions	4.0	2.7	1.3	.028	1.4
Cooperative Learning: Small Group Work	3.7	2.2	1.5	.022	1.2
Brainstorming	3.8	2.4	1.4	.029	1.0

While other methods were used more often by the Orava participants, the differences are not statistically significant. These methods and their frequency of use are presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus Non-Orava Participants (TSI)

Teaching Method	Orava (n=10)	Non-Orava (n=10)	Diff.	T-Test p-value	Effect Size
Education Technology	3.0	1.3	1.7	.102	N/A
Role Plays	2.9	1.9	1.0	.108	N/A
Writing of Student Position Papers	2.7	1.7	1.0	.172	N/A
Independent Reading by Students	3.4	2.5	.9	.213	N/A
Case Studies	2.7	1.8	.9	.462	N/A
Demonstration	3.8	3.0	.8	.259	N/A
Heterogeneous Groups	3.3	2.5	.8	.196	N/A
Team Teaching	2.7	1.9	.8	.111	N/A
Student Projects	2.3	1.7	.6	.260	N/A
Assessing Student Needs	3.1	2.3	.8	.155	N/A

Again, we found corroborating data on participants' anonymous evaluations as represented by these statements:

During the time we had for planning (that I really appreciated) I developed a plan for a series of lessons . . . that I can directly apply in my fall course. I realized that the [Orava] courses have given me tools to solve the most problematic areas of my previous teaching.

Last year . . . I heard that an American foundation was opening some courses in innovative methods. I have been teaching for 10 years, and I must admit that sometimes I had the feeling that my teaching for children is uninteresting . . . As a result [of the workshops], I have re-evaluated my teaching abilities. I have learned how to assess students much better, how to evaluate them, and teach them to learn.

COMPARING USE OF METHODS BY ORAVA PARTICIPANTS WITH TEACHER TRAINERS FROM ROMANIA

A fully comparable group of 22 teacher trainers from Romania was selected for comparison with the Orava participants. The Romanian teacher trainers had recently completed a full year of training in innovative pedagogic methods with topics similar to those of the Orava Project. The 22 selected for the sample are also similar in demographic characteristics to the Orava participants who completed the TSI.

As Table 3.6 indicates, Romanian teacher trainers used most methods rated more frequently than Orava participants. These included traditional pedagogical approaches such as lecture, drill, and practice.

In the case of the first three methods presented in Table 3.6, Orava participants used the methods often, but the Romania teacher trainers reported using them even more often. In the case of the last three, the Orava participants did not use them often. This suggests that the Romanian teacher trainers have incorporated the innovative methods into their existing practice as opposed to using the innovative methods almost exclusively.

A particularly interesting finding is that the Orava participants use team teaching more often than their Romanian counterparts to a significant and very large, meaningful degree.

**Table 3.6: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants
Versus Romanian Teacher Trainers TSI**

Teaching Method	Orava (n=22)	Romania (n=22)	Diff.	T-Test p-value	Effect Size
Team Teaching	3.1	1.4	1.7	.000	1.6
Lecture	2.2	4.2	-2.0	.000	1.4
Drill and Practice	3.8	4.6	-.8	.006	.9
Class Discussions	3.9	4.6	-.7	.015	.9
Heterogeneous Groups	3.0	4.0	-1.0	.022	.9
Homogeneous Groups	2.7	3.6	-.9	.046	.7
Questioning for Evaluation	3.9	4.7	-.8	.019	.8

Comparing Use of Methods by Orava Participants with Teacher Trainers from 10 ENI Countries

Drawing from the TSI database, we created two comparison groups to examine the use of teaching methods. These groups were comprised of 22 educators from ten countries: Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine. All members were teacher trainer participants from different cohorts of the 1998-99 International Education Exchange Program. Using two comparison groups allowed us to comment on redundant effects.

Our analysis indicates that Orava participants used the following innovative methods more frequently than both groups:

- class discussions
- cooperative learning/small group work
- role plays
- simulations/games

For Comparison Group A (see Table 3.7), these findings were statistically significant and meaningful; for Comparison Group B (see Table 3.8), they were not.

Table 3.7: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Group A (TSI)

Teaching Method	Orava (n=22)	ENI Group A (n=22)	Diff.	T-Test p-value	Effect Size
Class Discussions	3.9	2.9	1.0	.003	1.2
Cooperative Learning/ Small Group Work	3.7	2.7	1.0	.007	.9
Role Plays	3.1	2.3	.8	.034	.7
Simulations/Games	3.0	2.3	.7	.061	N/A

Table 3.8: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Group B (TSI)

Teaching Method	Orava (n=22)	ENI Group B (n=22)	Diff.	T-Test p-value	Effect Size
Class Discussions	3.9	3.5	.4	.176	N/A
Cooperative Learning/Small Group Work	3.7	3.2	.5	.176	N/A
Role Plays	3.1	2.4	.7	.074	N/A
Simulations/Games	3.0	2.8	.2	.624	N/A

The findings for Orava participants compared with both ENI control groups are that Orava participants use lecture less frequently than either group. This reinforces the earlier finding from our comparison with the Romania group. The comparative mean scores from all groups are provided in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9: Mean Scores for Frequency of Use of Lecture for Orava Participants Versus ENI Control Groups (TSI)

Teaching Method	Orava (n=22)	Romania (n=22)	Control Group A (n=22)	Control Group B (n=22)
Lecture	2.2	4.2	2.6	3.3

CLASSROOM PRACTICES AS OBSERVED

Classroom observation offers a unique and important opportunity to gauge both the impact and effectiveness of the Orava Project’s training approach on teaching practices. Its value is drawn mainly from the fact that the observer can witness the way in which teachers apply their new knowledge in the complex environment of a real classroom, with all of its constraints and

unpredictable occurrences. This method thereby provides the observer with an opportunity to see how teachers integrate new knowledge with particular content, how new techniques are applied, and whether these applications appear to enhance learning of subject matter and democratic principles.

Given such goals, observation can be a particularly valuable tool for assessing the nature of teacher-student interaction—a key indicator of all the elements mentioned above. Moreover, observation can provide a window into how the teacher blends these elements to generate new practices. It can also help to assess if the teacher’s knowledge is limited, evidenced by a more superficial application of techniques.

Our findings are based on the observations of eight classrooms selected by Orava Project staff and located in two different regions of the country. This sample of classrooms includes those led by teachers who have participated in the Orava Project and those that are considered non-participants. Table 3.10 describes these and other key features of the classrooms observed.

Table 3.10: Characteristics of the Classrooms Observed

School	Location/Size	Classroom # Students	Level of Participation	Observation Focus
Elementary & Middle School	Dolny Kubin 720 students	3 rd grade 31 students	Since 1994 (3-year leave)	Reading
Hospital St. School	Dolny Kubin 436 students	6 th grade 31 students	Since 1994	Mathematics
Kindergarten # 13	Dolny Kubin 103 students	4 to 6 yrs 10 students	Since 1994	Free play & circle time
Kindergarten # 33	Bratislava 105 students	3 year olds 12 students	Since 1994	Free play & circle time
District 2, Grades 1-9	Bratislava 805 students	4 th grade 28 students	1 st generation CTL	Science
Kindergarten, District 5	Bratislava 76 students	Age 4-5 13 students	Non-participating	Free play & circle time
Basic School, Grades 1-9	Bratislava 550 students	5 th grade 22 students	Non-participating	Slovak language
Basic School, Grades 1-9	Bratislava 550 students	8 th grade 15 students	Non-participating	Algebra

Kindergartens

The two Orava kindergarten classrooms we observed showed a thorough understanding of the constructivist view of teaching and learning—the conceptual underpinnings for the project’s preschool program. Both teachers observed reflected the Orava Project principles in the schedule of activities, arrangement of space and materials, the nature of the demands placed on children, the nature of the activities available, and the encouragement of socio-moral development.

Teacher-child interaction was respectful and prompted children to extend their thinking and offer their ideas. Moreover, the techniques offered by Orava (e.g., non-competitive games, approaches to emergent literacy, opportunities for choice in interest centers) appeared integrated into teachers’ practice.

For example, in Kindergarten #13 in Bratislava, the teacher refined and wove together a range of innovative methods that strongly communicated a deep understanding of their intent and power. She designed cohesive experiences for circle time that addressed the issue of feelings. She began by reading a story that she wrote in the form of a fairy tale. After the reading, she facilitated a discussion among the children, which helped them to link their experiences to the story. She also asked skillful follow-up questions, helping to extend children’s thinking and reveal more of their thinking. The discussion was followed by a game that linked to the topic of feelings. The circle time nested comfortably in the other aspects of the classroom as well as other activities observed in the curriculum.

While there was a slight difference in the quality of teaching observed (one being exceptional and the other very good), both Orava kindergarten teachers evidenced a strong and internalized understanding of the principles and strategies underlying the project’s Early Childhood Program.

When compared with the Orava kindergarten classrooms, the non-participating classroom was different in several respects. First, there was no evidence of the type of literacy-related supports present in the Orava classroom. Examples include labeling areas and rules, dictating stories, and book making.

The second difference relates to the nature of questioning. For example, questions posed to the children after book reading focused entirely on story recall. Open-ended questions that elicit children’s thinking and ideas were absent. Nonetheless, the interaction between the teacher and her class was personalized and warm.

Third, while the classroom schedule included a mix of whole group activities and free play, the role of the teacher in the non-participating classroom during free play was markedly different from the role of teachers observed in the Orava classrooms. The non-participating teacher did not engage with children by asking intellectually stimulating questions, playing the role of scribe, or taking advantage of opportunities to extend children's learning. Instead she monitored behavior and organized supplies.

The difference between the Orava kindergartens and the non-participating one would be more striking if the non-participating kindergarten had been typical of a traditional approach. An interview with the school director revealed that "for the past two years this kindergarten has not been traditional anymore." Conferences sponsored within the district as well as other factors have influenced teacher-child interaction in this school.

Moreover, the kindergarten inspector, who was present during the observation, indicated that she "likes the constructivist theory and would like to develop the 'open school' model." She had learned about the model from her professor at Comenius University who also leads Orava's Early Education Program. Despite the inspector's knowledge and interest, she is unaware of the sponsor of this approach.

