

PN-ACX-207

Prepared by:

Creative Associates International, Inc.

Dr. Gilbert A. Valverde, Ph.D.

**Outline for an Activity to Develop an
Educational Evaluation System in
the Dominican Republic**

The Basic Education and Policy Support
(BEPS) Activity

Contract No. HNE-I-00-00-00038-00
Task Order No. 4

Improved Human Resource Policies

Prepared for:

LAC/RSD-EHR
US Agency for International Development

June 2001

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background	1
Methodology	2
II. INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITIES.....	3
III. TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPABILITIES IN DATA COLLECTION, VALIDATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISSEMINATION: ACTIVITY OUTLINE.....	5
Activity Goals	5
Activity Description	5
IV. ACTIVITY INDICATORS.....	10
Pertaining to Component 1	10
Pertaining to Component 2	10
V. RESOURCES NEEDED.....	11
Major USAID Cost Outlays	11
GODR/NGO/University Contributions.....	12
APPENDICES	13
A. List of Documents Reviewed	14
B. List of Persons Interviewed	15
C. Consideraciones para el desarrollo de un Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación en la República Dominicana: Documento para Discusión	17

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

Since 1992, the Dominican Republic (DR) has been engaged in a process of educational reform. While significant progress has been made, particularly in expanding coverage, successive Secretariats of State for Education and Culture (SSEC) have not given explicit attention to quality nor to the attendant systems for evaluation and monitoring such explicit attention would entail.

The General Law of Education, approved in 1997, calls for a “Sistema Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación” (a National System for the Evaluation of the Quality in Education). This system is intended to develop a number of general objectives in the area of evaluation and monitoring.¹ The “Reglamento de Evaluación de la Calidad Educativa” (“Guidelines for the Evaluation of Educational Quality”) should have dictated guidelines for the application of the system, but instead it only lays out general objectives and does not specify implementation procedures.

The new administration recently declared improving educational quality a top priority within its next strategic plan, with the slogan – “Repensar la Educación a partir de la calidad.” (rethink education from the quality). As part of this new strategy, the SSEC has requested that USAID provide technical assistance on a reliable system for educational evaluation and monitoring.

The SSEC has communicated the importance and urgency of designing a system that will help to track indicators and variables for policymaking, planning, monitoring, and resource allocation. The technical assistance for the SSEC started with an initial assessment of the existing institutional capabilities and needs in the area of evaluation by exploring the following questions:

- What departments collect which data? How is the data processed? Who uses the data and for what purposes?
- What information needs are going unmet and why?
- What capabilities does the SSEC hope to develop associated with proximate and long-range decision-making goals, particularly in the area of educational indicators? Which capabilities are of the highest priority?

An initial document, based upon these preliminary probes, was circulated to the SSEC, non-governmental organizations, and persons in higher education in order to generate a discussion of priorities in the development of an educational evaluation system. This current report follows up on the previous assessment and a round of face-to-face conversations outlining the key features of a project for the development of evaluation capabilities for the education system of the Dominican Republic.

¹ Ley General de Educación No. 66'97, Secretaría de Estado de Educación y Cultura, Santo Domingo, D.N., Dominican Republic, 1997, pp. 21-22.

Methodology

The author conducted an assessment based upon interviews with key decision makers and observers, a review of relevant documents, and discussions with USAID and SSEC officials, and with Dominican non-governmental actors for the purpose of ascertaining needs and institutional capabilities in the DR. As the point of departure for the outlining of an activity to develop capabilities in educational indicators and evaluation that is most isomorphic with those needs, the consultation proceeded in accordance with the following five phases:

1. *Preparation:* A period in which the author reviewed preliminary materials, to include all relevant educational policy and technical documents from the DR as well as the UNESCO and OECD indicators projects (see Appendix A, "List of Documents Reviewed"), and familiarized himself with the situation regarding indicators both in the DR and beyond, particularly in the DR's participation in the international system. The result was a set of initial ideas and questions to be explored during face-to-face conversations in the DR.
2. *First Visit:* Visit to the DR to meet and interview key DR educational system actors. Meetings included the Secretary of State for Education and pertinent advisors, directors, and technicians in evaluation, quality control, and a number of other SSEC units, USAID officers, a director of a non-governmental organization concerned with education, and academics (see Appendix B, "List of Persons Interviewed"). The purpose of these meetings was to gather information on needs and technical or institutional capacities.
3. *Pre-planning Phase:* A period during which all information gathered during Phases 1 and 2 was processed. A detailed draft report addressing key features of an activity for the support of the DR in the area of indicators/monitoring/evaluation/assessment was prepared (See Appendix C). At the end of this phase, the draft was delivered to the USAID mission, and through the mission, to the SSEC, a Dominican NGO, and some professors in institutions of higher education.
4. *Second Visit:* Period involved consultation and collaboration within the DR in order to gather feedback to the initial report. The consultant worked with the SSEC and USAID Mission personnel in the preparation of a penultimate draft activity design.
5. *Follow-up Phase:* Period used to prepare the final activity outline (the current document), which reflects the draft report and feedback to the draft, to be submitted to the relevant parties.

II. INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITIES

Phases 1 and 2 of the work reported herein produced the following picture regarding needs and capabilities in the area of educational indicators in the DR:

- Director Generals of most SSEC departments indicate that most data needs for decision making go unmet. Each department often collects its own data, communicating directly with regional and district level authorities. Often the simplest data are the most difficult to come by and are deemed unreliable (e.g., number of teachers, number and condition of school buildings, etc.). Data collection and reporting efforts that exist are inconsistent in the operational definition of measures and in reporting format, a severe limitation to their usefulness in decision-making.
- There are no administrative dispositions in the SSEC for the central processing and archiving of data. New efforts are underway, but these are still in planning and very initial implementation phases. The particular needs of an Indicators and Evaluation Unit in the SSEC have not been accounted for in the design of this system.
 - Two SSEC units have conducted activities that can conceivably be seen to be parts of an eventual Indicators and Evaluation effort. One set of efforts is the designing, fielding, and reporting of achievement data associated with the Pruebas Nacionales (National Tests) used as elements in decisions regarding promotion of students. The second is a series of monitoring efforts of the Curriculum Unit for the purpose of understanding how the national curriculum is enacted in classrooms.
 - Although both law and knowledge of sound administrative practice accord high priority to the development of indicators and evaluation capabilities in the SSEC, consideration of the operationalization of this priority is still at its preliminary stages. A number of separate units in the SSEC and also extra-secretarial agencies have ideas regarding how to develop such capabilities. There are currently no operational plans.
 - There is no strong tradition of reliance on analysis in Dominican educational policy making—a challenge that all such efforts will face is developing such capabilities—and dispositions for creating, critically assessing, and communicating knowledge relevant to decisions in educational organizations.
 - Despite the paucity of current efforts in evaluation and monitoring, the SSEC has the ambition to develop a technically strong unit involved in the monitoring and assessment of educational indicators for the purpose of managing the educational system from the perspective of quality of outcomes and processes.
 - The most promising leverage point, which was identified by the author and ratified in discussion during Phase 4, is in the area of the measurement and monitoring of the classroom implementation of the intended curriculum. This is an area complimentary to current efforts in achievement testing and curriculum monitoring, while at the same time is in accordance with the national policy of curriculum-driven educational

reform. The activity outlined below recognizes this leverage point and suggests activities to strengthen and further current efforts and to develop new capabilities in both the technical and administrative aspects of the creation and use of data for decision-making.

III. TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPABILITIES IN DATA COLLECTION, VALIDATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISSEMINATION: ACTIVITY OUTLINE

Activity Goals

A dual program to assist the Dominican educational system's efforts to develop capabilities for monitoring educational quality, enhancing its cost-effectiveness, and probing the nature of educational opportunities afforded by the system. The activity will provide educational leaders in the DR's public and private sectors both technical assistance in indicators and evaluation and also assistance in the development of local capabilities to use contemporary technologies to collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the nature of opportunities made available in the educational system, the roles of key agencies and actors, and the accomplishments of students.