Basic Schools

The basic school (grades 1-9) classrooms that we observed present a more mixed result. Of the three Orava classrooms observed, only one evidenced the level of understanding and application of the Orava principles described for participating kindergartens. The accomplished teacher was located in a Dolny Kubin basic school and we observed her leading a math lesson to sixth graders. The teacher's approach to review was both engaging and effective. She was working with the class on operation on positives, and negative integers. Exchanges were fast paced but not rushed, with a good mix of teacher and student talk and activity.

She then led students in playing a game that replaced a more traditional drill and practice session. Students were all eager participants. After the game was over, the teacher followed up with a cooperative group activity in which children constructed a similar game, generating their own problems. The lesson was a well-organized and interactive learning experience in which students were asked to think and pose their own problems.

The teacher used the Orava strategy very appropriately and paired it with her own (cooperative groups making their own games), which showed a deep understanding of the underlying principles of Orava training and an ability to refine and instantiate them into specific content.

Her use of cooperative group learning showed a sophisticated understanding of when and how to use this strategy. She had a rationale that was well thought through and addressed the composition of the groups, the roles taken, and how students would be evaluated. In addition, she made her grading explicit and used it in a positive and effective way with her students.

In contrast, other classrooms we observed illustrated a different and less advanced understanding of the Orava principles and a concomitant level of skill. Both the third grade reading lesson and fourth grade science lesson appeared to be technique-driven. These teachers used active methods, but those methods did not necessarily further the lesson's objectives.

While the techniques used (guided reading and free writes, respectively) are part of the Orava training for teachers to promote critical thinking, both teachers' practices appeared formulaic. Both teachers stated that their goal was to promote critical thinking, yet their own questions posed to the class seemed perfunctory. Furthermore, children's responses were not followed up to probe for reasons or to push their thinking. Very few opportunities were provided for the children to ask questions themselves, and the teachers' lack of synthesis provided no forum for class discussion.

The two non-Orava classrooms we observed were not "traditional" lessons. In one case, the mathematics teacher is a trainer in pedagogical methods for a Methods Center. In the other instance, the teacher had been exposed to innovative methods by her mother and by watching a video given to her by a colleague. She is currently a participant in the Orava workshops.

The non-participating mathematics teacher had the students answer questions at their desks while volunteers drew the responses on the front board. The lesson was a series of questions answered in this fashion. The teacher circulated and gave individual feedback to students through dialogue and questioning. The lesson ended with a short quiz. This was an effective, active lesson through which students learned content and thinking skills. The teacher is an instructor of teaching methods at a Methods Center.

The non-participating Slovak language teacher used active learning methods throughout the period; the activities and the teacher-student interaction promoted critical thinking, and differentiated instruction was used.

FINDINGS

The main findings regarding the effectiveness of democratic educational practices are:

- The Orava Project appears to have had a positive effect on participants' attitudes toward democratic educational practices. All those surveyed rated the program in which they participated as "excellent." They felt they had learned how to facilitate critical thinking, foster cooperation by and with students, and respect students as individuals.
- The program development process used by UNI was highly democratic and collaborative. This served as an excellent model for participants of democratic educational process.
- Through analysis of EDC's *Teaching Skills Inventory*, we found that Orava participants valued highly specific democratic educational practices, and began to use them in their classrooms.
- Classroom observations revealed teachers actively using the innovative methods. Use of these methods varied in effectiveness depending on the individual skill of the teacher.
- An issue which arises, from the classroom observations and from the *Teaching Skills Inventory* analysis, is whether participants are using the innovative methods sometimes at the expense of more traditional methods. In some cases traditional methods, such as lecture, might better serve the educational purposes.

CHAPTER FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT

INTRODUCTION

The political context in which the Orava Project operated—from its initial days until the election in 1998—was a significant factor that shaped its overall approach to implementation and, consequently, its strategies for dissemination. In response to the inhospitable political climate of the past, the project worked actively at the grassroots level. By advertising the availability of the program through workshops and meetings at local schools and through its network of pedagogical faculty at Comenius University and others, the project enlisted individuals who were interested in adopting innovative methods in their classrooms. The origin and nature of the project's grassroots approach provide an important context within which to consider the

In this chapter, we examine the impact of the program, specifically focusing on the question:

What evidence is there that the Orava program is being disseminated?

To address this question, we analyzed data gathered from a variety of sources. Project documents received while we were in Slovakia—particularly summary reports, participants' evaluations, and consultant documentation—were critical to our analysis. Data from our participant survey, classroom observations, interviews, and focus groups offered additional information.

What follows are the results of our analyses, which we have organized into three main sections: (1) Individual Impact, (2) Formal Dissemination Mechanisms, and (3) Evidence of Informal Diffusion.

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT

Participation in the Orava Project has and continues to be voluntary for each individual, without institutional pressure applied from principals or others in positions of authority. In fact, our survey results and interview data reveal that those who proceeded through the various training programs did so because of their sustained interest in and personal commitment to the democratic teaching methods promoted by the project. This emphasis on individual commitment

and power to control the extent of their involvement has had a considerable personal impact on participants.

Why is it particularly important to effect personal change in teachers? As one participant indicated, “If we want to make teaching more human and democratic, we have to start changing ourselves.” This sentiment, so well expressed by one teacher, was echoed by many others, who also pointed to changes in relationships with colleagues, increased tolerance of others, comfort in expressing opinions, and even changing personal relationships within their families.

The impact of a “volunteer” approach to dissemination was further strengthened by project leaders’ ability to create a climate of openness and exchange within the program. Respondents, particularly those who were involved from the beginning, underscored the importance of the partnership that the UNI staff developed with local educators. As one faculty member stated, “The Orava Project did not come to impose a U.S. model on Slovakia, but appreciated local initiative and stimulated local development.”

This extensive anecdotal evidence of individual impact is supported by the fact that more than 120 of these volunteer participants (62 core teacher leaders and approximately 62 faculty) are now actively involved in disseminating the innovative methods and principles promoted by the Orava Project. Below we examine the formal mechanisms in place for their dissemination activities.

FORMAL DISSEMINATION MECHANISMS

Core Teacher Leaders

One major vehicle for dissemination is core teacher leaders (CTLs). The Orava Association¹ reports that there are currently 62 CTLs who comprise the first generation of participants from basic schools and kindergartens and who are committed to training others. Table 4.1 describes key characteristics of this first generation of CTLs. As expected, the majority of the first generation graduates are in the Orava region, where the program was initially launched. The project then expanded to the Nitra region and Bratislava respectively, as the numbers for each region reflect. The data also reveal that the Early Childhood Program that is offered through

¹ Survey results conducted and aggregated by Orava Association staff in August and September 1999.

Comenius University and the Bratislava office has been most active in Bratislava, as evidenced by the fact that all current first-generation CTLs in the ECP are teaching in that metropolitan area. This is not surprising, since the leader of the Early Childhood Program is a faculty member at Comenius University and the Executive Assistant in the Bratislava office.

Table 4.1: Characteristics of First-Generation CTLs

Region	Total No. CTLs	Average Years of Experience	Educational Level	School Setting
Bratislava	13	22.3 yrs kindergarten 15.8 yrs basic schools	University	7 kindergarten 6 basic schools
Orava	32	16.8 yrs basic schools	University	32 basic schools
Nitra	17	13.5 yrs basic schools	16-university 1-doctoral	17 basic schools

These individuals continue their involvement on a voluntary basis, though there has been some discussion among CTLs and Orava staff about a stipend for this activity that may be offered in the future. Currently, CTLs receive logistical support from the Orava offices in Bratislava, Dolny Kubin, and Nitra. This assistance consists of access to training materials, videos, and space for planning and meetings as well as equipment such as copiers and computers.

In general, CTLs are paired as they provide training to other teachers; they also collaborate on preparing sessions, dividing the labor based on each person's degree of comfort with specific content offered. When asked how they decided which sessions to offer, respondents in the Orava region revealed that they chose topics in response to participants' requests. At this time no formal mechanism exists for assessing the needs of participants.

The benefits to those participants who complete the training and go on to train others is evident in interviews and in evaluative information collected by the Orava Association. CTLs comment on what they learn as they "spread the word" to other teachers. Preparing to train others leads them to a more thorough analysis of the Orava methods and, consequently, to a deeper understanding of the approach. One respondent noted the way in which they act as "multipliers," learning from each other in workshops: "There is a two-way interaction between the instructors and participants, and learning happens both ways." They attribute their ability to create this climate of exchange to their firsthand experiences participating in training sessions led by the UNI/Comenius staff.

It is difficult to determine from the available records exactly how many second-generation CTLs are in the process of being trained by first-generation CTLs, and exactly what training they are receiving. However, data from the participant survey shed some light on the scale. Five CTLs in the Orava region estimated that they have collectively trained a total of 770 teachers, with 240 of these being trained over the last 12 months. Additional data from the Orava Association's Early Childhood Summary Report indicate that two groups of CTLs—one in Malacky and another in Dolny Kubin—will complete the program in 1999.

Innovative Methods for Teaching and Learning Faculty

Within the university system, dissemination is more difficult to gauge, yet there is evidence that the Orava principles are influencing teacher preparation. For example, IMTL participants from Comenius University, estimated to comprise one-quarter (n=62) of the pedagogical faculty, are using the Orava methods to conduct their courses. As a result of their involvement in the project, they have shifted to more student-centered approaches that encourage students to be more self-directed. For instance, one professor described how she assigns students a paper to write over one or two semesters. Students select a topic that is relevant to pedagogical practice and conduct literature reviews as well as their own investigations. Incorporating self-assessment methods addressed in the Orava approach, she requires students to present their work to the class and to respond to classmates' questions. Peers then evaluate the student and the student evaluates him/herself. She remarks, "I am now thinking much more about my students and lecture less. These methods create a new openness in teaching."

Another faculty member described how the Orava Project has influenced his approach to practice/student teaching, which occurs three times in Slovakia. The first experience is in students' third year as an observer; the second time is in the fourth year for two weeks of practice teaching; the third is in students' fifth year as a practice teaching assignment for three weeks. Mentor (cooperating) teachers are selected for their openness to new methods and their creativity. While mentor teachers have no association with the Orava Project, he informs them about the expectations, and mentor teachers sign an agreement that reflects their understanding. Those of his students who are using these innovative methods reported to their professors that they have better interactions with those they teach. These successes are observed by the mentor teachers, and their resulting interest has prompted the offering of a conference later this year, that will involve mentor teachers from a number of districts.