Activity Description

A program that entails the support of a technical group devoted to educational evaluation and the design and management of an educational indicator system. The activity would entail both support for the creation and initial development of a Dominican technical team devoted to educational evaluation and also the contracting of US academics with substantial international consulting experience to fulfill a dual role:

- *Conducting traditional consulting services by providing technical assistance in educational indicator systems, contemporary methods in educational measurement, and the evaluation of educational opportunities to the nascent Dominican evaluation unit, team, or consortium (henceforward "Indicators and Evaluation Group" or IEG); and*
- *Conducting semester-long, graduate level, applied courses in these areas to a group made up of no more than about 15 students (evaluation personnel from the SSEC, education NGOs, and graduate students).*

Activity Component 1: Development of the Indicators and Evaluation Group

This component entails the conformation and 'launching' of a technical team devoted to educational evaluation and monitoring in the DR. The IEG would have the proximate goals of organizing and fielding first efforts in the collection and analysis of educational indicator data – with an initial emphasis on indicators related to the implemented and attained curricula. In doing so, the IEG would commence the pursuit of the long-term goal of developing as a group capable of using contemporary procedures to systematically assess the effectiveness of educational system actors, agencies, and practices to inform educational system decisions and interventions in ways that improve the quality of educational outcomes. The creation of such a group and its adaptation to the specific political and organizational environment of education in the DR is viewed as a long-term goal but one that is best pursued by designing and fielding (and learning from) increasingly challenging evaluation efforts in accordance with a continuously refined and developed vision of the information needs of the educational system. The development of a unit

with such a vision should result in an IEG with a distinct set of structures and preferred theoretical and methodological approaches, while at the same time the capability to participate in global professional networks in the field.

Initially, as agreed in conversations with a variety of SSEC and non-governmental actors, the emphasis will be placed on the curricular and pedagogical aspects of evaluating educational opportunities, with a secondary emphasis on refining existing capabilities in the measurement of educational achievement and the development of new capabilities in the measurement of learning. Goals for this component of the activity will thus be:

- Constitution of an IEG devoted to educational indicators and evaluation for the Dominican educational system.
- Incorporation of the IEG into international professional networks in the field.
- Acquisition of information infrastructure and physical infrastructure to support the endeavors of the IEG.
- The design and fielding of studies intended to evaluate educational opportunities afforded in Dominican schools.
- The design and fielding of studies to assess the achievement of Dominican students.
- The design and fielding of studies to uncover what Dominican students learn as they progress through the educational system.
- The analysis, reporting, and use in administrative and policy decisions of information that relates indicators of the intended, implemented, and attained curriculum.

Constitution of the IEG would require not only the assemblage of technical personnel and the assignation of their responsibilities, but also the constitution of a governance system. It is important that the governance system include some form of Steering Committee, which the Director of the IEG would preside *ex-officio*, that would include representation of the SSEC, NGOs, the Teachers' Union, and other key actors. Thereafter, a strategic plan for the IEG must be created and approved by the Steering Committee—and the IEG Director must make the administrative dispositions that flow from the strategic plan. It is proposed that the initial focus of support for the IEG be in developing capabilities in the area of evaluating curricular definitions of educational quality, and it is anticipated that the strategic plan will emphasize this.

The IEG will need to develop instruments for the assessment of educational opportunities afforded in the Dominican educational system. This typically entails not only the piloting of paper-and-pencil instruments and an assessment of their value, but also substantial research and development work using a variety of field methods. Support in research and development for the generation of instruments for assessing educational opportunities would entail not only consultant expertise but also infrastructure such as computers, digital reproduction equipment (digital video and still cameras), and other such equipment.

Specifically, the IEG must be supported in its efforts to:

- Operationalize goals in the national curriculum in order to specify observation protocols, coding schemes, and test blueprints.
- Design, test, and validate data collection strategies and instruments for the measurement of educational opportunities.
- Design, test, and validate data collection strategies and instruments for the measurement of student achievement, including both newer quantitative and qualitative evaluation techniques.
- Design, test, and validate data collection strategies and instruments for the measurement of learning through longitudinal or synthetic cohort studies.
- Analyze, interpret, and present to system actors and decision makers information gathered on educational opportunities and their relationship to system goals and student achievement and learning.

Activity Component 2: Development of Local Capabilities in Educational Evaluation

Consultants assisting in Component 1 would be responsible for participating in the training of Dominican personnel by conducting formal courses in their areas of expertise. Each course would focus on techniques of data collection and analytical strategies to understand and/or inform programmatic and educational policy decisions. Course aims would be to: acquaint participants with the nature and methods of educational policy research and program evaluation and to help students develop skills for conceptualizing fundamental educational problems, framing these problems for analysis; design and conduct sound data collection and analysis plans; and draw and present conclusions regarding programmatic or policy alternatives. Each course would be organized to do several things: help participants understand and discuss the current literature on analysis for educational planning, policy, and leadership; develop an applied knowledge of methods; analyze an actual policy or administrative issue or educational program; and produce and present recommendations based on evidence produced through theory-driven evaluation. Students would be expected to leave the course with the ability to use research and evaluation methods based on the social sciences in applied research settings. More specifically, they would be able to do the following:

- Conceptualize and define educational problems that can be subject to policy interventions.
- Judge the relationship of an existing educational program or policy to conceptualizations of social and/or educational problems.
- Design and carry out targeted research activities in evaluation to enhance decision making.
- Understand and practice professional and ethical standards in evaluation and human subjects research.
- Produce and/or collect reliable and valid information about an educational activity or policy problem and use them to answer evaluation questions or to assess alternative policy options.
- Model the consequences that follow from the implementation of one programmatic or policy choice over another.

- Develop an effective strategy to present the results of analysis in a well organized and concise written form.
- Develop effective oral briefings concerning the analysis, training materials for teachers and/or other educational staff, and material for public audiences.

The courses would be conducted as a series of graduate practicums, with the first part of the course being conducted as a seminar where students and the instructor would read the pertinent literature and, via guest speakers, acquire shared understandings regarding the challenges of crafting educational activities and conducting policy analysis in the DR. The second part of the course would be conducted by organizing participants into a working evaluation and policy analysis team. The program would concentrate primarily on the experience of conducting a set of educational evaluation exercises of use to a specific governmental or non-governmental educational program or other educational initiative. The course/team would work together to generate and review problem frames, examine and evaluate a range of data bearing on the condition under study, collect pertinent data, assess impact, formulate alternative policies to address the findings, and provide grounded information on the consequences of implementing recommended program or activity changes.

This program would entail the use of one to four US academics in the DR, visiting periodically over the course of two years. A group of students would receive a three to four-week intensive first course session (daily meetings of 2.5 to 4 hours) conducted by these specialists and team-taught with the participation of a Dominican faculty member – preferably with no less than a Master’s degree in Measurement, Evaluation, Statistics, or Policy Studies. During the final period of the first session, a practical evaluation problem (with the SSEC, a particular component of it, or a particular externally-funded activity as the explicit ‘consumer’) would be identified and a data collection and analysis plan would be put together. The consultant-instructor would then depart with the Dominican co-instructor serving as team leader and coordinating data collection activities. The consultant-instructor would commit a certain amount of time to serve as a ‘virtual’ team member via E-mail and real-time on-line collaboration and conferencing (such as Microsoft NetMeeting 3). During the data collection period, and at its conclusion, the consultant-instructor would return for two-week periods to monitor and coordinate the class in finalizing collection, drawing up final analysis and reporting plans, and beginning the preliminary analyses. Additionally, the consultant would conduct lectures and seminars targeted to emergent issues in implementing the evaluation or policy analysis activity. The consultant would depart again with a commitment to ‘virtual participation’. Upon conclusion of the analysis phase, the academic would return for a final one to two-week period for preparation and presentation of a final report—again in conjunction with additional teaching and traditional technical assistance to Activity Component 1. Thus, the consultant would travel to the DR for an initial period of four to five weeks, with a one-week preparation period and two to three weeks of intensive initial meetings with the course participants, followed by approximately four, two-week long visits during a semester, to ensure activity success in meeting both pedagogical and evaluation goals.