Teacher preparation is the direct way in which IMTL participants disseminate the program. However, faculty realize that the mentor teacher is an important ally and one to cultivate and train. The system in Slovakia is such that universities are not responsible for the ongoing professional development of teachers; rather, it is the primary responsibility of the Methods Centers. All IMTL participants in Bratislava recognize that future dissemination to practicing teachers relies on working with the Methods Centers and/or having the NGO secure approval to offer accredited training. In this way, IMTL participants will be able to attract more classroom teachers by providing incentives such as credits needed for pay increases and promotions.

Another way in which university faculty play a role in dissemination is by partnering with CTLs who are teaching in local schools. For example, in both the Bratislava and Nitra focus groups, faculty attended with practicing teachers with whom they collaborate regularly in offering workshops to other practicing teachers.

These and other pedagogical faculty are exposing their students to innovative learning methods; at the same time their courses provide their students with similar methods that can promote critical thinking in kindergartens and basic schools. This mutually reinforcing relationship—between how individuals are taught and what they are learning to teach—is likely to have a significant impact on this new cohort of teachers. Unfortunately, the scope and scale of this evaluation made it impossible for us to gather data on those who have participated in teacher preparation programs influenced by the Orava Project.

Implications for Quality

The highly individual and volunteer nature of the dissemination efforts suggests both strengths and cautions. The power of having a cadre of committed and enthusiastic trainers is, without doubt, an asset to the ongoing dissemination of the program. The cautions reside in the inevitable variability of CTLs' and others' mastery of the content. There is some evidence that this caution is important to attend to, especially given the increasing demand for the program. For example, CTLs in the Orava region report that in the district of Namestovo, they expect to have 80–100 new teachers sign up to begin the program.

Concern about the quality of training for second-generation participants results from our classroom observations discussed in Chapter Two. Despite the small sample of classrooms observed, some inferences can be drawn from these data. While the two Orava kindergarten classrooms were of high quality, the basic school classrooms (grades 1-9) that we observed

presented a more mixed result. Of the three basic classrooms observed, only one evidenced the level of understanding and application of the Orava principles that demonstrate a level of mastery.

Our cautionary observations are echoed in a trip report written in May 1999 by Jerry K. Stonewater, Ph.D., from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics of Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. In it he writes:

In one follow-up report I received from the Nitra staff, they told me about a teacher who was in one of my workshops and tried out one of the new lessons in her classroom. Of course, this news is certainly a positive indicator of success. Yet the staff reported that the teacher had no idea of how to approach an inquiry lesson in her teaching. She still wanted to “tell” the students how to solve the problem rather than leading them in discovery.

In fairness to the teacher, she was doing her best; inquiry teaching skills are hard to learn and she had no opportunity to do so. But this teacher example points to the need for long-term support and training for teachers. This particular teacher was brought one step along the way; yet there remain many more steps to be taken.

As the project begins to expand its reach, it is important that the first-generation CTLs and other key providers in the system are given the support and feedback needed to adopt and master the Orava methods. How CTLs are selected to be trainers will also play a significant role in determining the future integrity of an effective program.

EVIDENCE OF INFORMAL DIFFUSION

Another indicator of impact is the extent to which there is some evidence that central ideas of the program have influenced non-participants. In our short, eight-day site visit in Slovakia we accumulated some anecdotal evidence that points to such informal diffusion. When arranging to observe non-participating classrooms, project co-directors were clear that it would be difficult to find a classroom in the Orava region where no exposure to innovative methods had occurred. We therefore chose to observe classrooms in Bratislava, as staff and evaluators alike concluded that it would be the best place to find non-participants, since Orava efforts were new in this area. However, in an observation of a non-participating kindergarten classroom in Bratislava, we were surprised by the extent to which the teacher’s strategies and approach reflected the Orava Project. In an extensive follow-up interview with the teacher, she revealed that she had had some training and had viewed videotapes but could not identify the sponsor.

In the same school, the kindergarten inspector for the district was also interviewed. Her depth of knowledge and understanding of the constructivist approach, a hallmark of the ECP, was remarkable. On further probing, we learned that she has studied under Dr. Sona Kilusova at Comenius University, who is both an IMTL participant and the Executive Assistant of the Orava Association in Bratislava.

These examples point to how the stability of the program and its presence in Slovakia is having an impact on the thinking and ideas within the educational community of Slovakia.

The interview with the kindergarten inspector, a non-Orava participant, offers another example of informal diffusion. In her role, she supervises 19 schools with 66 classes. Her commitment to the principles of the project's ECP, combined with the influence of her position, is likely to have an impact on the classrooms and schools in her district. The same holds true for Orava participants who now are in positions of power. The four school administrators whom we interviewed from the Orava region all have considerable standing within the school system. One has recently been promoted to a regional administrator within the school department; two are district administrators, and the fourth is a principal of a very large elementary and middle school. Their roles and commitment to the project can provide a powerful force for continued change.

COORDINATION OF DISSEMINATION EFFORTS

As mentioned previously, the Orava Project has targeted its activities to a range of recipients. Teachers in basic schools, administrators, and faculty at universities have all received training aimed at changing their attitudes and practices. In this section, we examine the extent to which current dissemination efforts work in concert. Specifically, we address the question:

What evidence is there that the program was able to bring about a well-coordinated effort that is mutually reinforcing?

The Early Childhood Program

Orava's ECP is an impressive example of how one component of the project has coordinated its dissemination efforts and how these efforts, in turn, appear to be leading toward a more systemic impact. One distinguishing feature of the delivery of the ECP is that it is conducted over a two-year period. The training sessions are interspersed with regular visits by the instructor to assist with in-class implementation. This assistance includes feedback and suggestions to teachers and

considers the conditions under which they work, including resources, goals, and ages of the children they serve. On-site assistance provides another essential element that impacts the sustainability of the program. By making routine visits to participating teachers' classrooms, project leaders can also assess the extent of teachers' understanding of the Orava principles and the quality of their implementation. As a result, there is a basis for determining when such first-generation teachers are ready to become trainers themselves.

Moreover, we know that effective professional development is facilitated when participants are members of an active intellectual community. While the project links teachers across basic schools, it has done less to saturate the day-to-day environment. Kindergartens are considerably smaller than many basic schools; their smaller sizes make it easier to create school communities that reflect the Orava principles. For example, when the early childhood instructor provides ongoing technical assistance and training to only one teacher in a small program, it is probably more likely that other teachers will become involved, as evidenced in the kindergartens we visited. In basic schools with faculty as large as 55 or student populations as great as 800, whole school change requires a more systemic approach. Furthermore, the ECP addresses some basic structural elements such as the organization of the classroom environment, the schedule of the day, and other features that are important to the adoption of these innovative methods. Consequently, participating kindergarten teachers are required to make changes that are likely to necessitate both the involvement and the agreement of the kindergarten director. The conversations that are bound to occur elevate the visibility of the innovations introduced. As a result, changes are more likely to occur at a systems level.

Such systemwide changes are not readily apparent in the basic school component of the program. In fact, two Orava participants reported, "We didn't need to make big changes at school in order to use the materials. We could use them within the curriculum and time periods we already have." While such an expectation allows immediate application in basic schools, the hope is that innovative methods used in classrooms will eventually lead to institutional reform at the school level.

Another noteworthy aspect of the ECP is how it connects to the current preparation program for preschool teachers at Comenius University. The constructivist approach appears to be well coordinated with the university's early childhood development. Since Dr. Sona Kilusova is the leader of early childhood at both the Orava Association and Comenius University, this is not

surprising. The redundancy of the messages for beginning and practicing teachers can be especially effective, particularly since some university students are placed in Orava classrooms to observe.

Mutually Reinforcing Content

While it may have been difficult to create a more systemic approach to dissemination in the past, the program developers achieved a significant level of consistency in principles and methods taught across all components of the program that we examined. It is highly likely that Orava participants—regardless of whether they teach in basic schools, kindergartens, or at universities—share an approach to teaching and learning that values critical thinking, authentic learning activities, and active student engagement. In addition, our content analysis of materials and participant evaluations reveals the recurrent theme that the program has helped teachers work in partnership with their students. This points to a coherent and powerful underlying philosophy that offers a solid foundation for further dissemination.

FINDINGS

The main findings regarding program impact are:

- There has been a high level of impact on individual participants as a result of their involvement in the Orava Project.
- There is a cadre of 62 core teacher leaders who are committed volunteers, working to disseminate the program in three regions of the country.
- While the volunteer nature of the dissemination effort is a definite program asset, there appears to be a need for strengthened systems to ensure quality control, especially as the program expands.
- The Orava Project's Early Childhood Program provides an excellent example of well coordinated and mutually reinforcing activities. Ongoing consultation, support, and feedback lead to the refinement of classroom practices. Moreover, the ECP creates the connections among the kindergarten programs, the university, and the project that can strengthen the overall impact on multiple systems.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUSTAINABILITY

INTRODUCTION

Although the political context has been daunting during the life of the Orava Project, we found considerable evidence that various aspects of the project's activities have made an impact, and are likely to be sustained after funding has stopped. These sustainable aspects are largely concentrated in the Slovak educators who have volunteered their time and energy to the project, and continue to advocate for democratic education.

In addition, efforts to institutionalize Orava Project's activities are underway—through Comenius University, the Methods Centers, and the Orava Association NGO. These efforts have recently been fortified by the changes in government. In this chapter, we examine the sustainable development that has already taken place.

In this section, we focus specifically on the question:

What changes have been made in Comenius University and other pre-service institutions as a result of UNI's efforts?

We report here on the information gleaned through our interviews; more detailed information may be found in the reports developed by project staff.

COMENIUS UNIVERSITY

Comenius University is the oldest and largest university in Slovakia and is considered the best in the country. It has 15 faculties, including the faculty of education. About 10 years ago, the faculty of education was slated to be closed down; however, after the Velvet Revolution, it expanded enormously, and it now includes 250 faculty staff covering all fields of education.

Our analysis indicated two primary areas of change at Comenius University as a result of the Orava Project—on both the university's pedagogical practices and its programs. These changes are reported below

Impact of UNI's Efforts

The Orava Project is one of many democratic education initiatives introduced to the university. Dr. Erich Mistrik, the Vice Dean of the Pedagogical Faculty at Comenius University, also mentioned the PHARE and Tempest programs, sponsored by the Dutch government which focus on European citizenship, and others that focus on special education and inclusion in particular.