This would be a three-year activity. The first part would be a series of four semester-long practicums, following the pedagogical outline described above, conducted successively over a

two-year period. The results of Year 1 would be two evaluation/policy analysis reports and briefings conducted by the consultant-instructor and practicum participants, in addition to whatever traditional consulting the consultant is commissioned with. Results of Year 2 would be 15-20 trainees successfully finishing the program and engaged in evaluation work in the private or public sector (or continuing their education) and two more evaluation/policy analysis reports and briefings, in addition to whatever traditional consulting the consultant is commissioned with. Year 3 would have two complementary parts: the provision of traditional consulting services to the Dominican evaluation team (which would include both consultants and activity trainees); and support in the United States for additional training in specific topics for some of the trainees. Selected trainees would be supported for attendance to short courses in measurement, analysis, or evaluation at US institutions (for example, National Council of Measurement in Education workshops, National Science Foundation/National Center for Educational Statistics short courses, University of Maryland summer programs in measurement, etc.).

Participants. About fifteen to twenty participants would be recruited from the SSEC (perhaps staff from appropriate units in both Sub-secretariats), staff working on bilateral or multilateral aid supported activities, and staff of the IEG and graduate students from Dominican universities. A system of competitive admissions would be used. All applicants would be required to submit evidence of mastery of reading of technical English, an updated curriculum vita, two personal references (one written by a referee familiar with academic performance of applicant, and another from a referee familiar with the applicant's work performance) and a writing sample. Materials would be reviewed by an admissions committee made up of two Dominican members of education NGOs, two representatives of the SSEC, one USAID representative, and the first consultant. This committee, prior to final selection, would interview short-listed applicants.

Consultant-instructors. Consultant-instructors must be individuals who are fluent in Spanish, hold regular academic appointments in duly accredited institutions of higher education, and have experience in international consulting in educational evaluation, measurement, and/or policy analysis—or that are scholars with international experience in the application of political science, economics, sociology, or anthropology to educational evaluation. One-to-four consultant-instructors would be required.

Implementing Units. One possibility would be to have a consortium of postsecondary institutions, education NGOs, and the Government of the DR (GODR) as co-signers of agreement with USAID, with one university or NGO serving as program site and receiving capital goods purchased upon conclusion of activity. Consultant-trainers might be individual contractors, an institution of higher education, or a consulting firm.

IV. ACTIVITY INDICATORS

Pertaining to Component 1

- 1.1 Constitution and continuous functioning of the IEG
- 1.2 Constitution and continuous functioning of the IEG Steering Committee
- 1.3 Creation of a Strategic Plan
- 1.4 Creation of measurement and analysis plans for the integrated evaluation of system curricular goals, educational opportunities created in schools and classrooms, student achievement and student learning
- 1.5 Development and validation of measurement instruments for objectives under 1.4
- 1.6 Fielding of instruments under 1.5
- 1.7 Composition and dissemination of evaluation reports

Pertaining to Component 2

- 2.1 Percentage of admitted trainees completing two-year series of practicums
- 2.2 Percentage of completing trainees accepted to, and successfully completing small courses of study in Year 3
- 2.3 Percentage of completing trainees primarily engaged in professional evaluation or policy analysis (or pursuing advanced degrees in these areas) by end of 4th year subsequent to commencement of program.
- 2.4 Four evaluation or policy analysis reports and briefings produced by trainee group under the leadership of international consultant.
- 2.5 Consulting activities successively accomplished by consultant-instructor in her/his traditional consultant role.

V. RESOURCES NEEDED

Major USAID Cost Outlays

- 1) Pertaining to Component 1
 - a) Salaries
 - b) Depending on final implementation strategy, the equipment could be the same as specified under Component 2
- 2) Pertaining to Component 2
 - a) Course development costs for each of the four practicums.
 - b) Consultant-instructor honoraria, travel, and per diems.
 - c) Budget (travel funds, lodging, meals, and incidental expenses) for trainees' participation in data collection and field visits.
 - d) Budget for data entry and cleaning costs
 - e) Cost for trainees' books and other written reference materials intended to be kept at a 'evaluation laboratory,' including three years of subscription to a dozen US and European peer-reviewed professional journals.²
 - f) Cost for purchase and maintenance of one large-screen desktop computer with cd-writable drive, internet connection, and equipped for real-time on-line collaboration and conferencing and videotape editing; one color laser printer; two laptop computers; and one portable computer projector – as well as word processing, database, data entry, spreadsheet, statistical analysis, graphics, video editing, desktop publishing, collaboration, and qualitative data analysis programs.
 - g) Cost for purchase and maintenance of other data collection and analysis equipment (VCR, television, writing materials, video cameras, digital still cameras, and a color scanner)
 - h) Budget for reproduction and dissemination of survey and testing instruments.
 - i) Reproduction costs for occasional readings and assignments, and budget for other instructional materials.
 - j) Costs for third-year travel, per diems, and other costs related to five to fifteen trainees' attendance at short courses in the United States.
 - k) Costs of three-year "sobresueldo" contribution to Dominican academic-coordinator to be added to base salary provided by own institution (perhaps approximately 20 percent of base salary)
 - l) Overhead costs if consultant-instructors form part of institutional contract

² Such as Educational Policy Studies, Journal of Educational Measurement, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Educational Researcher, Comparative and International Education Review, Sociology of Education, Economics of Education, Economic Development and Cultural Change, Review of Educational Research, etc.

GODR/NGO/University Contributions

- 1) Pertaining to Component 1 – N/A
- 2) Pertaining to Component 2
 - a) Paid release time for program participants.
 - b) Dedicated physical space for “Laboratorio de Evaluación” a documentation center, evaluation laboratory, trainee seminar meeting space, and office for Consultant-Instructor.
 - c) Basic instructional equipment: i.e., blackboard, overhead projector
 - d) Access and proper releases for use of SSEC and databases
 - e) Access to schools and ministry staff (including teachers) for data collection purposes
 - f) Appropriate credit-time recognition for participants that are university graduate students. Salary and no less than three-quarter time exclusive dedication to the training program for Dominican academic-coordinator, and recognition of this service for tenure and/or promotion.

APPENDICES

A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Aleman, Jose Luis. 1996. *Tecnologia, Economia y Educacion en la Republica Dominicana*.

Barro, Stephen M. 1997. *The Development of Internationally Comparable Indicators of Education Finance: The OECD Experience and Its Implications for Mercosur*.

Crespo, Manuel, & Luis Dominguez. 1996a. *Impacto del Programa de Capacitacion de Maestros en Servicios de Educacion Basica*.

_____. 1996b. *Pruebas Nacionales 1991 al 1996*.

Dore Cabral, Carlos, & Alejandra Liriano (Eds.). 1996. *El Caribe frente a los retos de la Globalizacion*.

EDUCA-CESDEM. 1996S. *Censo a los centros educativos primarios: Distrito Nacional*.

_____. 1995. *Censo a los centros educativos primarios: Distrito Nacional*.

Garcia, Dignora; Julio Leonardo Valeiron; Josefina Pimentel; & Rocio Hernandez. Undated. *Sistema Nacional de Evaluacion de la Calidad de la Educacion: Fundamentos, Experiencias y Perspectivas*.

Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluacion de la Calidad de la Educacion. 1998. *Primer Estudio Internacional Comparativo sobre Lenguaje, Matematica, y Factores Asociados en Tercero y Cuarto Grado*.