According to Dr. Mistrik, it was Dean Borjani, the prior dean of Comenius University, who laid the groundwork for making such change possible:

He was the person who opened the door. He recruited many new faculty who were bi- and tri-lingual. Therefore they could communicate with the international community. Faculty began to publish (now 20 books per year) and with the aid of technology could maintain those communications. He cleaned house and began to rid the university of the corruption so longstanding with the communist system. What happened with the faculty is a mirror of what happened within the country.

Dr. Mistrik credited a convergence of factors—Dean Borjani's leadership, along with other democratic education initiatives, like the Orava Project, as well as Slovak proponents—for transforming a large part of the university's pedagogical faculty. Courses, with content derived from the Orava Project have been institutionalized. Changes in practice are also evident in faculty and students alike. Faculty reported that for the first time, students feel that they work in partnership with their teachers. Dr. Mistrik, in particular, emphasized that such changes are considerable, especially when looking at the broader context. Slovak schools are very orthodox and slow to change. For instance, even though a policy has been in place for seven to eight years that allows teachers to decide on 30 percent of the curriculum, they are reluctant to do so. However, the influence of the Orava Project and like-minded programs is helping.

Now that one-quarter of the faculty have been Orava-trained, their influence on prospective teachers could be profound. Since practice teaching is a requirement of preparation programs and plays a role in shaping the practice of prospective teachers, how it is handled can either facilitate or impede sustainable development of Orava methods. Interviews with four Comenius faculty revealed that students are required to do "practice teaching" with mainstream (non-Orava) teachers. This may serve to undermine their learning about and their use of innovative methods. The faculty have been trying to mitigate this as best they can. For example, they are planning a conference with mentor teachers in February 2000. Future plans call for students from Comenius University to do their practice teaching with Orava-trained teachers. If this can be accomplished,

there will be a reinforcing and sustained effect. In the Early Childhood Program, faculty are already placing students in nearby Orava classrooms to observe.

The Orava Project has also helped the university gain wider access to ideas and develop systems that promote democratic education. For example, Orava staff supplied several computers and provided technical assistance to the university on their use. Such technology provided university staff with valuable access to networks of people around the world working on similar issues. Subsequently the university secured other funding sources to expand their computer capacity.

The Orava Project has also been instrumental in helping the university develop and implement a credit system, which has been a long-term goal of the rector. Two faculties are already piloting the system; in the coming year UNI staff will work with the rector to implement the system university-wide. Shifting to a credit system represents a major change toward more democratic education. Such a system replaces the lockstep, required program with a system that specifies agreed-upon standards of educational quality and supports the notion of choice and differentiated instruction according to students' needs.

The Orava Project has also influenced the university's library program. In an interview with Mrs. Daniela Gondova, the Director of the Library and Philosophical Faculty, we learned that the Orava Project sponsored a study tour in September 1998 to the University of Northern Iowa, during which time participants attended the American Library Association's conference in Chicago. Eight Slovak participants took part: three from Comenius University, two from Nitra, one from the Central Library for Academic Services, one from the Ministry of Culture, and one from the Parliamentary Library. Subsequent to that visit, eight librarians from the U.S. (from the American Library Association and the State Library of Iowa) came to Bratislava to give workshops.

Four U.S. colleagues also attended an April 1999 information conference in Slovakia. Three librarians from Nitra were in Iowa at the time of the visit, learning how to create catalogues for libraries. During 2000, it is planned that four people will make a study tour to Washington, D.C. to learn about legislation and lobbying.

In addition, the Orava Project has been able to broker an agreement with EBSCAM, which offers a full-text database with 4,500 journal articles and over 10,000 abstracts from the social science, medicine, business, and economics fields. This agreement includes free trial access and training for

several months, with the possibility of this leading to a permanent agreement in the future, pending the availability of funding.

The Orava Project negotiated with the Open Society Institute (OSI) to have Slovakia receive EBSCAM services at substantially lower rates. The national license for Slovakia will commence in January 2000, provided the Slovak government can pay for the service. An effort to raise the funds necessary is currently being explored by Comenius University with the Ministries of Education and Culture.

Future Implications

Now that USAID funding is coming to an end, and the work is not yet done, we asked Dr. Mistrik about future collaboration between Comenius University and UNI, a relationship that has been developed over an eight-year period and has contributed to substantial changes.

Dr. Mistrik indicated that we was optimistic about the future, and could envision two different paths for Comenius University's and UNI's work together. One would be that while the relationship between Comenius University and UNI may continue, it might operate within a different framework. The basis of the framework would be the collegial relationships that have already been formed; such an informal partnership would be reliant on the good will of individuals between UNI and the university.

The second path would be a formal agreement of mutual cooperation between Comenius University and UNI. This agreement, covering pedagogical faculty and faculty from the natural sciences, would address staff exchanges, research and post graduate work, as well as a publication exchange. As we understand it, this agreement is currently being developed. This latter path offers more opportunity to institutionalize changes and create sustainable impacts.

CONTINUING AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

While the Orava Project has made a significant contribution to changes in Comenius University, it is important to examine the extent to which the project has institutionalized its activities with other key educational systems. Therefore, we address the following question and sub-questions:

Is the program of UNI likely to produce continuing and sustainable development impacts after USAID funding has stopped?

- *Through policies of the Ministry of Education?*
- *Through the Methods Centers?*
- *Through the establishment of an NGO and its current personnel?*

Surveys conducted with 11 Orava participants, as well as data collected from numerous follow-up interviews, indicated high ratings of the program. In fact, all respondents rated their Orava experiences as “excellent.”

Despite participants’ enthusiasm for the program, survey responses indicated their skepticism about the program’s ability to be sustainable. Only three of the respondents predicted that the Orava Project would be institutionalized throughout Slovakia in the next three years. They indicated that the “entire education system and teacher preparation system needs to be changed. and this takes time.” To effect changes and create a level of demand for such changes requires financial support. It is therefore not surprising that lack of funding was cited as a major obstacle to the program’s ability to be sustainable. These themes were echoed by Dr.

of the intractable nature of the current educational system in Slovakia, and the extent to which reform is needed.

Such a pessimistic view, however, needs to be considered in light of activities already underway, through the Ministry of Education, the Methods Centers, and the NGO. These activities, which are described below, represent efforts across systems, to consolidate the Orava Project’s considerable gains and translate them into sustainable capacity.

The Ministry of Education

In order to sustain the project’s efforts in democratic education, the cooperation and involvement of the Ministry of Education is critical. The following statistics shed some light on the magnitude of the Ministry’s task. In Slovakia’s public school system, there are 6,447 schools, educating approximately 1.1 million students.¹

¹ There are 3,307 kindergartens (with 166,852 students); 2,389 elementary schools (with 622,665 students); 155 general high schools (with 68,494 students); 316 specialized high schools (with 96,128 students); 25 health services high schools (with 8,505 students); and 335 vocational high schools (with 114,947 students). In addition, there are also private schools, church schools, and those that serve particular ethnic/linguistic populations, such as Czech, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Russian, and Roma.

Although the past administration was less receptive to reform, the new administration indicates nascent support for the Orava Project and its democratic education principles. For example, the Ministry appointed Dr. Galbavy to serve as a high-level liaison to the Orava Project. Dr. Galbavy, who plays a significant role in the Ministry of Education as director of Primary and Secondary Schools, could play a pivotal role in determining the future of the Orava Project.

Second, the education reform process is currently underway in the Ministry, and Ministry officials have acknowledged the important role several Orava participants will play in this country-wide school reform effort. As members of expert groups, they will continue to exert their influence on a wide range of issues—from school finance to curriculum to early childhood education. Currently, these groups are developing a series of white papers that will be publicly debated, and legislation will be proposed next spring. Such a democratic process signals the Ministry’s openness to change, and the considerable influence the Orava Project can have on the entire reform process at the most fundamental level of policy development.

However, it is important to note that while the Ministry welcomes Orava participation, Mrs. Jancova, Director of the Ministry of Education’s Department of Primary Schools, and Primary Arts Schools, stressed that Orava cannot enter schools in a systematic way without obtaining official approval. This process is essentially an evaluation that assesses program’s goals, methods, and financial status. The State Pedagogic Institute then evaluates the project’s application and determines if it complies with their criteria. The parties then agree on terms of their cooperation.

At this time, several programs, such as Integrated Thematic Instruction, experimental methods of assessment and grading, and French language instruction in kindergarten have achieved such official status as “experimental” programs. It is likely that if the NGO focuses its energies on gaining accreditation for the Orava Project, it would have similar positive results.

Regional Methods Centers

Currently, there are four Methods Centers in Slovakia that are primarily responsible for re-certification of practicing teachers. These centers are located in Banska Brystrica, Nitra, Bratislava Region, and Western Slovakia. A typical Methods Center has 40 full time and 40 part-time adjunct faculty who are responsible for the development and implementation of re-certification programs.

According to the coordinator of the Western Bratislava Methods Center at Tomasikova, one

Orava course (innovative methods) has achieved approval. The first class, which is underway, has 25 participants who will complete the credit-bearing program in two years.

While Dr. Sona Kilusova, the executive assistant of the Orava Association, indicated that she intended to seek approval for more Orava courses through various Methods Centers in the future, there are no current plans to expand this program as the Methods Center's capacity for doing so is limited. In fact, both the Methods Center coordinator, as well as Orava Project participants, confirmed that the current system is strained. Some respondents indicated that there is little financial incentive to be employed by a Methods Center, making it difficult to recruit and retain qualified instructors. Moreover, while collaboration with universities is desirable, their relationship has been historically marked by competition, rather than a spirit of mutual collaboration.

At this juncture, it is important to determine the most productive path for the NGO to follow, in terms of both short- and long-term gains. For example, continuing to develop a relationship with the Methods Centers is important in the long run, especially if the current system for professional development remains in place and begins to expand. At the same time, it is important for the NGO to focus its energy on working with the Ministry, undergoing the official procedures that would permit the Orava Project to secure the needed status to offer accredited courses outside the Methods Centers.

Development of the NGO

Currently, there are three NGO offices that carry out the day-to-day work of the Orava Association—the main office in Bratislava, and offices in Dolny Kubin and Nitra. Since the development of the NGO six months ago, the co-directors, Drs. Meredith and Steele have served as a unique leadership force. Because they have returned to UNI, it will be necessary to continue their work in the absence of their day-to-day involvement.

As described earlier, a number of steps have already been taken to build institutional relationships with other agencies in order to ensure systematic dissemination and sustainability of the program. For example, the Orava Association is now working with the Methods Center in an official capacity, by gaining accreditation for an in-service course that is currently being offered through the Western Bratislava Methods Center. Slovak universities are now offering accredited pre-services Orava courses. The NGO is beginning to work with the Ministry of Education on several initiatives.

In addition, steps have been taken to solidify the Orava Association as an NGO. Dr. Sona Kilusova, a member of the pedagogical faculty at Comenius University, was recruited to serve as executive assistant to direct the NGO operations.

While Dr. Kilusova is new to the position (she assumed the role of executive assistant in June 1999), she has a deep knowledge of the project's practices and principles. In fact, Dr. Kilusova has been involved with the Orava Project since its inception, first as a participant, and then as an organizer and faculty/technical assistant support for the Early Childhood Program. Highly regarded by teachers and administrators alike, she has established positive working relationships with individuals from Methods Centers and school districts.

In addition, Dr. Kilusova has gained the respect of the coordinators in the Dolny Kubin and Nitra offices, both of whom work part-time. While both coordinators have some experience with the Orava Project, having served as interpreters, they will need more clearly defined roles and a fuller sense of the functions of the office and the Orava mission—in order to sustain the program in the regions. Plans for a staff retreat are now underway to provide staff with a broader picture of the NGO as well as to define roles and responsibilities.

Mission and Role of the NGO. Dr. Kilusova outlined the Orava Association's mission as follows.

- Provide education courses for teachers where they learn skills that they cannot learn in the traditional pedagogic courses at the university
- Promote partnerships with universities and new relationships with students so that teachers develop new capabilities
- Continue to offer strategies that promote critical thinking, personal identity, and autonomy
- Contribute to the changes in society and help Slovakia move toward democracy in its schools

When asked to discuss how the above mission responds to her expectations for the future, Dr. Kilusova shared her vision for the organization in coming years. She expects that the Orava Association will share lessons learned with other countries interested in democratic education. She also sees a need to help Slovak educators create a professional association that will advocate for democratic schools, as well as a need to develop ethics for the profession.

She also concurred with the suggestion made by a number of respondents that the NGO offices

become resource centers for the educational community. Their videotapes, guidebooks, training materials, and literature should be expanded and be made widely available. Moreover, the materials should be more accessible by translating them from English into Slovak.

In addition to material resources, there is a need to network the expertise that currently exists within the Orava participant community. There are already some efforts being made to build a network among prospective and seasoned participants. For instance, the NGO publishes a professional journal. However, it has not been issued on a regular basis; the plan is to begin publishing quarterly. The journal does provide an outlet for participants to share their experiences and research related to innovative methods. But regular publication is essential to build a readership. This is especially important to Orava participants because those who participated in the evaluation rated reading professional journals as a high priority for their professional development and practice.

Personnel, Roles, and Responsibilities. Dr. Kilusova described her functions as “managing the Bratislava office, coordinating with the other two Orava offices, maintaining/developing liaison relationships with the educational community, planning workshops and meetings, and organizing all activities.” She says that she “wants all courses to continue and to find people with whom to

In addition, Dr. Kilusova continues her roles as organizer, faculty, and technical assistance support for the Early Childhood Program, and is beginning to assume those roles for the basic school program as well. She has indicated that “everything that is happening [at the Orava Association NGO] is harmonized with her faculty role at Comenius University.” However, because of her workload, she will not be able to play as extensive a role with the IMTL program as she has with the Early Childhood Program. She agreed with our conclusion that more staff is needed to do the job . . . “at least one more person,” she said.

Drs. Meredith and Steele continue in their roles as UNI executive directors with travel to Slovakia. Together with Dr. Kilusova, they make decisions mutually. We feel that it is important that during this transition year, Dr. Kilusova have a clear set of responsibilities and authority. The current work and the plans for growing future work also demand additional qualified staff, especially since Dr. Kilusova will maintain her position at the university while working at the Orava Association part-time. One staff person, no matter how accomplished, can be expected to sustain the program.

Sustainability also requires staff to organize and coordinate activities, provide follow-on activities, and pursue fundraising/development work. In addition, maintaining records and a database is essential, as management of such a complex program requires access to information that can support sound decision making. For example, there is a great deal of information about the Orava workshops which is kept in binders in the Orava office, including attendance records with typed and handwritten notations. However, it is difficult to link evaluations with specific sessions and it appears that instructors devise their own systems for organizing this information. Databases and record keeping systems that can generate summary reports are needed so that data can be analyzed. At this time it is especially important to analyze and synthesize these data to extract and apply the lessons learned.

Plans for 1999-2000. Dr. Kilusova and her Comenius University colleagues have developed a plan for 1999-2000. This plan includes: 1) developing a critical thinking course at the university for teachers of the second and third grade (with an experiment to include this as an elective course for students of other pedagogical fields) and 2) creating a two-year course of study called *Innovative Methods in Early Childhood Education*. Through the university, they would attempt to gain accreditation for this course.

During 1999-2000, they also plan to work with the Bratislava Methods Center at Tomasikova to continue the program for elementary school teachers and to pilot a program for kindergarten teachers.

They also plan to work with school district offices to offer a course in innovative methods for elementary school teachers and develop a new course for kindergarten teachers. Contacts will be made to various district offices in Bratislava and Dolny Kubin so that such courses can be offered in those districts as well.

Orava participants also suggested that the educational leaders be exposed to the Core Teacher Leader content and methods. In this way, the teachers could be supported in their use of Orava techniques.

FINDINGS

The main findings regarding sustainability are:

- The political context during the first five years prevented large-scale institutionalization of the

project's programs. However, there is evidence that sustainability of various activities will occur through the strong cadre of committed educators who have been trained.

- The number of participating pedagogical faculty from Comenius University was estimated to be one-quarter. We consider this to be a critical mass of involved university participants.
- Sustainability, through changes at Comenius University, appears to have taken root and be on-going. This has led to changes in their practice and the institutionalization of courses with content derived from the Orava Project.
- Recently, the political context has become more open to reform, and the next several months could represent an important opportunity to sustain the gains made through institutionalization.
- The Ministry of Education is open to an application from the Orava Association in regard to applying for official status as an officially sanctioned "experimental" program. This official certification would be important for long-term sustainability. The Ministry is also receptive to UNI participation on the expert committee that is currently reviewing educational finance and management.
- The education reform process currently under way in the Ministry includes the participation of several Orava participants on expert committees. These committees will issue white papers for public discussion and eventual legislation.
- The Ministry of Education has appointed a high-level liaison to the Orava Project. It is hoped that an agreement can be negotiated regarding the official status of the Orava Association NGO.
- The Orava Association has begun to work with the Methods Centers in an official capacity. The Western Bratislava Methods Center has received accreditation for one of the Orava Project's courses, and is currently offering it for credit for 25 participants.
- The Orava Association NGO is undergoing transition. A strategic planning process has begun.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we present our conclusions, based on the findings of our evaluation. First, we report our overall conclusions. The remaining sections provide more elaborated findings related to effectiveness, impact, and sustainability—the three critical issues that guided our evaluation.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Over the past five years, the Orava Project has made a deep impact on the lives and work of participating Slovak teachers, school administrators, and university faculty. The continuity of its leadership has consistently provided a positive, guiding force for all project activities. The constancy of project leadership, combined with the internal integrity of the program design, has led to the development of a community of local educators who are committed to the values and practices inherent in democratic education.

This is an impressive accomplishment, especially since the past political situation necessitated changes in the program implementation strategy. The project was initially designed to work simultaneously at the grassroots level and with the Ministry of Education. However, formal work with the Ministry and government institutions was not possible, given the difficult political climate of the recent past. Consequently, project energy was devoted to developing the grassroots approach.

The conclusions that appear below consider the political conditions that dominated the past. They also take into account the Orava Project's current stage of development, based on conception of the work and its timeline. According to the original proposal, the project was designed to span a seven-year period, concluding in the year 2002. Currently the UNI work is in the midst of its Phase 3, which was planned as a time for dissemination and diffusion activities.

A summary of our main conclusions follows:

- The Orava Project has achieved its goal, as stated in the original proposal, “to infuse democratic concepts and procedures into the Slovak educational system.” It has accomplished this by recruiting and developing a strong, enthusiastic cadre of educators (i.e., teachers, school leaders, administrators, and university faculty).
- Orava Project participants have demonstrated that they share a common set of values regarding democratic educational methods. It is also clear that they have begun to use the innovative methods frequently in their classroom practice.

- Democratic education has been modeled for participants as well as taught to participants. The co-project directors have used consensus building, negotiation, and collaborative methods in developing the programs and activities. This has served as a further model for participants in their own work in classroom teaching, teacher training, and education reform programs.
- The Orava Project has made an impact on pre-service education of teachers. This is particularly evident in the adoption of innovative methods and programs by the pedagogical faculty at Comenius University. Specifically, the project has successfully developed and implemented the “model program for the preparation of teachers and school leaders,” which was one of its stated sub-goals.
- Since involvement in the Orava Project is voluntary, alumni represent a cadre of self-selected people. This was an excellent strategy for the program thus far. However, for the program to become truly sustainable, a supplemental strategy is needed to secure the participation of mainstream educators.
- The current systems used by the project to monitor program activity are ad hoc. As the program moves forward in its dissemination phase, a more cohesive system is needed to monitor and support the ongoing work of program alumni as they apply the Orava methods in their own classrooms and as they train “second generation” participants.
- The NGO is in a critical transition year. Without the on-site involvement of the project’s co-directors who have returned to UNI, there is a need for organizational development (e.g., planning, staffing, staff training, and fundraising). There is also a need to continue to build institutional relationships with other agencies in order to ensure systematic dissemination and sustainability of the program.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS

Effectiveness

Orava participants share a set of democratic values and attitudes. Among those cited by participants were treating all children as individuals, fostering cooperation, encouraging respect for individual differences, and the importance of facilitating critical thinking. Almost all interviewed participants believed that these democratic values are appropriate for Slovakia today.