OECD. 2000. *Indicators of Educational Systems: Programme of the Fourth General ASSECbly*.

_____. 1999. *Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills: A New Framework for ASSECsment*.

OECD-PISA. 2000. *Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills: The PISA 2000 ASSECsment of Reading, Mathematical and Scientific Literacy*.

Pineros, Luis Jaime. 2000. *Segundo Programa de Mejoramiento de la Educacion Basica. Fase II – Evaluacion de medio termino subcomponente: Evaluacion Nacional del Rendimiento Escolar*.

Sanguinety, Jorge A., & Jorge Max Fernandez. 2000. *The Future of Education in the Dominican Republic: Opportunities and Challenges*.

SEEBAC. 1997. Ordenanza 1'96 que establece el Sistema de Evaluacion del Curriculum de la Educacion Inicial, Basica, Media, Especial y de Adultos.

SEEC. 2001. Orden Departamental No. 9-2001 mediante la cual se establece un sistema permanente de concurso de oposicion para seleccionar a director(a) y subdirector(a) de centros educativos.

_____. 1999a. *Evaluacion sobre el uso e impacto de los libros de texto.*

_____. 1999b. *Monitoreo del Desarrollo Curricular: Plan y resultados del primer monitoreo.*

_____. 1997. *Ley General de Educacion No. 66'97.*

SEEC – Consejo Nacional de Educacion. 2000. *Reglamento del Sistema Nacional de la Calidad de la Educacion.*

SEEC – PNUD – UNESCO. 2000. *Sintesis de la Evaluacion a Medio Termino del Plan Decenal de Educacion.*

Tapia, Leandra. 2000. *Informe: Monitoreo al Desarrollo Curricular del Nivel Basico.*

Tavares, Juan Tomas. 1994. *Los Empresarios y el Plan decenal de Educacion.*

UNESCO. 1993. *Planteamientos Principales del Plan Decenal de Educacion.*

Villaman, Marcos, & Raymundo Gonzalez. 1996. *Educacion, Democracia, Ciudadanizacion y Construccion de Identidades Nacionales.*

Vincent, Minerva, & Josefina Pimentel. 1996 *Concepciones, Procesos y Estructuras Educativas.*

Wilms, J. Douglas, and Marie-Andree Somers. 2000. *Resultados Escolares in America Latina; Informa para UNESCO.*

B. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Lic. Catalina Andujar – Director of the Department of Special Education.

Lic. Aida Consuelo Bonelly – Director, EDUCA.

Dr. Milagros Ortiz Bosch – Vice President of the Dominican Republic and Secretary of State for Education

Lic. Natalie Cabrera – Director General of Early Childhood Education (Inicial).

Lic. Miguel Angel Diaz – Director General of Secondary Education (Media).

Dr. Luis Dominguez – Monitoring Specialist, SSEC.

Sr. Roberto Fulcar – Undersecretary for Supervision and Quality Control, SSEC.

Lic. Nurys Gonzalez – Director General of Curriculum.

Mr. Donnie Harrington – Manager for Democracy and Economics, USAID Mission, DR.

Sr. Angel Hernandez – Undersecretary for Technical Pedagogical Affairs, SSEC.

Lic. Rocio Hernandez – Director General of Basic (Primary) Education.

Lic. Miguel Angel Diaz Herrera – Director, Secondary Education.

Lic. Midalma Lopez – Director General of Adult Education.

Prof. Sarah Gonzalez de Lora – Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, Pontificia Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra, Santiago de los Caballeros.

Ancell Schecker Mendoza – Coordinator for Intervention Program in 1 and 2 grades. Basic Education, SSEC.

Lic. Jose Agustin de Miguel – Advisor to INFOCAM.

Dr. Fernando A. Ogando – Specialist, SSEC.

Prof. Francisco Polanco – Director of Academic Affairs, Pontificia Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra, Recinto Santo Tomas de Aquino.

Mr. Julio Leonardo Valeiron – Director, National Examination System.

Neici Zeller – General Development Officer, USAID Mission, DR.