Further, Orava participants reflect these shared democratic values in their attitudes about teaching. Among those educational philosophies valued at the highest levels were establishing a classroom environment that encourages and supports critical thinking and problem solving; using interdisciplinary instruction; encouraging students’ active participation; giving students the opportunity to apply what they have learned; and providing regular feedback to students on their

classroom achievement. In these areas, participants demonstrated attitudes equal to or higher than those of comparable groups from other countries in the region and from New York State.

Orava participants have also begun to *use* innovative teaching methods to a significant and meaningful degree, more than their non-participating colleagues. Such methods include class discussion, small group work/cooperative learning, and brainstorming. These methods were being used by Orava participants significantly more often than by non-Orava participants in Slovakia and by comparison groups of teacher trainers from another program operating in the region.

Of great importance, the Orava program has *modeled* democratic practices in its program development in addition to teaching about these practices. Participants often praise the collaborative program development process, based on client needs, where participants are “co-authors.”

The content taught in the three key Orava training programs reflects the pedagogical methods used in the U.S., as well as other programs implemented in the region. This includes content in key areas such as critical thinking theory and frameworks; teacher questioning methods; lesson planning; cooperative learning groups; the use of reading and writing for critical thinking; early childhood education; and school improvement methods and skills for educational leaders.

Particularly effective seems to be the use of “home groups” to cluster participants outside of class to promote their working together on follow-on assignments. In addition to the value of completing the assignments that relate theory to practice, this technique promotes networking and support. It helps to eliminate the isolation so commonly felt by teachers, especially those who are attempting to change their practice.

The effectiveness of the innovative methods that individual teachers bring to their classroom lessons, of course, varies with the skill of the teacher. This has an impact on Orava participants as well as non-Orava participants (who may be motivated to find and use Orava materials). Practice and correct educational application contribute to effectiveness. Therefore, post-workshop support and technical assistance are important.

Impact

There is a high level of *individual impact* which has been brought about by educators’ participation in the Orava program. This is reflected in their enthusiasm, commitment, and willingness to volunteer their time to attend workshops and train others.

Though a volunteer corps of practitioners is a definite asset to the project, it has its limitations as a strategy for widespread dissemination.

Several Orava participants are now in positions of authority in the school system. In addition, there is an impact derived from instances in which Orava participants who are faculty members at participating universities are teaching non-Orava participants in their formal classes. There is a growing number of non-Orava participants who are being taught by Orava-trained faculty in their formal university work.

The Orava Project's Early Childhood Program provides an excellent example of well-coordinated, mutually reinforcing activities. Scheduled workshops are supplemented by ongoing consultation and support. There is feedback that leads to refinement and the fusing of several systems (i.e., kindergartens, institutes of higher education, and the school districts).

Sustainability

Despite a previously unreceptive Slovak administration, there has been some institutionalizing of the Orava program. This has occurred primarily at Comenius University (through the participation of a quarter of the pedagogic faculty and through the library project).

In addition, one of the Methods Centers has obtained accreditation to offer the Orava program's *Innovative Methods of Teaching and Learning* course. And recently, the Ministry of Education has appointed a high-level liaison to the Orava program and has indicated an acceptance of the Orava Association's offer to participate in the working group that will make recommendations regarding reform of management and finance.

The *Orava Journal* serves to sustain participants' knowledge and shared experiences. The goal is to publish the journal quarterly.

The high level of commitment of participating individuals ensures that the program will continue on varying levels after USAID funding has ended. In addition, Comenius University is in the process of developing an agreement with UNI to continue its long-standing partnership. Moreover, the dedication of members of the Orava Association NGO and the enthusiasm of those who have been trained by the project and who will not return to "traditional" teaching methods will help maintain the program in the post-funding period.

CHAPTER SEVEN: RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This is an important and pivotal time in the life of the Orava Project. USAID funding is coming to an end in June 2000. We expect that until then, the remaining resources will be used to capitalize on past accomplishments. These recommendations are based on the insights we gained as we conducted this evaluation, and we hope that they will assist the Orava Association as it plans for the future.

An underlying theme throughout our recommendations is the need to create a more systemic approach to dissemination, while at the same time building the management capacity needed to focus these efforts and sustain them. Though the project has had an impressive impact on individuals, there has been less opportunity for and focus on systems change. Individual teachers, administrators, and faculty are clearly committed to applying Orava's innovative methods. However, there is a limit to what individuals can achieve and sustain without institutional understanding and support. Moreover, without a systemic approach, the ultimate impact on children will be diminished. Currently, there are many teachers and administrators across different schools who can serve as levers for school change. The time is right to harness these resources to create more democratic institutions. To this end, we strongly recommend a dissemination approach that builds a critical mass of participants within schools.

In addition, many of the management recommendations we make in the following section are designed to strengthen the systemic dissemination approach described above—and, in turn, support the program's sustainability. It is important to acknowledge that the Orava Association staff has already begun to address issues critical to the program's sustainability, including:

- Obtaining accreditation for an Orava in-service course through one of the Methods Centers
- Offering accredited pre-service courses through universities
- Solidifying the Orava Association as an NGO by embarking on a planning process to define roles and strengthen staff skills
- Negotiating the content of a future agreement with the Ministry of Education
- Having the potential to contribute to the Ministry of Education's expert groups that are making recommendations for education reform

- Considering a plan for the payment of first generation CTLs who are training second generation participants
- Continuing to enhance the educational and training resources available through Orava offices

The recommendations presented below build on the significant programs and personnel already in place. They are organized in two categories, which are essential for implementing and sustaining systematic change: (1) developing and implementing a plan for systematic disseminations and (2) increasing the management capacity of the Orava Association.

Developing and Implementing a Plan for Systematic Dissemination

Effecting systemic reform involves several key tenets as well as management techniques that can facilitate the reform. The Orava Project has implemented two key tenets of effective change management: it has gained credibility by demonstrating tangible early success, and it has created a “domino” effect by engaging at the start of the work those who were most receptive and “ready.” These are essential first steps.

The next phase requires implementing systemic change, and will involve additional, challenging steps that are described in the recommendations below:

Recommendation 1: Develop and Implement Quality Control Mechanisms

In order to disseminate the activities of the Orava Project and the lessons learned, it is important to build systems and procedures that will ensure quality as participants attempt to apply what they have learned and are involved in training others.

There should be support for and monitoring of program alumni, who are attempting to use the methods with students in their own classrooms. To effect *systemic change*, there must be planned follow-up and support to ensure that participants are using the methods appropriately and to reinforce the methods for them when they return to their schools. There is a good chance that time constraints and lack of encouragement (or active discouragement) at school will thwart participants’ attempts to use the methods unless this support is provided in an organized way. Certain Orava Project activities already provide such follow-up—the Early Childhood Program and the “home groups—but it should be planned and structured for all main activities.

There should be a defined process of selection, accreditation, and train-the-trainer workshops for those alumni who will train new participants. To ensure the quality of training of subsequent

generations, we recommend that potential trainers undergo a defined process of certification. In the immediate future this process would lead to certification as an Orava Project trainer. In the longer term, it would be desirable for the certification to be recognized officially by the Ministry of Education and tied to entrance criteria for various positions.

We recommend providing a *train the trainer* workshop series for CTL or IMTL graduates who wish to be trainers. At the conclusion of the workshop they would be assessed (by portfolio, demonstration lessons, etc.) via a prescribed methodology that has been carefully planned by program organizers.

Recommendation 2: Formally Involve Other Stakeholders and the “Unconverted”

Although it was previously impossible to do so, the time is right to expand the universe of participants and to involve former non-volunteers and other stakeholders in program planning. Furthering the relationship with the Ministry of Education is especially important at this juncture, since it has expressed a new openness to collaboration. In this way the program content will grow to reflect not only innovative methods but the needs of stakeholders as well. Perhaps Drs. Meredith and Steele could provide training for key local program planners in conducting needs assessments that probe far beyond what people perceive they want and that delve into self-reflection about what they do not know. At this time it is vital to develop a plan that reaches beyond voluntary participants to mainstream educators. While it is essential *to begin* with those who are ready, without mainstream educators educational reform is impossible. If such outreach does not occur, the program will be perceived as marginally relevant. Since several Orava participants are now in positions of authority, capitalizing on the authority of their new positions to encourage participation from mainstream educators could be important.

An initial step would be to develop a “social marketing” plan to change mainstream attitudes. This would include a campaign that would increase the readiness of others for the program. Since the universe of potential candidates for participation would increase as a result of this outreach effort, it would be important to have published selection criteria for new participants. Since resources are limited, selecting participants based on specific criteria will be important. For example: Does he/she have the ability and access to train others? Are there others in his/her school who have participated or who are participating?

Recommendation 3: Create a Focus at the School Level

As an important interim step between the program's focus on highly motivated individuals and its ultimate goal to reform the educational system, we recommend concentrating effort at the school level. In developing schools where critical masses of educators have been trained in the various Orava programs, there will be mutual support for education, articulation between and among the programs, and the opportunity for all constituents to work together to demonstrate how reform can result from the excellent course work provided by the Orava Project.

The best method would be to work with schools whose administrators had attended the Educational Leader Program, whose teachers had attended the Core Teacher Leader program, and whose graduates were hosts to practice teachers from the pedagogic university. This would provide articulation among the Orava Program and would provide reinforcing, on-site support that would not be dependent on Orava personnel to deliver.

Another important step to consider is expanding the program to the secondary school level. Although they operate under a different organizational structure than kindergartens and basic schools, it is critical to cover the entire pathway to achieve systemic reform. Students who learn through innovative methods in the earlier grade, are likely to have difficulty adjusting to the traditional methods currently used in secondary schools.

INCREASING THE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY OF THE ORAVA ASSOCIATION

Recommendation 4: Develop a Management Information System

It is critical to develop a database in order to manage the activities, monitor progress, and facilitate subsequent training and alumni networking. Although individual attendance is currently manually recorded, program staff should be able to identify which participants have attended particular programs. As program alumni begin to train others in large numbers, it is important to know how many such second-generation educators have been trained and how the training is conducted. The ability to aggregate data for analysis will facilitate identifying and applying lessons learned.

The database, further, could be used to accomplish the networking function desired by Dr. Kilusova. It could chronicle participants' qualifications. This would enable program organizers to make linkages between human resources and program-support needs as well as provide a consultant/trainer for future training activities.

Recommendation 5: Strengthen the Orava Association NGO

In order for the Orava Project to institutionalize its activity, the NGO will be a crucial vehicle during the next few years. In the longer term the NGO's functions may be performed by other institutions (e.g., the Methods Centers, universities), but in the short term, the NGO is the catalyst and sustainer of these activities.

We recommend that the NGO employ various means to sustain its work. It should apply to the Ministry of Education to become an accredited institution, able to propose and offer accredited programs. It should continue its work through the Methods Centers and the universities simultaneously. The development of proposals for additional funding is also important.

The staff of the NGO should be increased, at least in the short term, while it continues to organize programs and attempts to secure accreditation. If the NGO undertakes the new functions of database development and support/quality control for alumni, additional qualified staff will be needed. Staff roles and the relationship of staff members to the University of Northern Iowa must be clearly defined.

CONCLUSION

We believe that implementation of these recommendations will assist in sustaining the quality and deepening the impact of this effective program. In addition to providing important training and programs, the Orava Project has successfully created a climate for change among those it has worked with and trained. The time is right for building systems to disseminate the content and methods of the program more widely in order to be a catalyst for education reform in Slovakia.

REFERENCES

- DeVries, R., & Kohlberg, Lawrence. (1987). Constructivist early education: Overview and comparison with other programs. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goddard, P. (Mission Director). (1999, March). USAID Slovakia FY 2001 Results Review. USAID Slovakia.
- Mangieri, J. N., & Collins Block, C. (1994). Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students: Diverse perspectives. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Pelham, P. (1999, June). Evaluation of the Orava Project Phase I. [Report]. CDIE.
- Prawat, R. (1992). From individual differences to learning communities—Our changing focus. Educational Leadership, 49 (7), 9-13.
- Purpel, D. (1989). The moral and spiritual crisis in education. NY: Bergin & Garvey.

**Appendix A:
Respondents Interviewed**

RESPONDENTS INTERVIEWED

Date	Name	Title	Location
Tuesday, November 2, 1999	Paula Goddard Maria Mamlouk Ivona Fibingerova	USAID Mission	Bratislava
	Dr. Erich Mistrik	Dept. Head for Ethic & Civic Education	Comenius University, Bratislava
Wednesday, November 3, 1999	Marcela Maslova	Orava Association Regional Coordinator	Dolny Kubin
	Maria Dudakova	Vice Director, Dolny Kubin School District	Dolny Kubin
	Luba Miklusicakova	Director, Namestovo School District	Dolny Kubin
	Alena Cajkova	School District Office, Constructivism in Kindergartens	Dolny Kubin
	Maria Andraisova	School Director	Dolny Kubin
Thursday, November 4, 1999	Name Unknown	Kindergarten #13 Classroom Teacher	Dolny Kubin
	Maria Hagdukova	Kindergarten Director	Dolny Kubin
	Name Unknown	Third Grade Classroom Observation	Dolny Kubin
	Daniela Fucunova	Sixth Grade Classroom Teacher	Dolny Kubin
	Eva Porkorna	School Principal	Dolny Kubin
	Dr. Pavel Klenovcan	Member of the Pedagogical Faculty of Matej Bel Univ.	Banska Bystrica
	Dr. Eva Prsova	Member of the Pedagogical Faculty of Matej Bel Univer.	Banska Bystrica
	Aneta Anderkova	Doctoral Student, Matej Bel University	Banska Bystrica
	Maria Malikova	Member of Pedagogical Faculty of Constantine the Philosopher University	Nitra
	Helena Bujnova	Member of Pedagogical Faculty of Constantine the Philosopher University	Nitra
	Marta Kvasnovka	High School Teacher	Nitra
Kludia Lorinczova	Orava Association Coordinator	Nitra	

75

RESPONDENTS INTERVIEWED, Continued

Date	Name	Title	Location
Friday, November 5, 1999	Mrs. Faldanooa	Kindergarten Classroom Teacher	Bratislava School District #5
	Mrs. Neumanova	School Headmaster	Bratislava School District #5
	Mrs. Pazerkova	District Inspector of Early Childhood Programs	Bratislava School District #5
	Ms. Chleskova	Fifth Grade Classroom Teacher	Bratislava School District #2
	Mrs. Karaszova	Eighth Grade Classroom Teacher	Bratislava School District #2
	Brano Pupala	Methods Center Program Coordinator	Western Bratislava District
	Daniela Gondova	Director of the Library of the Philosophical Faculty	Comenius University, Bratislava
Saturday, November 6, 1999	Sona Kilusova	Professor, Pedagogical Faculty	Comenius University, Bratislava
	Pavol Panik	Professor, Pedagogical Faculty	Comenius University, Bratislava
	Jan Kuzma	Professor, Pedagogical Faculty	Comenius University, Bratislava
	Vladimir Kurel	High School Teacher	Comenius University, Bratislava
	Sona Kilusova	Orava Association Executive Assistant & Faculty Member	Comenius University, Bratislava
Monday, November 8, 1999	Name Unknown	Kindergarten Teacher	Bratislava
	Ms. Bolhacoea	Kindergarten School Director	Bratislava
	Viera Kubuva	Fourth Grade Teacher	Bratislava
	Maria Orsagova	Vice Director of Basic School	Bratislava
	Mrs. Jancova	Head of Ministry's Department of Primary Schools, Primary Arts Schools, & Kindergartens	Bratislava, Ministry of Education
	Dr. Meredith	Co-director, Orava Association UNI	Bratislava
	Dr. Steele	Co-director, Orava Association UNI	Bratislava
	Paula Goodard	Mission Official	USAID Mission
	Maria Mamlouk	Mission Official	USAID Mission
	Ivona Fibingerova	Mission Official	USAID Mission

Appendix B: Study Instruments

**PARTICIPANT SURVEY
ORAVA PROJECT EVALUATION**

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey regarding your participation in the Orava Project. This survey is one element in an evaluation being conducted by the Improving Educational Quality Project for USAID. Please answer the questions that appear below, providing responses that are as specific as possible. If there are questions that do not apply to your particular involvement in the Orava Project, please indicate this by writing, "Does not apply." In this way, we will know the reasons why specific questions were left blank. If you need more room to respond to questions, please use the back of the survey to do so. We appreciate your thoughtful and candid participation in this evaluation.

I. BACKGROUND

1. Name: _____
2. Affiliation: _____
3. Your position: _____
4. Your specific responsibilities:
5. How long have you been in this position? _____ (years)
6. What is your area of specialization:
7. How did you learn about the opportunity to participate in the Orava Project?
8. By what process were you selected to participate?
9. Do you know of colleagues who wanted to participate but were not selected? *Please describe.*
10. Do you know of colleagues who were asked to participate but declined? *Please describe.*

II. PARTICIPATION IN EVENTS/ACTIVITIES SPONSORED BY THE ORAVA PROJECT

11. What activities have you participated in that have been sponsored by the Orava Project and its staff? *Check (✓) all that apply.*
 - Workshops that focus on democratic pedagogical practices. *Please specify:*
 - Completed the Core Teacher Leader Program
 - Attended some workshops/seminars regarding the Orava Project's Educational Leadership program
 - Completed the full orientation on the Orava Project's Educational Leadership program
 - Meetings between school personnel and university faculty to discuss ways to implement university/school partnerships (e.g., in-service training for teachers, practice teaching placements)
 - Meetings with faculty from other universities to exchange ideas and/or curriculum
 - National conferences sponsored by the Orava Project, Comenius University, and the IUVENTA Center
 - Regular recipient of the *Orava Teachers Journal*

Others. *Please specify:*

How would you rate the quality of events/activities sponsored by the Orava Project?

Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

12. What is the one most important thing you have learned from your participation?

13. Have you been able to use it in your work? If so, how?

14. What is one important thing you had hoped to learn but did not?

15. Were there ideas or strategies you hoped to apply to your work and could not? Why not?

16. What follow-up has there been? What follow-up would you have liked to have?

17. How would you rate the overall relevance of Orava Project sponsored events to your specific responsibilities as a university faculty member? *Check (✓) the statement that best describes your experience.*

Highly relevant Very relevant Somewhat relevant Of limited relevance Irrelevant

III. IMPACT OF THE ORAVA PROJECT ON YOUR WORK

18. Please list the most important democratic principles/values for teaching and learning.

19. Do you think your attitude about these has changed as a result of the Orava Project?

21. Do you think these democratic principles are applicable for Slovakia today? Why or why not?

22. Do you think these democratic principles are being implemented in Slovakia?

23. What facilitates/impedes their implementation?

24. Do you predict that this work will be able to be institutionalized throughout Slovakia in the next three years? Why or why not?

25. To what extent do you feel that the Orava programs are coordinated with the mainstream programs of your institution? (e.g., school, university, method centers)

Very coordinated Coordinated Somewhat Limited Not at all

In what ways?

26. Do you feel that the Orava programs are coordinated with the programs in your region?

Very coordinated Coordinated Somewhat Limited Not at all

In what ways?

27. Do you have any other comments?

❖ If you are a university faculty member, please answer the additional questions (#'s 28 through 45) that appear in Section IV.

❖ If you are a participant in the Educational Leadership Program, please answer questions #'s 41 through 45 in Section IV.

❖ If you are a teacher leader, please answer the additional questions #'s 46 through 53 that appear in Section V.

IV. QUESTIONS FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY

28. How closely do you currently work with local basic education schools in providing in-service education?

Very closely Closely Somewhat In a limited way Not at all

29. Did you begin this practice through your participation in the Orava Project? Yes No

30. How long have you been collaborating with local schools in this way? _____ (months/years)

31. How many in-service workshops have you conducted?

32. What topics have you offered? *Please specify:*

33. How closely do you work with local basic education schools in arranging practice teaching for your students in which the classroom teacher has been trained by the Orava Project?
 Very closely Closely Somewhat Limited Not at all
34. When did you begin this practice of placing student teachers in classrooms? _____ (date)
35. How was the Orava Project involved in developing these placements of students?
36. How many of your students do you place in Orava classrooms each year? _____ (number)
37. How many of your students do you place in classrooms where the teacher is not involved in the Orava Project? _____ (number)
38. In what ways do you work with the Orava-trained classroom teachers who accept your student teachers?
39. Are there ways that these student teachers differ from other students you have prepared in the past?
40. What problems did you encounter in placing students in classrooms with an Orava-trained teacher?
41. To what extent do you use the Orava Project's Educational Leadership Program in designing and delivering courses?
 Very regularly Frequently Occasionally Infrequently Not at all
42. How many of the 11 seminar topics have you used? _____ (number)
43. Which topics did you find most helpful? Please name specific seminar topics.
44. How did these Orava materials change your instruction?
45. What facilitated or impeded their implementation?

Thank you for your participation.

V. TEACHER LEADER QUESTIONS

46. To what extent do you use the Orava Project's Core Teacher Leader Program?
 Very regularly Frequently Occasionally Infrequently Not at all
47. Which topics did you find most helpful? *Please name specific topics.*
48. How did these Orava materials change your instruction in your classroom?
49. What has facilitated or impeded their implementation?
50. To what extent have you been successful in training other teachers in using these instructional strategies?
 Very successful Successful Somewhat successful Limited success Not at all
51. How many teachers have you trained in total? _____ (number)
52. How many teachers have you trained over the past 12 months? _____ (number)
53. What factors have facilitated or impeded your training of other teachers to use instructional strategies promoted by the Orava Project?

Thank you for your participation.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE METHODS CENTERS

1. What are the functions of the Methods Center?
2. Who works there?
3. Who conducts workshops?
4. What are the in-service requirements for teachers?
5. What is the relationship with the State Pedagogic Institute?
6. What is the relationship with the Orava Project?
7. What is the relationship with other Methods Centers?
8. What is the relationship with the Pedagogic Universities?
9. What is the procedure for accrediting teachers? (Re-accrediting teachers)
10. Are Orava courses now accepted for in-service credit?
11. What is the government education structure?

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**

1. Please tell us the vital statistics about your school system. How many schools? How many teachers? What grades are compulsory?
2. What are the main responsibilities of the Ministry? (policy development? curriculum development? teacher certification? monitoring? evaluation and assessment?)
3. How does the Ministry carry out these responsibilities? (e.g., centralized vs. local control? inspectors, Methods Centers, curriculum specialists? teacher trainers? using universities?)
4. What are the Ministry's goals for the education system this year? For the future?
5. Is the Ministry happy with the type of education that is delivered? What are the pluses and minuses?
6. How are teachers trained in pre-service? Who are the service providers? How are standards and content of training determined? What are the requirements for certification?
7. What type of in-service training do teachers receive? Who provides this?
8. What type of coordination is there between pre- in-service and actual teacher roles in their schools?
9. Is the Ministry receptive to NGOs or other outside service providers for teacher training? If yes, please provide some examples.
10. Can you speak specifically about your impressions of the Orava Project? Do you think it matches the Ministry's goals? Can it be implemented in pre- and in-service training (by whom and how?), and will the Ministry provide funding for future work of the project when U.S. funding ends?
11. What is the coordination between Orava and the Ministry? Between the NGO and the Ministry?
12. Are Orava courses now accepted for in-service credit? For teacher certification?
13. To what extent are Orava courses coordinated with Ministry initiatives and programs? To what extent could they be in the future?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ORAVA NGO

A. ORGANIZATION

1. What is the purpose and mission? Is there a mission statement, an organization chart?
2. What are the qualifications/background of the staff? How were they selected?
3. What type of staff development has been given to the NGO staff?
4. Is there a "team" environment within the NGO? Among the three NGOs?
5. What talent pool can be drawn from to provide consultants and future staffing for the NGO?
6. What type of personnel evaluation is performed?
7. What types of program evaluations are performed?

B. ADMINISTRATION

1. What type of equipment is in the office?
2. What budgeting and accounting procedures are used?
3. What has been the annual budget? What is the minimum funding required to maintain the activities? To develop new activities?
4. What record-keeping systems are used to perform a detailed examination of records (e.g., participants' attitude surveys, evaluation surveys, attendance records, follow-up surveys, etc.)?

C. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

1. What are the main functions of the NGO?
2. What type of organizing is done, and how? What are the procedures for setting up workshops (e.g., finding sites, selecting/notifying participants, arranging for transportation, meals, translations, etc.)
3. Are participants paid for their attendance? For conducting workshops? If so, what is the amount and what is the procedure?
4. What has been (will be) the role of the NGO in production of the guides? Is the NGO to be a library/resource center?

D. COORDINATION/RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS/CONSTITUENCIES

1. What types of needs assessments are performed?
2. What relationships are there with the Ministry of Education?
 - (a) What support comes from the Ministry of Education?
 - (b) What official orders support the Orava Project and/or its type of work?
 - (c) What official orders contradict the work of the Orava Project?
3. What relationships are there with local education officials?
4. What relationships are there with the Methods Centers?
5. What relationships are there with the universities? With faculty members?
6. What relationships are there with in-service providers?

7. What relationships are there with local schools? With local inspectors?
8. What relationships are there with other constituent organizations (e.g., teachers' unions, teachers' associations)?
9. What mechanisms are there for community participation and local involvement?
10. What relationships are maintained with other NGOs?
11. What relationships are maintained among the three Orava NGOs?
12. How does the coordination with UNI work—through what mechanisms, with what frequency? What will UNI's role be this year? In the future?
13. How could the administrative capacity be expanded to the rest of the country? What would need to happen?
14. Has there been any resentment of the Orava Project on the part of some constituencies? What has it been, and how has it been addressed?

CAPACITY-SUSTAINING MECHANISMS

1. How is political support developed and maintained?
2. How is funding developed?
3. Is there a marketing and public relations capacity? A social marketing capacity?
4. What is the public perception of the project? How do you know?
5. Has the NGO been involved with strategic planning? How? Will it be involved in the future?
6. Is there a research and development capacity?

COMMUNICATION WITH PARTICIPANTS/ALUMNI

1. How is communication maintained with past program participants?
2. Do they know the current activities of alumni? Do they provide support for those activities?

**SCHOOL COMPONENT
ORAVA PROJECT EVALUATION**

BACKGROUND

School: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____

School administrator: _____

School statistics:

Grades:

Number of students:

Number of teachers:

Characteristics of community served:

Level of involvement in Orava Project:

Involvement in other reform programs:

SCHOOL CLIMATE

What is the nature of the interactions during informal/noninstructional time (e.g., during transitions)?

Consider teacher-teacher, teacher-administrator, teacher-child, child-child interactions.

Examples:

Are there displays of student work?

Examples:

What indications are there of personalization in the environment or interactions?

Examples:

What evidence is there of outreach/openness to parents?

Examples:

Other comments:

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Grade: _____

Age range: _____

Teacher name: _____

Number of students: _____

Date/time of observation: _____

Teacher's stated learning goals for the lesson observed:

Teacher's explanation of instructional strategies:

Teacher's rationale for goals and approach:

Teacher's evaluation of how the lesson met his/her expectations:

Instructions

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE FOR EACH QUESTION AND GIVE ONE SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF WHY YOU GAVE THIS RATING.

5 Strongly Agree (SA)	4 Agree (A)	3 Neutral (N)	2 Disagree (D)	1 Strongly Disagree (SD)
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------

Checklist

1. The goals/instructional objectives were clear.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

2. The motivation was clear.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

3. The active learning method chosen was appropriate. It enhanced instruction. How?

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

4. The students were thinking critically.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

5. The students actively asked questions.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

6. Classroom order was maintained.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

7. The teacher used engaging questions.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

8. The lesson achieved its intended objective.

5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

Example:

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

NAME OF RESPONDENT: _____

Title of respondent: _____

Brief description of respondent's general responsibilities:

Length of time in position: _____ years

Background/experience:

Others participating? Yes No

If yes, names and positions:

NAME	POSITION
------	----------

(1)

(2)

Name of interviewer: _____

Date/time of interview: _____

INTERVIEW FOCUS: COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIP

- (1) Please share with us some of the important characteristics of your university? its culture and its commitment to teacher preparation and education reform.
- (2) How long have you been familiar with the Orava Project?
- (3) How and when did you first learn about the program?
- (4) What component of the Orava Project do you find most important to your goals for higher education? Why?
- (5) How would you characterize the nature of your relationship with the Orava Project? Please provide an example that best illustrates the nature of your relationship.
- (6) What factors have facilitated and impeded the development of your collaboration?

II. INTERVIEW FOCUS: SPECIFIC INITIATIVES

- (7) In what ways has the university collaborated with the Orava Project on the design and implementation of the Educational Leadership Program? (Probe for respective roles.) What have been the outcomes? For students? For faculty? For schools?
- (8) How has your participation in the Educational Leadership Program altered the programs and opportunities for students?
- (9) Has it altered the policies and practices within the university at large? In what ways? (Probe for examples.)
- (10) Has the university collaborated with the Orava Project on other specific projects? What is the nature of these projects, the role of each organization, and the outcomes? (Probe for early childhood, credit system, electives, school/university partnerships, library, technology.)

III. INTERVIEW FOCUS: FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- (11) What do you see as the future challenges affecting higher education in Slovakia and teacher preparation in particular?

What new priorities do you expect to set for the coming years?

- (12) How do you see the Orava Project's programs fitting into these future directions and contributing to these goals?

- (13) As you think about the future, how would you assess the sustainability of the Orava Project?

What particular strengths do you think the program possesses in this regard?

What particular areas do you think the Orava Project must address in order to be better prepared for the future?

9. The objective was appropriate.
- | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----|-----|------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| (SA) | (A) | (N) | (D) | (SD) |
- Example:
10. What was most effective about the lesson?
11. What was least effective about the lesson?

Bibliography

- Adler, M. (ed.) (1984). The Paideia Program. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- The American Federation of Teachers. (1990). The Goal of Critical Thinking: From Educational Ideal to Educational Reality. Washington, D.C.: AFT.
- Bloom, B.S. (ed.) (1984). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain/Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, and Personal Communication.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1986). Reframing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Bolotov, V. & Spiro, J. (1995). "Using Critical Thinking to Transform Russian Schools" Educational Leadership, May, pp. 11 -13.
- Brookfield, S. (1986). Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Brookfield, S. (1987). Developing Critical Thinkers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1910). How We Think. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- Ennis, R. (1984). Goals for a Critical Thinking Curriculum. Illinois Thinking Project: University of Illinois.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1993). Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Knowles, M. (1980). The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pegagogy to Andragogy. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company.
- Mager, R. (1971). Preparing Instructional Objectives. California: Fearon Press.